



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 29, 2001

No. 44

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Willie T. Lockett, St. Martha Missionary Baptist Church, Oak Hill, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Eternal all wise God, Thou who art from everlasting until everlasting. It is again that we come into Thy presence. We come with grateful hearts and we come thanking You first for the privilege of coming to You and You hearing our prayer. We thank You for this day. We thank You for this session and for this place in our Nation's capital where we are assembled.

We thank You for these legislators and pray that You will touch their hearts and minds so that they will be mindful of the needs of our Nation; and that, while You control their thoughts, You will give them the courage that they might play the game of life with boldness, fairness, and integrity.

Help them to stand firmly on their belief if it is within Thy sight and in Thy will. Help them to keep this Nation one that others will continue to look to for guidance and direction. Help them to propose the kind of legislation that will increase the quality of education for our children. Help them to pass the laws that will set a new standard in housing, employment, and health care.

Then, God, teach us to love one another as You have commanded us to do.

This we ask in Your name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. McNULTY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 1 minute. All other one minutes will be at the end of the day.

INTRODUCING THE REVEREND WILLIE T. LOCKETT

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to have one of my constituents, the Reverend Willie Lockett, helping us this morning by offering today's morning prayer.

The Reverend Lockett holds degrees from the University of Illinois, Atlanta University, Morehouse College, and the Interdenominational Theological Center.

In addition to being a learned minister, he is truly a man of all seasons.

He has been a teacher, a salesman, a civil servant, and most importantly a pastor.

He is a leader in our community in helping organizations like the United Negro College Fund, the NAACP, the American Heart Association, South Brevard Sharing Center, and South Brevard Habitat for Humanity. He also has a long history of working with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and Dr. King from 1955 through 1975.

His ministry over 36 years is a testament to the power of faith and commitment to one's God and community.

I thank the Reverend for his service to us today and for over three decades of service to our community and to our Nation.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6, MARRIAGE PENALTY AND FAMILY TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2001

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 104 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 104

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the marriage penalty by providing for adjustments to the standard deduction, 15-percent rate bracket, and earned income credit and to allow the nonrefundable personal credits against regular and minimum tax liability. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1297

amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Rangel of New York or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST); pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MS. PRYCE OF OHIO

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, now printed in the bill and proposed to be considered as adopted in the pending resolution, be modified by the amendment that I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: Page 11, after line 8, insert the following:

“(3) LIMITATION BASED ON AMOUNT OF TAX.—The credit allowed under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed the excess of—

“(A) the sum of the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) plus the tax imposed by section 55, over

“(B) the sum of the credits allowable under this subparagraph (other than this section) and section 27 for the taxable year.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the modification offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means requested, House Resolution 104 is an appropriate and fair rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 6, the Marriage Tax Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act of 2001.

This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

After general debate, it will be in order to consider a substitute amendment offered by the minority which is printed in the Committee on Rules report and will be debatable for 1 hour. Finally, the rule permits the minority to offer a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill as well as the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. Speaker, as taxpayers all across America are completing the dreaded

annual ritual of filling out tax forms and writing checks to the government, thousands of newlywed couples across the Nation have had a rude awakening.

By simply saying those magic words “I do,” newlyweds across our great Nation may be surprised and probably outraged to find that their tax bill has increased by hundreds and maybe thousands of dollars.

Hopefully, these couples have not cashed and spent the wedding checks they received from Grandpa Joe and Aunt Lucy, because they still have to pay Uncle Sam.

We should not really be surprised. After all, there is not much that the government does not tax. But it is hard to find a good reason to tax marriage and penalize the most fundamental institution in our society.

Still, each year, 42 million working Americans pay higher taxes, not because their incomes have gone up, but simply because they are married. This is fundamentally unfair and discriminatory.

Mr. Speaker, most families find that, to make ends meet, both spouses have to work. Under our current Tax Code, working couples are pushed into a higher tax bracket because the income of the second wage earner, often the wife, is taxed at a much higher rate.

Because of the marriage penalty, 21 million families pay an average of \$1,400 more in taxes than they would if they were single and living alone or single and living together.

Mr. Speaker, if one is paying taxes today, one is paying too much; and if one is married, one is unfairly singled out to pay even more. It is simply wrong and irresponsible to increase taxes on married couples, especially when marriage is often a precursor to added financial responsibility such as owning a home or having children.

The Marriage Tax Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act will bring fairness to the Tax Code by doubling the standard deduction for married couples, expanding the 15 percent bracket so more of a couple's income is taxed at a lower rate, and increasing the amount that low-income couples can earn and still be eligible for the earned income tax credit.

But H.R. 6 does not just help out newlyweds. It also helps out our Nation's families as well by doubling the child tax credit from \$500 to \$1,000.

H.R. 6 provides relief to all couples suffering from the marriage penalty tax, which means lower taxes for almost 59,000 couples in my district alone.

Mr. Speaker, since earning the majority, Republicans have kept our promises and reached our goals of balancing the budget, paying down the debt, and protecting Social Security and Medicare; and there is no turning back.

The fact is the government is currently taking in more money than it needs to operate. That is the very definition of a budget surplus. The surplus

is big enough that we can give some of it back to the people who earned it because, if one is paying taxes today, one is just paying too much.

What better place to start than by correcting the inequity in the Tax Code that affects 25 million married couples.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to either defend the marriage penalty or to eliminate it altogether. There should be no more excuses.

I urge all my colleagues to support this fair and appropriate rule so that we can once again pass the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Act and send it to the President who this time is waiting to sign it. It is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats support tax relief for American families. Let me say that again so that everyone understands. Democrats want fair and meaningful tax relief for working American families.

But, Mr. Speaker, Democrats want tax relief in the context of a real budget with real numbers. The budget passed by the House yesterday is, quite frankly, bogus. It is bogus because it uses phony numbers and faulty assumptions. It is bogus because it has been written to be rewritten.

The Republican majority has used winks and wishes instead of the real numbers that would give the American public the real picture of what is really going on with the Federal budget.

Here is the bottom line: Democrats do not want to go down the same path we found ourselves on 20 years ago after the last big tax cut endorsed by a Republican President.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues have, for the past few months, waxed ever so eloquently that the surpluses now flowing into the Federal Treasury are merely signs that Americans are overtaxed. They say the money which is forecast to come rolling into the Treasury over the next 10 years belongs to taxpayers and should be returned to them.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats do not disagree that American families need tax relief, but we need to put that tax relief into context. The country ran up a \$5 trillion debt because of the tax cut we passed in 1981.

The real story is that the national debt belongs to every man, woman, and child in this country. The real story is that those projected surpluses are just that, projections. We have no idea if they will ever materialize. Frankly, it seems more than a little foolhardy to base our economic security and prosperity on wishes and winks.

We passed a bankruptcy reform bill a few weeks ago that says American consumers have to own up to their debts and cannot just erase them so they can go out and spend more money they do not have. Well, it seems to me that we need a little of that reform in this Chamber.

Congress has spent the past 15 years struggling to get deficits under control; and now, finally, we are on the road to paying back those huge debts.

Those are the same debts that have forced the Congress to ignore pressing national needs like infrastructure development and replacing or modernizing sewer systems, roads and highways, and our Nation's airports.

We have been forced to put off modernizing our military, ensuring that every child has access to a good education, providing a real prescription drug benefit for our seniors, and shoring up Social Security and Medicare to prepare for the retirement of the baby boom generation.

But now the Republicans want to ignore our debt and ignore our national needs just so they can give us another tax cut like the one they gave us 20 years ago.

Yesterday, any number of times, Members on the other side of the aisle said their constituents want their money back. But, Mr. Speaker, we as a country have an obligation to pay off the debts we incurred because of a tax cut we enacted 20 years ago.

The Reagan tax cuts were supposed to give Americans their money back. But look what those tax cuts got us. They got us high unemployment, high interest rates, and an economy that only began to recover when the Congress drastically cut spending on national priorities and raised taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the tax cuts of 20 years ago were nothing more than a game of three-card monte, and the tax cuts the Republican majority is rolling through the Congress in 2001 are just another version of the same scam.

□ 1015

As I have said before, if it looks to good to be true, it probably is. And these promises are just that: too good to be true.

The Republican majority is incapable of seeing the truth in the budget numbers. Instead, they come out onto the floor day after day to say that Democrats only want to perpetuate big government, to make it grow, and fritter away the hard-earned money of American taxpayers. Where do they get this? This is not about big government, this is about responsible government. This is not about keeping anyone's money, this is about paying off the debt and investing for the future.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats want tax relief, and we want tax relief in the context of fairness and in the context of real numbers. We want to provide real relief from the unfair marriage penalty for those couples who pay more taxes just because they are married, but we do not want to provide relief for those who already get a marriage bonus under the code, as the Republicans would do. We want to increase the child care tax credit and make sure that increase is meaningful for those families who need it most.

If the Republican majority is so dedicated to returning money to the tax-

payers, why is it most of the marriage penalty relief in their bill does not become available until the year 2004? Why is it their bill will not be fully effective until the year 2009? And why, Mr. Speaker, is it that the Republican bill does not make the child tax credit, something that would really help families, fully effective until 2006? One might think taxpayers, after hearing all this big talk in Washington about giving them back their money, might say, "Show me the money." But for most American families there will not be any money to show.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to take off the blinders and deal straight with the taxpayers. Families who put off facing harsh realities often find themselves in serious financial consequences. The same holds true for the Congress. We need to face up to the fact that we cannot afford a \$2.4 trillion tax cut that benefits primarily the wealthiest of Americans while simultaneously trying to save Social Security and Medicare, making sure every child gets a good education, modernizing our military forces, facing the crises in foreign countries, and giving seniors a real prescription drug benefit. We should not pretend, Mr. Speaker. That is not what we were elected to do.

Mr. Speaker, I support providing relief to married couples who are penalized in the Tax Code simply because they are married. I support increasing a child tax credit and ensuring that it is available for lower-income working families. Undoubtedly many will vote for this bill today because they, too, support these changes in the Tax Code. But we continue to hope our Republican brethren will wake up and smell the coffee. They cannot have their cake and eat it, too.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. THOMAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the authorizing committee, I just want to take this time to thank my colleagues in the minority, the minority leader, the Committee on Rules, and the members on the committee, for acceding to the unanimous consent request for that minor change in the legislation, because what it does do is draw to everyone's attention the fact that we have a number of professionals around here who labor long and hard, and they are almost always perfect.

Their work consists of something like this: on page 4, first paragraph B of section 1(f)6 of such code is amended by striking "other than with, and all that follows," through "shall be applied," and inserting "other than with respect to section 63(c)4 and 151(d)4(a) shall be applied."

And, Mr. Speaker, it all has to fit, and it all has to fit for hundreds of

pages. They do it every time we bring a bill to the floor, with this exception. And I know they are chagrined, but I do want to thank everyone, because there are a number of professionals that allow us to appear on the floor and argue important issues such as this, but that the hard labor of making it fit is done by a number of professionals that we owe an ongoing debt of gratitude. And the fact they made a mistake, which really chagrins them, allows me to thank them for all those thousands of pages of no mistakes.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

I am flabbergasted I am getting 4 minutes on this. There should be a line of people stretching all the way down the steps asking the gentleman from Texas for 30 seconds or less so that every one of us can stand up here and say, please, let us not take another step in the direction of plunging off the cliff, in the direction of huge deficits, in the direction of invading Social Security and the Medicare Trust Funds in order to pass a series of tax cuts that we cannot afford.

I support ending the marriage penalty. Someday I might support even greater efforts than those encompassed in the Democratic alternative. But there are three important points I need to make about this bill. The first is that over half of married couples do not pay a marriage penalty, they get a marriage bonus. Those who are insulting or degrading marriage by telling people that they will pay more taxes if they say "I do" should realize that, in fact, most who say "I do" are paying less.

The second point I would make is that we do not have a budget resolution. We have one passed by the House, but not by the Senate. We ought to be making major tax decisions only after we see what Congress as a whole has adopted and what kind of tax relief we can afford.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this tax bill that comes before us today is part of an overall plan of excessive tax cuts, tax cuts aimed at those with the greatest means. Forty-three percent of the benefits go to the top 1 percent with an average income of \$900,000. This wave of tax-cutting has been the most significant event leading to the economic downturn or anemia that we have suffered since even before the President came into office and began talking down the economy in order to justify things.

Second, this program provides no economic stimulus in an effort to get us out of this malaise. Seventy-nine percent of the benefits do not arrive until more than 5 years from now. That means that the bond market and the stock market are depressed because we have locked into law economic policies that are going to hurt this country,

that are going to drive deficits and inflation; but at the same time, consumers will not have any more money in their pocket.

Finally, I have to oppose this package of tax bills because of the millions of people it leaves out. The President of the United States stood up there and gave us an example of a waitress without a spouse, with two kids, and said that that was the reason to adopt his tax plan, to help that waitress supporting two kids and making \$25,000. It appears as if the President's staff went through all of the restaurants and found one waitress that would benefit, because if that waitress was making \$23,000 with two kids, she gets nothing under the President's plan. If that waitress had three kids, she gets nothing under the President's plan. And if that waitress is currently exactly as the President describes her, but she has some costs for child care, she gets nothing. Not even a one-cent insult tip is left on the table by the Republican series of tax bills for the very waitresses that the President of the United States asked us to think about.

It is one thing to injure America's working poor and those who are struggling to get by by having a huge tax plan that will ruin the economy and not give them a penny, but it is another thing to insult them and say that they do not pay taxes when, in fact, every waitress is paying FICA taxes and not getting any tax relief. Taxpayers deserve tax relief, and under this plan they get nothing.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), my friend, the chief deputy whip.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to speak on this proposal. I would point out that the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) suggested that the President was somehow responsible for the flattening out of the economy in the last 6 months of last year. I think 60 days into a Presidency is a little quick to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to speak in favor of this rule. We have passed marriage penalty relief in the House before, and it has been passed in the Senate before, and it has come out of conference before, and it has gone to the White House before. The difference is this relief will be signed into law if we do our job well here now and in the next few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, we have a budget in the House. We will not vote on the final tax package until the Senate approves its budget next week, and this will be part of it. Government has traditionally taxed what it wanted to discourage, and subsidized what it wanted to encourage. For too long in America we have been subsidizing the wrong things and taxing the wrong things. We have been discouraging things we should have been encouraging, and encouraging things we should have been discouraging.

This change in the Tax Code once again puts a premium on marriage and

families as a foundation of our society. I hope there is still a bonus left for marriage in the Tax Code, and believe there will be when we pass this bill, because families and marriage is something that should be honored. If we subsidize families, that is a good thing and not a bad thing. If we help with things like the child tax credit, where we are moving today to double the tax credit on income tax returns, that has a positive impact on American families.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the rule. I strongly support the bill. It will pass the House, I predict, handily today, and this time it will be signed into law by the President of the United States.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and the work the Committee on Rules has done to structure the debate. In many ways the Federal Tax Code is illogical, immoral and unfair. This is the case with the marriage penalty, most certainly. Currently the Tax Code is structured so a married couple pays higher taxes on their income than an unmarried couple earning the same income and filing separate returns.

Mr. Speaker, under this Tax Code many couples are punished for being married, including many in my congressional district in Indiana. Cameron Gardner and his wife Lindsey are an example of over 38,000 Hoosier families in my district who suffer under the marriage penalty. Cameron works for a local company in Anderson, and Lindsey is a student at Ball State University. They have a 1-year-old daughter. Eliminating the marriage penalty would allow Cameron and Lindsey to keep about \$1,400 more a year to help pay bills and take care of their daughter. It does not include the benefits that would accrue from the President's increased child tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, families should be encouraged today. I stand in strong support of this rule. I stand in strong support of this bill. It is time to end the illogical, immoral and unfair marriage penalty; and I believe in my heart Congress will do so today.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as someone who campaigned on the platform of providing tax relief to working families in central Florida, I am especially proud today to be an original cosponsor of this important legislation to fully eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Why do I support this legislation? Because it will make a meaningful dif-

ference in the lives of approximately 60,000 working families in central Florida, who will receive an average tax break of \$1,400 per year. \$1,400 per year will have a positive impact on the lives of working families back home.

□ 1030

For example, a married couple with two children, a \$1,400 tax savings translates into \$117 worth of groceries in the refrigerator every month that otherwise would not be there.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation today and vote yes on H.R. 6 when it comes to the floor in a little while. This is the type of legislation that we came to Congress for.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the power to tax is the power to destroy. When one considers this fact, it is a travesty that married couples are taxed at a higher rate than the rest of society. We can all agree that marriage is a sacred institution. What message are we sending to young couples as they get married? Because of an unfair Tax Code, when a bride and groom walk down the aisle they lose money with each step they take.

Nearly 62,000 families in my district are adversely affected by the marriage tax penalty. I have spoken to many of them on this subject and they agree that it is wrong. They are right; it is wrong. Today I want to be able to tell them we are doing something about this. It is time to put common sense back into our Tax Code.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to end the marriage tax penalty because saying "I do" should not mean that one is saying I do to an additional \$1,400.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. RILEY).

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to allow married couples to keep more of their money. The breakdown of the family has had a devastating effect on our society. Instead of having families stay together, our current Tax Code is forcing families apart.

H.R. 6 is legislation that will lighten the tax burden once and for all on all married couples. It is time to shore up family life by allowing husbands and wives to keep more of what they earn. H.R. 6 will do just that.

The marriage penalty not only punishes our most sacred institution, marriage, but it also indirectly hurts women. When the marriage penalty first appeared in the Tax Code in 1969, most families had one breadwinner and the tax provision was actually designed

to give a tax cut, a so-called marriage bonus, to all of our one-income families. The tax policy failed to envision the growing number of women that would eventually go into the workforce. Today, in nearly 75 percent of all families, both the husband and wife work outside the home. When two working spouses combine their income, the wages of the secondary earner are usually taxed at a higher marginal rate.

Since it is often the wife who is the secondary earner in the family, the marriage penalty, in my view, creates an extremely unfair bias against them. The beauty of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is that we do not penalize those families who choose to have one spouse stay at home with their families. H.R. 6 eliminates the homemaker penalty for families in which one spouse decides to work part time or not at all. In other words, Mr. Speaker, this legislation benefits all married couples.

In my district, there will be 60,392 married couples who will benefit from this legislation. In the State of Alabama, 424,956 married couples will benefit from this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule. It is a good rule. It is high time we have done this. We have done it before. It is time to go ahead and get it signed into law.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. KERNS).

Mr. KERNS. Mr. Speaker, today the United States Congress will vote on sweeping legislation that will help preserve families and fairness in our Tax Code. This legislation will reverse a system that is currently penalizing millions of men and women simply because they have chosen to marry.

This marriage tax penalty affects persons of all races, ages, and incomes. I am fortunate to represent Indiana's Seventh Congressional District. The seventh district encompasses most of west central Indiana and is the very essence of middle America. Our residents are hard-working men and women who instill in their children the values that their parents instilled in them.

These Hoosier values include honoring the family. A recent study found that nearly 60,000 married couples in Indiana's seventh district pay a marriage penalty. Through this penalty we are telling families that it would be better for the mother and father not to be married.

Our government, in effect, is giving incentives for a split in the family. This is wrong. With taxes now at their highest in this Nation's peacetime history and many families paying more in taxes than they spend on basic essentials such as food clothing and housing, it is imperative that we allow families to keep more of their hard-earned dollars and to save and spend as they choose.

This bipartisan legislation will provide \$220 billion in marriage tax penalty relief. By working with the executive branch, we have enhanced the President's proposal and will, in fact, provide twice as much in marriage tax penalty relief.

The freshman class of the 107th Congress has been very instrumental in working to make today's vote possible. All these Members represent different regions of the United States and we have come together in agreement and a change that must occur.

The marriage tax issue is not a Republican issue; it is not a Democrat issue. This is about families and fairness. I am proud to join my colleagues here today and the others who make up the 230 cosponsors of this legislation in correcting the marriage tax penalty. I am confident today that we will make good on our promise to American families.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in closing that the time has come once and for all to eliminate this tax on marriage. If one is paying taxes today, they are paying too much. And just because they are married, they should not have to pay more. I urge my colleagues to support this rule, pass the marriage tax penalty and Family Relief Tax Act so we can send it to the President, who is waiting to sign it. This legislation is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which an electronic vote, if ordered, will be taken on the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 171, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]
YEAS—249

Aderholt	Barton	Blunt
Akin	Bass	Boehert
Armey	Bereuter	Boehner
Bachus	Berkley	Bonilla
Baker	Berry	Bono
Ballenger	Biggert	Boswell
Barcia	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Barr	Bishop	Brown (SC)
Bartlett	Blagojevich	Bryant

Burr	Hilleary	Quinn
Burton	Hinojosa	Radanovich
Buyer	Hobson	Ramstad
Callahan	Hoekstra	Rangel
Calvert	Holt	Regula
Camp	Horn	Rehberg
Cannon	Hostettler	Reyes
Cantor	Houghton	Riley
Capito	Hulshof	Rodriguez
Castle	Hunter	Roemer
Chabot	Hutchinson	Rogers (KY)
Chambliss	Hyde	Rogers (MI)
Coble	Isakson	Rohrabacher
Collins	Issa	Ross
Combest	Istook	Roukema
Cooksey	Jenkins	Roybal-Allard
Cox	Johnson (IL)	Royce
Cramer	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Crane	Jones (NC)	Ryun (KS)
Crenshaw	Keller	Sandlin
Cubin	Kelly	Saxton
Culberson	Kennedy (MN)	Scarborough
Cunningham	Kerns	Schaffer
Davis (CA)	King (NY)	Schiff
Davis, Jo Ann	Kingston	Schrock
Davis, Tom	Kirk	Sensenbrenner
Deal	Knollenberg	Sessions
DeLay	Kolbe	Shadegg
DeMint	LaHood	Shaw
Diaz-Balart	Largent	Shays
Dooley	Latham	Sherwood
Doolittle	LaTourette	Shimkus
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Shows
Duncan	Lewis (KY)	Simmons
Dunn	Linder	Simpson
Ehlers	LoBiondo	Skeen
Ehrlich	Lucas (KY)	Smith (MI)
Emerson	Lucas (OK)	Smith (NJ)
English	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Eshoo	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (WA)
Ferguson	McCrery	Snyder
Flake	McHugh	Souder
Fletcher	McInnis	Spence
Foley	McKeon	Stearns
Ford	McKinney	Stump
Fossella	Mica	Sununu
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Sweeney
Frost	Miller, Gary	Tancredo
Gallely	Moore	Tauzin
Ganske	Moran (KS)	Taylor (NC)
Gekas	Morella	Terry
Gibbons	Myrick	Thomas
Gilchrest	Nethercutt	Thornberry
Gillmor	Ney	Thune
Gilman	Northup	Tiahrt
Gonzalez	Norwood	Tiberi
Goode	Nussle	Toomey
Goodlatte	Ortiz	Trafficant
Goss	Osborne	Turner
Graham	Ose	Upton
Granger	Otter	Vitter
Graves	Oxley	Walden
Green (WI)	Pascrell	Walsh
Greenwood	Paul	Wamp
Grucci	Pence	Watkins
Gutknecht	Peterson (PA)	Watts (OK)
Hall (OH)	Petri	Weldon (FL)
Hansen	Pickering	Weldon (PA)
Hart	Pitts	Weller
Hastings (WA)	Platts	Whitfield
Hayes	Pombo	Wicker
Hayworth	Portman	Wilson
Hefley	Pryce (OH)	Wolf
Herger	Putnam	Young (FL)

NAYS—171

Abercrombie	Carson (OK)	Engel
Ackerman	Clay	Etheridge
Allen	Clayton	Evans
Andrews	Clement	Farr
Baca	Clyburn	Fattah
Baird	Condit	Filner
Baldacci	Conyers	Frank
Barrett	Costello	Gephardt
Becerra	Coyne	Green (TX)
Bentsen	Crowley	Gutierrez
Berman	Cummings	Hall (TX)
Blumenauer	Davis (FL)	Harman
Bonior	Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)
Borski	DeFazio	Hill
Boucher	DeGette	Hilliard
Boyd	Delahunt	Hinchey
Brady (PA)	DeLauro	Hoefel
Brown (FL)	Deutsch	Holden
Brown (OH)	Dicks	Honda
Capps	Dingell	Hooley
Capuano	Doggett	Hoyer
Cardin	Doyle	Inslee
Carson (IN)	Edwards	Israel

Jackson (IL)	McDermott	Sanders	Burr	Hastings (FL)	Norwood	Velazquez	Waxman	Wilson
Jackson-Lee (TX)	McGovern	Sawyer	Burton	Hastings (WA)	Olver	Vitter	Weiner	Wolf
Jefferson	McIntyre	Schakowsky	Buyer	Hayes	Ortiz	Walden	Weldon (FL)	Woolsey
John	McNulty	Scott	Callahan	Hayworth	Osborne	Walsh	Weldon (PA)	Wynn
Johnson, E. B.	Meehan	Serrano	Calvert	Herger	Ose	Wamp	Wexler	Young (FL)
Jones (OH)	Meek (FL)	Sherman	Camp	Hill	Otter	Watkins	Whitfield	
Kanjorski	Meeks (NY)	Skelton	Cannon	Hinojosa	Owens	Watts (OK)	Wicker	
Kaptur	Menendez	Slaughter	Cantor	Hobson	Oxley			
Kennedy (RI)	Millender-Solis	Solis	Capito	Hoeffel	Pascrell			
Kildee	McDonald	Spratt	Capps	Hoekstra	Pastor	Baird	Hoooley	Obey
Kilpatrick	Miller, George	Stark	Cardin	Holden	Paul	Baldacci	Jackson-Lee	Pallone
Kind (WI)	Mink	Stenholm	Carson (IN)	Honda	Payne	Bonior	(TX)	Pomeroy
Klecza	Moakley	Strickland	Carson (OK)	Horn	Pelosi	Borski	Jefferson	Ramstad
Kucinich	Mollohan	Stupak	Castle	Hostettler	Pence	Brady (PA)	John	Sabo
LaFalce	Moran (VA)	Tanner	Chabot	Houghton	Peterson (MN)	Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Schaffer
Langevin	Murtha	Tauscher	Chambliss	Hoyer	Peterson (PA)	Capuano	Jones (OH)	Slaughter
Lantos	Nadler	Taylor (MS)	Clay	Hulshof	Petri	Clyburn	Kanjorski	Stark
Larsen (WA)	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)	Clayton	Hunter	Phelps	Costello	Kennedy (MN)	Stenholm
Larson (CT)	Neal	Thompson (MS)	Clement	Hutchinson	Pickering	Crane	Kucinich	Stupak
Lee	Oberstar	Thurman	Coble	Hyde	Pitts	DeFazio	LaFalce	Tanner
Levin	Olver	Tierney	Collins	Inslee	Platts	English	Lee	Taylor (MS)
Lewis (GA)	Owens	Towns	Isakson	Issa	Pombo	Filner	Lewis (GA)	Thompson (CA)
Lipinski	Pallone	Udall (CO)	Condit	Istook	Portman	Gibbons	LoBiondo	Thompson (MS)
Lofgren	Pastor	Udall (NM)	Conyers	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)	Gutierrez	McDermott	Turner
Lowey	Payne	Velazquez	Cooksey	Jenkins	Pryce (OH)	Gutknecht	McGovern	Udall (CO)
Luther	Peterson (MN)	Viscosky	Cox	Johnson (IL)	Putnam	Hefley	McNulty	Udall (NM)
Maloney (CT)	Phelps	Watt (NC)	Coyne	Johnson (IL)	Quinn	Hilleary	Menendez	Visclosky
Maloney (NY)	Pomeroy	Waxman	Cramer	Johnson, Sam	Rahall	Hilliard	Miller, George	Waters
Markey	Price (NC)	Weiner	Crenshaw	Jones (NC)	Rangel	Hinchey	Moore	Watt (NC)
Mascara	Rahall	Wexler	Cubin	Kaptur	Regula	Holt	Oberstar	Wu
Matheson	Rivers	Woolsey	Culberson	Keller	Rehberg			
Matsui	Rush	Wu	Cummings	Kelly	Reyes	Baldwin	Meek (FL)	Royce
McCarthy (MO)	Sabo	Wynn	Cunningham	Kennedy (RI)	Riley	Blunt	Nussle	Sisisky
McCollum	Sanchez		Davis (CA)	Kerns	Rivers	Gordon	Radanovich	Weller
			Davis (FL)	Kildee	Rodriguez	Johnson (CT)	Reynolds	Young (AK)
			Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick	Roemer	Lampson	Ros-Lehtinen	
			Davis, Jo Ann	Kind (WI)	Rogers (KY)	Leach	Rothman	
			Davis, Tom	King (NY)	Rogers (MI)			
			Deal	Kingston	Rohrabacher			
			DeGette	Kirk	Ross			
			DeLahunt	Kleczka	Roukema			
			DeLauro	Knollenberg	Roybal-Allard			
			DeLay	Rush	Rush			
			DeMint	Kolbe	Ryan (WI)			
			Deutsch	LaHood	Ryun (KS)			
			Diaz-Balart	Langevin	Sanchez			
			Dicks	Lantos	Sanders			
			Dingell	Largent	Sandlin			
			Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Sawyer			
			Dooley	Larson (CT)	Saxton			
			Doolittle	Latham	Scarborough			
			Doyle	LaTourrette	Schakowsky			
			Dreier	Levin	Schiff			
			Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Schrock			
			Dunn	Lewis (KY)	Scott			
			Edwards	Linder	Sensenbrenner			
			Ehlers	Lipinski	Serrano			
			Ehrlich	Lofgren	Sessions			
			Emerson	Lowey	Shadegg			
			Engel	Lucas (KY)	Shaw			
			Eshoo	Lucas (OK)	Shays			
			Etheridge	Luther	Sherman			
			Evans	Maloney (CT)	Sherwood			
			Everett	Maloney (NY)	Shimkus			
			Farr	Manzullo	Shows			
			Fattah	Farr	Simmons			
			Ferguson	Mascara	Simpson			
			Flake	Matheson	Skeen			
			Fletcher	Matsui	Skelton			
			Foley	Matsui	Smith (MI)			
			Ford	McCarthy (MO)	Smith (NJ)			
			Fossella	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (TX)			
			Frank	McCollum	Smith (WA)			
			Frelinghuysen	McCrery	Snyder			
			Frost	McHugh	Solis			
			Gallegly	McInnis	Souder			
			Ganske	McIntyre	Spence			
			Gekas	McKeon	Spratt			
			Gephardt	McKinney	Stearns			
			Gilchrest	Meehan	Strickland			
			Gillmor	Meeks (NY)	Stump			
			Gilman	Mica	Sununu			
			Gonzalez	Millender-McDonald	Sweeney			
			Goode	Miller (FL)	Tancredo			
			Goodlatte	Miller, Gary	Tauscher			
			Goss	Mink	Tauzin			
			Graham	Moakley	Taylor (NC)			
			Granger	Mollohan	Terry			
			Graves	Moran (KS)	Thomas			
			Green (TX)	Moran (VA)	Thornberry			
			Green (WI)	Morella	Thune			
			Greenwood	Murtha	Thurman			
			Grucci	Myrick	Tiahrt			
			Hall (OH)	Nadler	Tiberi			
			Hall (TX)	Nadler	Tierney			
			Hansen	Napolitano	Toomey			
			Harman	Neal	Towns			
			Hart	Nethercutt	Traficant			
				Ney	Upton			
				Northup				

NOT VOTING—12

Baldwin	Lampson	Ros-Lehtinen
Everett	Leach	Rothman
Gordon	Pelosi	Sisisky
Johnson (CT)	Reynolds	Young (AK)

□ 1059

Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. LARSEN of Washington changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. SANDLIN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 354, noes 62, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

AYES—354

Abercrombie	Barrett	Blagojevich
Ackerman	Bartlett	Blumenauer
Aderholt	Barton	Boehlert
Akin	Bass	Boehner
Allen	Becerra	Bonilla
Andrews	Bentsen	Bono
Armey	Bereuter	Boswell
Baca	Berkley	Boucher
Bachus	Berman	Boyd
Baker	Berry	Brady (TX)
Ballenger	Biggert	Brown (OH)
Barcia	Bilirakis	Brown (SC)
Barr	Bishop	Bryant

NOT VOTING—16

Baldwin	Meek (FL)	Royce
Blunt	Nussle	Sisisky
Gordon	Radanovich	Weller
Johnson (CT)	Reynolds	Young (AK)
Lampson	Ros-Lehtinen	
Leach	Rothman	

□ 1109

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MARRIAGE PENALTY AND FAMILY TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2001

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 104, I call up the bill (H.R. 6) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the marriage penalty by providing for adjustments to the standard deduction, 15-percent rate bracket, and earned income credit and to allow the non-refundable personal credits against regular and minimum tax liability, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 104, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 6 is as follows:

H.R. 6

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Marriage Tax Elimination Act of 2001”.

(b) SECTION 15 NOT TO APPLY.—No amendment made by this Act shall be treated as a change in a rate of tax for purposes of section 15 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF MARRIAGE PENALTY IN STANDARD DEDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 63(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to standard deduction) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$5,000” in subparagraph (A) and inserting “200 percent of the dollar amount in effect under subparagraph (C) for the taxable year”;

(2) by adding “or” at the end of subparagraph (B);

(3) by striking “in the case of” and all that follows in subparagraph (C) and inserting “in any other case.”; and

(4) by striking subparagraph (D).

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subparagraph (B) of section 1(f)(6) of such Code is amended by striking “(other than with” and all that follows through “shall be applied” and inserting “(other than with respect to sections 63(c)(4) and 151(d)(4)(A)) shall be applied”.

(2) Paragraph (4) of section 63(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:
“The preceding sentence shall not apply to the amount referred to in paragraph (2)(A).”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

SEC. 3. PHASEOUT OF MARRIAGE PENALTY IN 15-PERCENT BRACKET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to adjustments in tax tables so that inflation will not result in tax increases) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(B) PHASEOUT OF MARRIAGE PENALTY IN 15-PERCENT BRACKET.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000, in prescribing the tables under paragraph (1)—

“(i) the maximum taxable income in the lowest rate bracket in the table contained in subsection (a) (and the minimum taxable income in the next higher taxable income bracket in such table) shall be the applicable percentage of the maximum taxable income in the lowest rate bracket in the table contained in subsection (c) (after any other adjustment under this subsection), and

“(ii) the comparable taxable income amounts in the table contained in subsection (d) shall be ½ of the amounts determined under clause (i).

“(B) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the applicable percentage shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

For taxable years beginning in calendar year—	The applicable percentage is—
2001	170
2002	173
2003	178
2004	183
2005 and thereafter	200.

“(C) ROUNDING.—If any amount determined under subparagraph (A)(i) is not a multiple of \$50, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of \$50.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subparagraph (A) of section 1(f)(2) of such Code is amended by inserting “except as provided in paragraph (8),” before “by increasing”.

(2) The heading for subsection (f) of section 1 of such Code is amended by inserting “PHASEOUT OF MARRIAGE PENALTY IN 15-PERCENT BRACKET;” before “ADJUSTMENTS”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

SEC. 4. MARRIAGE PENALTY RELIEF FOR EARNED INCOME CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 32(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to percentages and amounts) is amended—

(1) by striking “AMOUNTS.—The earned” and inserting “AMOUNTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the earned”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, the phaseout amount determined under subparagraph (A) shall be increased by \$2,000.”.

(b) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Paragraph (1)(B) of section 32(j) of such Code (relating

to inflation adjustments) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined—

“(i) in the case of amounts in subsections (b)(2)(A) and (i)(1), by substituting ‘calendar year 1995’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) of section 1(f)(3), and

“(ii) in the case of the \$2,000 amount in subsection (b)(2)(B), by substituting ‘calendar year 2000’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) of section 1(f)(3).”.

(c) ROUNDING.—Section 32(j)(2)(A) of such Code (relating to rounding) is amended by striking “subsection (b)(2)” and inserting “subparagraph (A) of subsection (b)(2) (after being increased under subparagraph (B) thereof)”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

SEC. 5. ALLOWANCE OF NONREFUNDABLE PERSONAL CREDITS AGAINST REGULAR AND MINIMUM TAX LIABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 26 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to limitation based on tax liability; definition of tax liability) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) LIMITATION BASED ON AMOUNT OF TAX.—The aggregate amount of credits allowed by this subpart for the taxable year shall not exceed the sum of—

“(1) the taxpayer’s regular tax liability for the taxable year reduced by the foreign tax credit allowable under section 27(a), and

“(2) the tax imposed for the taxable year by section 55(a).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (d) of section 24 of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (2) and by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(2) Section 32 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (h).

(3) Section 904 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (h) and by redesignating subsections (i), (j), and (k) as subsections (h), (i), and (j), respectively.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment printed in the bill is adopted, as modified by the order of the House of today.

The text of H.R. 6, as amended, as modified, is as follows:

H.R. 6

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, ETC.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Marriage Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act of 2001”.

(b) SECTION 15 NOT TO APPLY.—No amendment made by this Act shall be treated as a change in a rate of tax for purposes of section 15 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF MARRIAGE PENALTY IN STANDARD DEDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 63(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to standard deduction) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$5,000” in subparagraph (A) and inserting “200 percent of the dollar amount in effect under subparagraph (C) for the taxable year”; and

(2) by adding “or” at the end of subparagraph (B);

(3) by striking “in the case of” and all that follows in subparagraph (C) and inserting “in any other case.”; and

(4) by striking subparagraph (D).

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subparagraph (B) of section 1(f)(6) of such Code is amended by striking “(other than with” and all that follows through “shall be applied” and inserting “(other than with respect to sections 63(c)(4) and 151(d)(4)(A)) shall be applied”.

(2) Paragraph (4) of section 63(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:
“The preceding sentence shall not apply to the amount referred to in paragraph (2)(A).”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

SEC. 3. PHASEOUT OF MARRIAGE PENALTY IN 15-PERCENT BRACKET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to adjustments in tax tables so that inflation will not result in tax increases) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(B) PHASEOUT OF MARRIAGE PENALTY IN 15-PERCENT BRACKET.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2003, in prescribing the tables under paragraph (1)—

“(i) the maximum taxable income in the lowest rate bracket in the table contained in subsection (a) (and the minimum taxable income in the next higher taxable income bracket in such table) shall be the applicable percentage of the maximum taxable income in the lowest rate bracket in the table contained in subsection (c) (after any other adjustment under this subsection), and

“(ii) the comparable taxable income amounts in the table contained in subsection (d) shall be ½ of the amounts determined under clause (i).

“(B) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the applicable percentage shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

For taxable years beginning in calendar year—	The applicable percentage is—
2004	172
2005	178
2006	183
2007	189
2008	195
2009 and thereafter	200.

“(C) ROUNDING.—If any amount determined under subparagraph (A)(i) is not a multiple of \$50, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of \$50.”.

(b) REPEAL OF REDUCTION OF REFUNDABLE TAX CREDITS.—

(1) Subsection (d) of section 24 of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(2) Section 32 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (h).

(c) INCREASE IN ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX EXEMPTION AMOUNT FOR JOINT RETURNS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 55 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) ADJUSTMENT OF EXEMPTION AMOUNT FOR JOINT RETURNS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The dollar amount applicable under paragraph (1)(A) for 2008 and each even-numbered calendar year thereafter—

“(i) shall be \$500 greater than the dollar amount applicable under paragraph (1)(A) for the prior even-numbered calendar year, and

“(ii) shall apply to taxable years beginning in such even-numbered calendar year and in the succeeding calendar year.

In no event shall the dollar amount applicable under paragraph (1)(A) exceed twice the dollar amount applicable under paragraph (1)(B).

“(B) EXEMPTION AMOUNTS FOR 2005, 2006, AND 2007.—The dollar amount applicable under paragraph (1)(A) shall be—

“(i) \$46,000 for taxable years beginning in 2005, and

“(ii) \$46,500 for taxable years beginning in 2006 or 2007.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Paragraph (1) of section 55(d) of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (B), by striking subparagraph (C), and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraphs:

“(C) 50 percent of the dollar amount applicable under paragraph (1)(A) in the case of a married individual who files a separate return, and

“(D) \$22,500 in the case of an estate or trust.”

(B) Subparagraph (C) of section 55(d)(3) of such Code is amended by striking “paragraph (1)(C)” and inserting “subparagraph (C) or (D) of paragraph (1)”.

(C) The last sentence of section 55(d)(3) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “paragraph (1)(C)(i)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(C)”, and

(ii) by striking “\$165,000 or (ii) \$22,500” and inserting “the minimum amount of such income (as so determined) for which the exemption amount under paragraph (1)(C) is zero, or (ii) such exemption amount (determined without regard to this paragraph)”.

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subparagraph (A) of section 1(f)(2) of such Code is amended by inserting “except as provided in paragraph (8),” before “by increasing”.

(2) The heading for subsection (f) of section 1 of such Code is amended by inserting “PHASE-OUT OF MARRIAGE PENALTY IN 15-PERCENT BRACKET;” before “ADJUSTMENTS”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2003.

(2) SUBSECTION (b).—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

(3) SUBSECTION (c).—The amendments made by subsection (c) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2004.

SEC. 4. MARRIAGE PENALTY RELIEF FOR EARNED INCOME CREDIT; EARNED INCOME TO INCLUDE ONLY AMOUNTS INCLUDIBLE IN GROSS INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 32(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to percentages and amounts) is amended—

(1) by striking “AMOUNTS.—The earned” and inserting “AMOUNTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the earned”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, the earned income amount determined under subparagraph (A) shall be 110 percent of the otherwise applicable amount. If any amount determined under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of \$10, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$10.”

(b) EARNED INCOME TO INCLUDE ONLY AMOUNTS INCLUDIBLE IN GROSS INCOME.—Clause (i) of section 32(c)(2)(A) of such Code (defining earned income) is amended by inserting “, but only if such amounts are includible in gross income for the taxable year” after “other employee compensation”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

SEC. 5. MODIFICATIONS TO CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) INCREASE IN PER CHILD AMOUNT.—Subsection (a) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to child tax credit) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year with respect to each qualifying child of the taxpayer an amount equal to the per child amount.

“(2) PER CHILD AMOUNT.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the per child amount shall be determined as follows:

“In the case of any taxable year beginning in—

2001 and 2002	The per child amount is—
2003	\$600
2004	700
2005	800
2006 or thereafter	900
	1,000.”

(b) CREDIT ALLOWED AGAINST ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 24 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) LIMITATION BASED ON AMOUNT OF TAX.—The credit allowed under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed the excess of—

“(A) the sum of the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) plus the tax imposed by section 55, over

“(B) the sum of the credits allowable under this subpart (other than this section) and section 27 for the taxable year.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) The heading for section 24(b) of such Code is amended to read as follows: “LIMITATIONS.—”.

(B) The heading for section 24(b)(1) of such Code is amended to read as follows: “LIMITATION BASED ON ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—”.

(C) Section 24(d) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “section 26(a)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (b)(3)”, and

(ii) in paragraph (1)(B) by striking “aggregate amount of credits allowed by this subpart” and inserting “amount of credit allowed by this section”.

(D) Paragraph (1) of section 26(a) of such Code is amended by inserting “(other than section 24)” after “this subpart”.

(E) Subsection (c) of section 23 of such Code is amended by striking “and section 1400C” and inserting “and sections 24 and 1400C”.

(F) Subparagraph (C) of section 25(e)(1) of such Code is amended by inserting “, 24,” after “sections 23”.

(G) Section 904(h) of such Code is amended by inserting “(other than section 24)” after “chapter”.

(H) Subsection (d) of section 1400C of such Code is amended by inserting “and section 24” after “this section”.

(c) ADDITIONAL CREDIT FOR FAMILIES WITH 3 OR MORE CHILDREN AVAILABLE TO ALL FAMILIES.—Subsection (d) of section 24 of such Code is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “In the case of a taxpayer with three or more qualifying children for any taxable year, the” and inserting “The”, and

(2) in the subsection heading by striking “WITH 3 OR MORE CHILDREN” and inserting “PAYING SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

(2) SUBSECTION (b).—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

SEC. 6. PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE.

The amounts transferred to any trust fund under the Social Security Act shall be determined as if this Act had not been enacted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider a further amendment printed in House Report 107-31, if offered by the gentleman from New York (MR. RANGEL) or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 60 minutes, equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from California (MR. THOMAS) and the gentleman from New

York (MR. RANGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (MR. THOMAS).

MR. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

MR. SPEAKER, it is a pleasure to bring to the floor H.R. 6, the Marriage Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act of 2001, where 43 million taxpayers will receive tax relief under this measure in calendar year 2002, and more than 60 million taxpayers when it is fully phased in.

Let me also say that there are a number of people who have said that the Republicans, in moving these pieces of tax legislation to the floor, have been overly hurried, that we have not laid the groundwork in preparation for presenting these bills.

As evidence of our long-term commitment and preparation for presenting H.R. 6 on the floor today, it is a pleasure to recognize the gentleman from Iowa (MR. LATHAM) to explain to what extent Republicans have gone to make sure that the timing of the bill on the floor today is most appropriate.

MR. SPEAKER, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (MR. LATHAM).

MR. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

MR. SPEAKER, the gentleman's timing is absolutely perfect today. At 6:22 this morning, I became a grandfather for the first time. Again, the gentleman's timing is impeccable for Justin and Lynnae, my son and daughter-in-law, and their new baby girl, Emerson Anne.

This is obviously a great day. But how appropriate today that we are going to pass the Marriage Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act and increase that child tax credit for Justin and Lynnae. They have a lot of challenges ahead, and this is going to mean more money in their pockets so that they can help Emerson Anne in her future, to help her grow and be prosperous and have a good education.

It is a great day. Again, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's timing is impeccable.

MR. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

MR. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

MR. SPEAKER, let me congratulate my chairman for the timing of bringing this bill on the floor for the Member's grandchild that was born. I only wish this bill was at such good timing for the baby boomers who will be eligible for Social Security and Medicare soon.

Unfortunately, at the time that they will become eligible, that is the time they expect to have their surplus. I hope it is there.

One thing they hope to have locked into place will be this enormous tax cut, and I tell the Members, this tax cut just does not fit. So they have come a long way in understanding the needs that we have in providing relief for taxpayers, especially as it relates to the child care bill.

As long as we give it in all of these doses, and at the end of the day we have a \$3 trillion tax bill and will not have money to do the other things that we promised and that we want to do, I would suggest that some of the compassion that the President is talking about should be leaking down to the House floor so that we can work together.

□ 1115

We have not had an opportunity to do that, but I do hope that the time is still there for us to come together with a responsible tax cut, and I would suggest that if we can just put off the tax cut for a while and concentrate and do something now to stimulate the economy, instead of providing gifts for the wealthy, that our time would be better spent.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6. American families are working longer and harder than ever, and more and more of their money is going to Washington. In fact, today's couples spend an average of 40 percent of their income in taxes; and if there is nothing else that we do in this body, we should strengthen families.

I am pleased to stand before you today because this legislation represents an historic and long overdue step for families.

H.R. 6 provides tax relief to families. This legislation provides relief on two fronts, by eliminating the marriage penalty and doubling the child tax credit.

Last year, the House passed with strong bipartisan support the same proposal to eliminate the marriage penalty. This year I am confident we will finally be able to bring tax relief to American families.

H.R. 6 will ensure that these couples are never again penalized just for being married, and it will make a promise to future couples that they will not be punished for making the decision to get married.

H.R. 6 doubles the current child tax credit. The legislation also extends present law refundability of the tax credit. This is a huge win for families. It will allow parents to keep more of the money that they earned to invest in their future and to provide an education for their children and to spend less and less time working to send their money to Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bill.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means for yielding the time to me.

The whole basis upon which this tax cut, which is about \$400 billion over the next 10 years, the whole basis of this tax cut is based upon the \$5.6 trillion that the Congressional Budget Office says will be available over the next 10 years.

The Congressional Budget Office, however, said one other thing, too. They also said in the same document, when they made this prediction about the \$5.6 trillion, that there is only a 50 percent accuracy or probability that the 5-year projections of the \$5.6 trillion will become true, and they cannot even make a prediction on the 10-year numbers.

In other words, they are basically saying we are using the number of \$5.6 trillion, but really do not rely upon the accuracy of it because we cannot really say it is going to happen. We do not know if it is going to happen. It may not happen.

So the whole basis of this tax cut is based upon conjecture, and I have to say that after this tax cut passes, and then after we pass the estate tax repeal next week, we will be at about \$1.7 trillion or \$1.8 trillion, and that does not even include the loss of interests on that money. So we are probably talking about \$2 trillion, \$2.5 trillion of the \$5.7 trillion that may not exist.

What is interesting is that we have had a lot of statistical studies on this. The top 1 percent of the taxpayers in America, those people that make \$370,000 a year and above, actually the average is about \$1.1 million income per family, the top 1 percent, they are going to get about 40 percent of this total tax cut, this so-called phantom tax cut.

This is a bad bill. The Democrats have a tax cut bill that is modest. It is actually very large. It is about \$700 billion, but it fits within a budgetary framework. It takes into consideration in the event these numbers do not come into effect and are not accurate, and it pays down the debt.

Mr. Speaker, I believe very, very strongly that if this bill passes, the estate tax bill passes next week, you are going to see a reduction in Social Security benefits over the next 3 years or 4 years.

We will not be able to do prescription drugs. All this talk the President has about education; that will not come to pass. And certainly Medicare is going to be in deep trouble, too.

This is a bad bill. We should vote for the Democratic substitute, which is more modest. It does deal with the marriage penalty. We do want a tax cut, but we want to make sure it is modest, and that, obviously, it fits

within fiscal discipline, which has given us the enormous growth we had over the last 10 years under Bill Clinton.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), my colleague, because if we listened to his speech carefully, he did say after this tax cut passes. I appreciate his understanding of the fact that a vast majority of the Members of this House want to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal tax burden today on American families is an intolerable 34 percent of personal income, so it is especially appropriate today that we are debating a bill that would be getting rid of a tax that penalizes two pillars of our American family, and those are marriage and children.

By alleviating the impact of the marriage penalty and doubling the per child tax credit, this bill will provide nearly \$400 billion in family-friendly tax relief over the next 10 years.

In my district in Washington State alone, 73,000 couples will be helped by this bill and 122,000 children by the bill that we will be passing today. The marriage penalty is a particularly strong attack on working women. Currently, the Tax Code creates a disincentive for women to go to work at all, or, if they do, to earn much above the very low threshold.

Women who make a salary on a par with their husbands are taxed at an extraordinary rate, a marginal rate that is higher when you combine incomes. It pushes that rate up.

This is not a problem for couples with a single breadwinner so much, but in today's society, where both the husband and wife work in most households, it is a huge problem. Conservative estimates put this problem at about 25 million American couples who are paying an average of 1,400 in additional taxes just because they are married. This is wrong, Mr. Speaker.

This bill represents real relief for couples in our society. As newlyweds start out on their new life, they should not face a punishing tax bill.

The incentives are wrong. The tax is unfair. Mr. Speaker, we should honor marriage, not taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to help couples and young families by supporting H.R. 6.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, and the winner is and the winner is. On November, the American people voted for investment in education for our children, health care for families, and prescription drugs for our seniors, but the Republicans keep coming with their tax cut for their rich friends.

They have lost touch with the people and have no idea what their priorities are.

As we debate the marriage penalty act today, vital programs that serve millions of Americans are being ignored.

Tonight thousands of American war heroes will go to bed on the streets. Millions of American children will go to bed hungry, and millions of Americans will go to bed wondering how much longer their bodies can fight against AIDS, cancer, diabetes, Lupus, and hundreds of other incurable diseases.

Unfortunately for the American people, today on the House floor we are once again debating a tax bill that helps only a few and ignoring the real problem that we face as a Nation.

Support fair marriage tax relief. Vote yes on the substitute and let us get back to the work that the people sent us here to do.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to identify some of the rich friends that are going to be helped in this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, more than 1 million taxpayers at the lower end of the income tax brackets will find their tax liability reduced to zero in 2002. Tax relief in this bill is not just for young families. At least 6 million families, the taxpayers who are 65 or older will benefit from this bill. It is a bill that benefits all married couples with children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, for yielding me the time.

Today's vote, Mr. Speaker, is one of the key votes on tax equity that this Congress will make. Whether or not an individual Member may support our efforts to provide a proportional tax cut for every taxpayer, they have to concede that this bill makes our Tax Code fairer for dual-income couples and families with children. That is why I rise to urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join us in support of this legislation.

On a fundamental level, increasing the child tax credit makes our tax system more fair. It especially helps middle-income and low-income families who can use the money to meet the priorities of their family budget.

Since the 1950s, the ugly fact is we have shifted more and more of the tax burden of the Federal Government onto the backs of Americans working families.

This legislation takes an important step forward in improving tax fairness and progressivity in our Tax Code.

Here are the facts: This legislation takes 2 million working families completely off the tax rolls. This legislation provides benefits to 25 million

families through doubling the child tax credit. This legislation provides relief to 5 million families within the earned income tax credit.

The tax relief debate that we have should not be a partisan debate, but rather a debate about how fairly to return a portion of our national surplus back to working families.

American taxpayers have been overcharged by their government, and it is only fair that Congress ensure that they receive a refund.

This legislation provides tax fairness, and everyone who professes to support tax fairness on the other side of the aisle should have an obligation to support it.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

(Ms. KILPATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member on the Committee on Ways and Means, for yielding the time to me.

You do the math, America. We think we will have a \$5.6 trillion surplus over the next 10 years. We also think we can tell what the weather will be next week or tomorrow. That is about what it is when we talk about projections. We do not have the money.

We, Democrats, do support a tax cut. Yes, we have a surplus, but Americans also want election reform so that every vote will count, education reform, prescription drugs, health care access, and, yes, to save our Social Security and Medicare plan.

With this tax cut today that is before us and the trillion dollars we have already passed, we will not be able to address those needs that American people want.

We want to do something about the marriage penalty, and the Democrats have a plan. But do you not think, America, that we ought to take care of the needs of Americans and see what the real numbers are and then offer a tax plan that will work?

Support the Democratic alternative. The other will lead us into deficit.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), a valued member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, when a couple stands at the altar and says "I do," they are not agreeing to higher taxes. Yet, 25 million Americans couples currently pay higher taxes simply because they are married.

Let us be clear, it is just plain wrong to place a tax penalty on marriage. The legislation before us today will provide real relief to American couples, 47,000 of which are in my district in northern California.

□ 1130

When combined with the across-the-board rate cuts already approved by this House, this legislation will mean

up to \$560 for the average family of four this year. These are dollars which families can use to pay off credit card debts or cope with high energy costs, especially important in my home State of California.

I urge all my colleagues to support this much-needed legislation.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member on the Committee on Ways and Means for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6 today. But I support marriage penalty relief because it does not make sense for married people to pay more taxes just because they are married.

That being said, we in Congress have a lot of tough choices we have to make. The Republican budget we passed yesterday and the tax cut we are working on today make it clear that their priorities are cutting taxes for the few instead of supporting programs that benefit the many.

In fact, opposing this today, my wife will tell me, wait a minute. You are taking away our tax cut for Members of Congress, because my wife teaches school. I said, yes, but it is still wrong. We should not have it for people who have higher incomes.

I support repealing the marriage penalty, but our Democratic proposal actually goes further than H.R. 6 to address marriage penalty corrections. But I also support a prescription drug benefit for seniors, investing in our schools, shoring up Social Security, and making sure the United States is strong as can be.

Mr. Speaker, we need to heed the warning signs of our economy. We should not charge forward with huge tax cuts, because we need to look at the current numbers and what the projections were for last year.

They say a fool and his money are soon parted. We owe the American people more than to be foolish with their money.

Americans have worked hard for the last 8 years to achieve the surpluses we are now enjoying. Instead of heeding the economic warning signs, we are charging forward with a huge tax cut that, even Alan Greenspan has argued, will do very little to spur the economy. Like a gambler who bets the farm on one hand, this Congress is risking it all—with no guarantee that they'll cash in.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member on the Committee on Ways and Means for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, life has its lessons. One of the lessons I learned early on was I went to a used car salesman, and he showed me a car. That body of that car looked like it was in excellent condition. He turned on the radio, and the music of the radio, the stereo just reverberated around me; and I fell in love with the car.

But there was one thing that I forgot to do was open up the hood to the car to see the engine and drive the car to make sure that it functioned and did what it said it was to do.

I say to the American people, you have got to and we have got to look under the hood, inside the engine of what is being proposed here in these tax cuts.

We are being told that everything can happen. We can save Social Security, Medicare; that we can make these the surpluses based upon 10 years out. No, I say to my colleagues, we have to make choices. Those choices have to be based upon a discipline and well-thought-out process.

We cannot do this without a budget because we do have other priorities. Those priorities include Medicare, Medicaid. They include education. They include a prescription drug plan. We must have all of those things if we are going to have a true car.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, there is broad bipartisan support in this House for correcting the marriage tax penalty. Indeed, this is a measure that could have been approved the week after President Bush's inauguration. In fact, there is such broad bipartisan support, it could have been approved last year. Or it could have been approved back in 1995 when the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) offered it in the Committee on Ways and Means to implement the Republican contract on America by correcting the marriage tax penalty.

But our Republican colleagues at that time had higher priorities: they preferred tax relief for corporations rather than couples; and they rejected his proposal. Last year they had a higher priority than relief for married couples, which was to try and win an election by preserving this as a campaign issue instead of coming together to agree on genuine marriage tax penalty relief.

Married couples in this country should and could have had this penalty corrected years ago. Yet, today, we find ourselves together, not in bipartisan agreement, but in disagreement, because once again our Republican colleagues offer a proposal that offers more relief to those who have no marriage tax penalty than those that do.

Any Member of this body, who believes that President Bush got it right in his campaign last year with his proposal for marriage tax penalty correction, needs to vote against the Republican proposal. They brought, as their principal witness to our Committee on Ways and Means, a gentleman who testified that President Bush's proposal on marriage penalty relief was worse than doing nothing at all. Yes, that is correct, as difficult as it is to believe. The Republican witness came and said

President Bush had it all wrong last year in the campaign and that we ought to reject his proposal.

I actually happen to think that the President came a lot closer to getting it right on this issue than the House Republicans with their old proposal that they have revised here, which is designed to shower benefits on those who have no penalty instead of focusing relief on those who have a legitimate complaint.

Let us be sure we understand what this bill does in that regard. Anyone in this House who believes we should not discriminate against single people ought to vote against this proposal, because that is exactly what it does by focusing more relief on those who incur no marriage penalty than those who do.

In fact, under this proposal, if someone has the misfortune to become a widow or a widower, on their income after this bill passes, that individual may well face a tax increase. I guess you might call it a "death tax" or the "single's discrimination tax". On the same amount of earnings that say a retired couple might have, a surviving spouse will face a higher rate filing individually—a single's tax discrimination. The same applies to the abused spouse who separates from her husband. The same applies to any single individual out there, who is penalized under this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, lest someone be confused by the last speaker, I will place into the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy. It says, "The Administration supports the House's action on H.R. 6 as another positive step on the way to passage of the President's tax relief plan."

The administration stands squarely in support of the legislation in the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, March 29, 2001.

H.R. 6—Marriage Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act of 2001 (Rep. Weller (R) Illinois and 225 cosponsors)

The Administration supports the House's action on H.R. 6 as another positive step on the way to passage of the President's tax relief plan. H.R. 6 is consistent with the objectives of the President's tax plan, which lowers the tax burden on families and restores fairness by, among other things, reducing tax rates, expanding the child credit, and significantly reducing the marriage penalty. The Administration looks forward to working with Congress as the legislative process continues to achieve a result that best embodies the objectives of the President's plan.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORING

Any law that would reduce receipts is subject to the pay-as-you-go requirements of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act. Accordingly, H.R. 6 or any substitute amendment in lieu thereof, that would also reduce revenues, will be subject to the pay-as-you-go requirement. The Ad-

ministration will work with Congress to ensure that any unintended sequester of spending does not occur under current law or the enactment of any other proposals that meet the President's objectives.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) and his friends. The gentleman from Illinois is a member of the committee who probably more than any Member of this House has been identified with the long and difficult process of reaching the floor today and the passage of the Marriage Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act.

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from California (Chairman THOMAS) for his leadership in the committee in working to move this legislation quickly to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to do something bipartisan today, an opportunity for Democrats, Republicans to join together to help the American family.

What is the bottom line? We have legislation today before us that wipes out the marriage tax penalty for the vast majority of those who suffer it and also increases the child tax credit, helping families with children, two good things that deserve strong bipartisan support.

I want to invite my Democratic friends to join with House Republicans in doing this and would point out that, last year, we passed legislation which wiped out the marriage tax penalty. In fact, last year, we passed it twice. Unfortunately, it fell victim to President Clinton's veto. But I would note that 51 Democrats joined with us in our effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

This year, our legislation has 230 cosponsors, 15 Democrats. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) has been a leader in working to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. I want to thank him for his effort in working to build bipartisan support for effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

What is the bottom line? Is it right, is it fair that, under our Tax Code, 25 million married working couples on average pay \$1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married? Is that right? Is that fair? Of course not.

While twice we have sent legislation to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, I believe the third time will be the charm because we have a President that says he will sign this legislation into law this time.

Let me introduce a couple that many in this House have gotten to know as I have discussed the marriage tax penalty over the last several years, Shad and Michelle Hallihan, two public schoolteachers from Will County, the Joliet area in Will County.

Their combined income is about \$65,000. Their marriage tax penalty is a little between \$900 to a \$1,000 a year, a little bit less than average. But they suffer the marriage tax penalty because they chose to get married. They

have two incomes. They file jointly. It pushes them into a higher tax bracket, creating the marriage tax penalty.

Our legislation will eliminate the marriage tax penalty for Shad and Michelle Hallihan. Only the bipartisan bill, H.R. 6, will eliminate the marriage tax penalty for Shad and Michelle Hallihan, because they are homeowners. They itemize their taxes. The alternative will not.

So clearly, if we want to help couples, middle-class couples like Shad and Michelle Hallihan, we should eliminate the marriage tax penalties.

Since we have been working on this legislation to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, Shad and Michelle have had a baby. They got married at the time we introduced the bill 3 years ago. They now have a child, little Ben. So they qualify for the child tax credit. It is \$500 today.

Under our legislation, not only do we eliminate the marriage tax penalty for Shad and Michelle Hallihan, but they get the benefit from the child tax credit increase. This year it is \$500. With the passage of this legislation into law, this year it will be a \$600 increase in the child tax credit, which means Shad and Michelle will see as a result of this legislation somewhere between \$1,500 and \$2,000 in tax relief by eliminating the marriage tax penalty by providing for a bigger child tax credit.

Let us vote from a bipartisan way. I invite Democrats to join with us. Let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty. Let us help families with children.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I just pause because I was so moved by the last presentation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAND) while I regain my composure.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to give the distinguished ranking member an opportunity to gain his composure.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly respect the motivation behind the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) for introducing this legislation, but I strongly disagree with the solution that he proposes.

Today's problem was yesterday's solution. The reason we are doing this was because, back in 1969, so many single people complained that they were getting unfairly treated by the Tax Code, and so we tried to fix it. In fact, we did fix it pretty much.

I have a Congressional Budget Office study that shows that only 37 percent of married couples actually get penalized, and their penalty is \$24 billion. Sixty percent of married couples actually get a bonus for having gotten mar-

ried, and that bonus totals \$72 billion. So there is actually about a \$50 billion net bonus going to people for having gotten married.

What we are doing to try to fix a problem is to make it worse. The cost of fixing it falls on the children of these very nice people who are getting married.

I cannot imagine somebody not getting married because of some tax penalty. What happened to love and romance, for crying out loud.

The fact is this is wrong. I do not even agree with the Democratic substitute. We ought to do the right thing and simplify the Tax Code and not do this kind of stuff.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member, for all the work he has done in this particular area.

I want to continue to respond. The prior speaker prior to my colleague said he wanted to help the American family. Which American family? I am talking about working families.

Do Shad and Michelle Hallihan know that they are getting no help for affordable housing? Do they know they are getting no help for child care? Do they know they are getting no help for health care? Do they know their parents will not be able to get a prescription drug benefit? Do they know how many schools we can fix with \$24 billion? Do they know how many lives we can change with \$24 billion if they only wait on a tax cut on the marriage tax penalty?

What else are Shad and Michelle Hallihan getting? They are teachers. They work for a school system. They get health care. What about all those other families out there who do not get health care, who do not have an opportunity to have a vacation and take their children somewhere?

This benefit may deal with a marriage tax penalty; but it deals with none of the other things like housing, child care, health care, prescription drug benefit, or Social Security. Wake up America. We do not want this.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I note to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), the previous speaker, that if she votes against this bipartisan effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, that 88,000 taxpayers in the 11th District of Ohio will continue to suffer the marriage tax penalty, and over 71,000 children will not be eligible for the increase in the doubling tax credit.

Let us be fair. Let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty and increase the child tax credit.

□ 1145

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr.

HAYWORTH), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) for yielding me this time.

And, Mr. Speaker, in response to my two colleagues on the other side of the aisle who previously spoke, we would be very happy to ask them to join us in marginal rate reductions, because that helps every taxpayer. We have a simple disagreement: Should families control their money, or the government? And I think that addresses that.

My colleagues, I bring yet another family to the well of this House. For our purposes today, we will call them the "Taxpayer" family. They will be especially helped by this tax relief plan because this is a growing family with five children. Let us say that John and Wendy Taxpayer both work.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I do not have the time.

Mr. RANGEL. I cannot see the photo.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I am very happy to show it to the gentleman.

Mr. RANGEL. If you could just tilt it a little bit. Thank you.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Let us say John and Wendy Taxpayer both work.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you very much.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, do I control the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) controls the time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, let us say that John Taxpayer earns \$30,000 a year with his teaching job at Madison Elementary School. Wendy makes \$32,000 a year working to help older Americans as a home health care assistant. Together they pay a \$732 marriage penalty, paying more in taxes just because they are married. That is wrong.

This bill ends that marriage tax penalty so that John and Wendy can keep that \$732 of their money each year to help pay for all the clothes, food, and other items that we all know goes into raising a family. And that \$732 over time is going to add up to big savings.

But then here comes the real help. This year we will also increase the child credit by \$100 to the Taxpayer family. That means that John and Wendy will have an additional \$500 to help all those little growing Taxpayers. And once the bill is fully phased in, the Taxpayers would get an additional \$2,500 to continue to help with their growing family. The AMT relief we include in this bill will ensure that the Taxpayer family gets the full benefits of the doubling of the child credit.

My colleagues, that is what this debate is about, not budgets and not rich versus poor, not anything else. This is about families. This is real tax relief for American families who need it now more than ever. Stand up for families; stand up for reduction of the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. McDERMOTT), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, we are here on day three of George the Second's runaway railway train. Last week we cut taxes, and yesterday we passed a budget out of here in a big hurry, and now here is day three.

There are some attractive pieces to this bill. As somebody mentioned, I proposed it five years ago, and the Republicans in the Ways and Means turned it down because they had other things that were more important. But what is amazing about what is going on here is that last week we passed out of here \$1.35 trillion tax cut packages. Therefore, out of the \$1.6 trillion, we only have \$300 billion left, and we have the estate tax, we have the charitable deduction, and we have the AMT fix. This train is running backwards because they are loading up the gift things in the front and not telling people what is coming in the back.

I sit on the Committee on the Budget as well as the Committee on Ways and Means, and there is no reasonable budget out there. This is a reckless train that we are on.

Now, I have been to several hearings, and the Governor from Wisconsin, who is now the head of HHS, came to testify at both those committees. He did not have one single answer to what he was going to do about Medicare. He says they are \$654 billion in the hole over the next 10 years, but did not offer a single answer as to how he was going to deal with that. The last thing we ought to be doing is running a big tax train out of here.

Then we had *deja vu*. In comes the Secretary of the Treasury. We asked him about Medicare solvency, and he did not have any single answer. But then we had a guy from the Treasury who really made sense. His name was Weinberger. He came in last week and he told us with a straight face that families know they will get \$100 in April of 2002. That will have a positive psychological effect in terms of spending and, therefore, a positive impact on the economy.

Now, if we think about that, what he is saying is this—it is acceptable to encourage people to spend what they do not have. I mean, we are saying, it is coming, they will be getting their \$100, so please run out and spend it right now to gin up this economy and increase their personal debt. That at least is consistent with this administration's philosophy on this railroad; let us run it out of here and never look at what we are going to have to pay down the road.

This is based on estimates. We have talked about this and talked about this. If anyone would get CBO to reestimate where we are going to be in 10

years on the basis of what has gone on in the last 6 months, we would have a totally different figure that we would be dealing with today. But, boy, the engineer is in the cab, and he is pulling back on the throttle, and here we go, choo-choo-choo right down the road, no matter what is on the road.

I say vote for the Democratic alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I support marriage penalty relief and child credits targeted to help the working poor. I cosponsored marriage penalty relief legislation in the 105th Congress when the Republican majority unanimously voted it down. I introduced it again in the 106th Congress, and now again in the current session.

While there are some attractive components to this bill, I have serious concerns with the size of President Bush's tax cut. Our Republican colleagues are trying to rush all the components of President Bush's tax plan through the House, and I will not support each individual component as we watch its price tag soar.

The cost of this bill and the one passed earlier on marginal rate reductions is already up to \$1.35 billion, and ballooning. This amount does not include the repeal of the estate tax, charitable deduction, the AMT fix, and the list goes on. At this rate, the Republicans will continue to push up the price tag to \$3 trillion. This must end. It is simply irresponsible.

I sit on the Budget Committee, and I promise you, there simply is not a responsible budget. Any tax cut must be designed within the framework of balanced priorities. There is none. The Republican Budget Resolution invades the Medicare surplus to fund the huge tax cut. They do not set aside adequate levels of funding for a meaningful drug benefit. There is no additional money left to shore up Social Security or education.

The list is endless. This is completely reckless!

I have been to several hearings, and it is the same theme over and over again: Where is the money?

I have heard testimony from Secretary Thompson at two committees—at neither could he answer a single question about how we are going to meet our financial obligations for the Medicare program.

The last thing we should be doing is a \$1.6 trillion tax cut when alarms are sounding on Medicare's long-term situation. The program needs an infusion of money, but the Administration does not seem to know how to achieve that. Of course not—the administration is trying to ram another tax cut down our throats before considering the budget.

It was *déjà vu* all over again with testimony from Secretary O'Neill regarding the Medicare's solvency. All we heard about is the "crisis" the program faces and the need to address it. When asked how, there are no answers.

Today, we are being asked to vote on a second, backloaded tax bill. Last week, Mr. Weinberger from Treasury told us with a straight face that families who know that they will get \$100 next April, in 2002, will have a positive psychological effect in terms of spending, and therefore a positive impact on the economy.

I suppose Mr. Weinberger is saying that it is acceptable to encourage people to spend what they don't have, and increase their per-

sonal debt. At least that is consistent with the Administration's apparent philosophy that paying down our national debt is not a priority—not if they are trying to pass a huge tax cut without the context of a responsible framework.

Let us not forget, these tax cuts are based on projections, not guarantees. Current projections are exactly that—projections. If the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) were to recalculate their estimates in today's economy, they would slash their projections of budget surpluses.

Based on their own track record, CBO concludes that estimated surpluses could be off in one direction or the other, on average by \$412 billion in 2006. Any responsible fiscal plan must anticipate inevitable errors in these projections. But the Bush proposal simply ignores these concerns.

The budget must maintain a reserve for inevitable errors in these projections. It must pay down the debt, shore up resources for Medicare and Social Security, and allow for other initiatives, such as education, prescription drugs and the uninsured.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to note for my colleague from Washington State that the two provisions of the President's tax plan that this House has already passed will provide this year for the average family of four \$600 in tax relief, almost \$400 from the rate reduction and, for two children, \$200 in additional family tax credits.

I would also note that while my good friend takes credit for some ideas, the marriage tax penalty, his proposal, was phased in over 10 years when he offered it. I would also note that we incorporated his idea, though we do it immediately, into this bill. So I hope he will join with us and make it a bipartisan effort.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA), and would note in doing so that this simply reinforces the fact that this is a bipartisan proposal. I congratulate him on his good work. He has been a leader on the Democratic side of the aisle with regard to this bill.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), my good friend and colleague, who has been a champion of this tax relief for several years. It is truly an honor and a privilege for me to join with him in cosponsoring this legislation.

I want to also recognize his leadership and thank him for giving me the opportunity to do my part to ensure that one day the marriage penalty is taken out of our Federal Tax Code. It has truly been an honor to work with him.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying fundamentally the marriage penalty is an issue of tax fairness. Married couples on average pay \$1,400 more in taxes simply because they are married. This is an unfair burden on our Nation's married couples. Marriage is a sacred institution, and our Tax Code should not discourage it by making

married couples pay more. We need to change the Tax Code so it no longer discriminates against those who are wed.

As most of my colleagues know, the marriage penalty occurs when a couple filing a joint return experiences a greater tax liability than would occur if each of the two people filed as single individuals. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that more than 25 million couples suffer under this unfair burden. The legislation that is before us will fix the grave injustice of our current Tax Code that results in married couples paying higher taxes than they would if they remained single. It also doubles the child tax credit to \$1,000 over 6 years.

This bill strikes to the heart of middle-income tax relief. These are the people who are the backbone of our communities. These are the people who need tax relief the most. With a record budget surplus, the time is long overdue for Congress to remove the marriage penalty from the Tax Code.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan bill achieves that goal, and I know that all of us present here today who support the measure will not stop working until this legislation is signed into law. My constituents have spoken to me very overwhelmingly on this issue, and the time has arrived to act decisively to eliminate the marriage penalty.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues, I strongly support marriage penalty relief and tax benefit for families. That is why I support the Democratic substitute. It provides married couples and families significant tax relief, but it does it in a way that is good for all Americans and allows us to prepare for our future. H.R. 6 may seem small today, but we cannot ignore the fact that it is only part of a \$3 trillion Republican tax plan. That is a lot of money, especially when it is based on an unreliable surplus projection. There are no assurances, no guarantees. What if we are wrong?

Mr. Speaker, the Republican \$3 trillion plan puts at risk our ability to prepare for our future. What we should be doing today is paying down the national debt, saving Social Security and Medicare, and taking care of all of the basic needs of all of our citizens. The Republican tax plan is not right for America. It tends to move us in the wrong direction. And I say, Mr. Speaker, this plan is not fair, and it is not just.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote against it and vote for the Democratic substitute.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I note to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), who spoke

on behalf of the Democratic substitute, that the proposal he speaks in favor of would deny help for almost 60,000 children in his district in Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I know that there are a lot of married people in Georgia. As my colleagues know, I am from Texas, and I want to divorce the 1.7 million married Texans from the government-imposed, IRS-enforced marriage penalty tax. It is just plain wrong for the Federal Government to penalize people who choose to get married. When two people stand before God and exchange their vows, it should be a celebration for them, not the IRS.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that America is the land of the free and the home of the brave, and this is true fact. Young couples have to be brave to get married because the Federal Government is going to free them from their hard-earned money when they say "I do."

I do not think any Member would disagree that we should encourage, not discourage, the greatest institution on earth, marriage. Let us vote today to give married couples a well-deserved honeymoon, the elimination of the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 12½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good example of where we could have found common ground with the Republicans to get marriage penalty relief for the American people. But once again, the proposal that they offer is excessive.

I would highlight to my colleagues that their proposal is more generous than the one that President Bush proposed. It is excessive in that it goes way beyond his proposal, which perhaps we even on this side of the aisle could have lived with. But when it comes to taxes these days, the Republican Party is like parents with twins who have just entered their teenage years. They know college is coming in a few years, and they should be saving to pay college expenses, but they refuse to.

Mr. Speaker, by providing excessive tax relief, the Republican Party is denying the looming problems that result from the retirement of the baby boomers in just a few years. This bill represents missed opportunities once again. It could have contained more tax simplification than it does, which

we should be doing, and it could have offered far more relief on the alternative minimum tax. But AMT relief and simplification are not part of the current political agenda in this institution.

Mr. Speaker, there are some good points to this legislation: The child credit, the earned income tax credit, and they do touch upon some relief with AMT.

□ 1200

The problem with this legislation is, once again, it is excessive. What we do here is we cut taxes and then we do a budget, rather than the other way around.

Let me speak specifically, if I can, for just a moment about alternative minimum tax, and I hope people are paying attention to what is about to happen.

This bill makes the alternative minimum tax worse by, listen to this, \$292 billion. That is not much of a fix. There are currently 1.5 million taxpayers who are categorized according to AMT. Under the current law, that number increases to 20.7 million in 2011. With some people having incomes of only \$50,000 a year, get ready, they are about to pay alternative minimum tax. Because of this entire tax proposal, 15 million more Americans are going to be forced into alternative minimum tax. If this bill goes through and is signed by the President, there is going to be no revenue left to fix alternative minimum tax.

The Democratic alternative is a sound piece of legislation. It is certainly much more fiscally responsible than the bill that we are going to vote on in a few moments. Our legislation is superior in that it addresses the looming problem of AMT. Get past sloganeering. Get down to policy. Fix alternative minimum tax.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), who discussed the consequences of alternative minimum tax. Of course, the alternative minimum tax was increased with the 1993 tax increase that President Clinton and the Democratic majority enacted back in 1993. I would note that their proposal provides actually less AMT relief than our proposal that we are offering today. I would note that in the marriage penalty relief that is in H.R. 6 that taxpayers are held harmless. They do not see the consequences of AMT, the alternative minimum tax, under our proposal. So that is a good thing and a step forward. Of course, I would note that in my friend's district that almost 100,000 children would be denied relief and help under the proposal which he supports.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), the dean of the Illinois Delegation and a senior member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the bill brought forth today reducing the marriage tax penalty and reducing taxes on families with children. This bill is the second installment on a tax relief plan put forward by President Bush to let overtaxed Americans keep their money. We are running enormous surpluses that are more likely to grow than shrink in the coming years if we do not act.

President Bush has a responsible program of tax relief refunding these surpluses to the people who pay the bills. The marriage tax penalty should never have been allowed to creep into the Tax Code in the first place. It violates sound tax policy and runs counter to bedrock American traditions. It has a tremendous negative impact on the people of my district. More than 70,000 couples pay an average marriage tax penalty of \$1,400 per year in the eighth district of Illinois. That is nearly \$100 million per year that families could spend in our district on education if they chose to do so.

This bill also doubles the per child tax credit as President Bush recommends. According to the Heritage Foundation, families in my district have nearly 125,000 children that would benefit from this increased tax credit. That is equal to \$62.5 million per year that families can spend on health care, clothing, and their education. This is obviously important for reducing the tax burden on families, but it also reduces marginal tax rates for affected families. Because of the various phase-outs and other provisions in the Tax Code, a relatively low-income family with children can easily find themselves paying marginal tax rates that are higher than those paid by the richest Americans. Doubling the child tax credit eliminates this terribly unfair situation.

It is urgent that we move quickly to convince taxpayers that we mean business. Consumer confidence will improve when people gain confidence that we will give them a pay hike by cutting their taxes.

I am also pleased that the Committee on Ways and Means is marking up a bill today to repeal the death tax. We still have more work to do to pass the President's charitable-giving tax reform, including two proposals I have advanced for years to allow non-itemizers to deduct their charitable contributions and to allow charitable IRA rollovers; and we must continue to work to pass fundamental pension reform.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Baltimore, Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, and I would also say to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), who will mention, I hope, the number of people in my district who will benefit from the marriage penalty relief, I would hope that our substitute would also be supported because our substitute will provide more relief to those who have a marriage penalty problem until the year 2004. The Republican bill that is on the floor does not provide any help in regards to the rate problems until the year 2004. That is one of the problems that I have with the Republican bill, and why I am going to vote against it because it is back-loaded. That means in order to get everything to fit together, most of the relief is provided in the second 5 years, not in the first 5 years.

In the first 5 years, under the Republican bill, only 28 percent of the relief is provided. The rest is in the outyears. Because they phase it in over such a long period of time in order to provide all of their promises that cannot possibly be lived up to, they back-load the cost of the bill. In fact, when this bill is put in with the rest of the bills that are being offered, and I have a little chart here, it shows how impossible it is for everything to fit together.

We have already passed the first bill here and now we are doing the second one, and there is hardly any money left over for the estate tax relief and the health care and the debt service.

Remember yesterday we had a \$1.6 trillion budget for tax relief. Well, when all of this is added up, if debt service is counted, it is going to be \$3 trillion. That is why those of us, particularly on this side of the aisle, are concerned that all of this cannot be done and still protect Social Security and still protect Medicare and be able to expand Medicare to include prescription medicines and pay down our national debt, which should be our first priority, and to invest in education, which both Democrats and Republicans have been talking about.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) is correct. We missed an opportunity today to have a bipartisan bill that could have enjoyed, I think, very broad support, to fix the marriage penalty problem, because there is a legitimate need to fix the marriage penalty problem. For those who are worried about that, as I am, and want to do something about it to the number of people that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) will mention in my district, I urge support for the substitute that will be offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) very shortly.

Once again, that will provide more relief, more relief to those people who have a marriage penalty until the year 2004, because the Republican bill, the underlying bill, because they are trying to put, as my chairman likes to say, 15 pounds of sugar into a 10-pound bag, they had to cut back on how they implement the bill.

So let us be fiscally responsible. Let us be able to pay down the national debt. Let us be able to deal with Social Security and Medicare and the other priorities. Support the Democratic substitute. Oppose the Republican bill.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would note to my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), that his argument in favor of the Democrat substitute indicates that he will vote to deny over 100,000 children in his district the help that is provided in the bipartisan bill that is before us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), who is one of the key bipartisan supporters of H.R. 6 before us today.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to look at this from a different perspective. Our labor is taxed. Our savings are taxed. Our investments are taxed. Our profits are taxed in America. Our sweat, our thrift, our future, all taxed in America and being addressed, quite frankly, pretty well by the Republicans. If we think about it, even business taxes, a tax on business, is passed on to us to pay.

Now, if that is not enough to tax your lower intestinal tract at the very lowest of levels, Mr. Speaker, even our sex is taxed in America. That being marital sex. Think about it. Marital sex in America is taxed. Responsible, legally married couples' sex is taxed while casual promiscuous sex in America goes literally untaxed and is incentivized and rewarded. A family friendly Congress does not penalize married couples right to the point.

I want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), and I want to commend the Republican Party that if we are to be family friendly we should start right at the base of it all and get down to the testosterone, Mr. Speaker.

It is time to treat married couples at least as well as we treat casual sex participants in the United States of America. I commend the chairman again, and I urge an aye vote for the bill.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), a respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can be quite as erudite as our last speaker but I will attempt to at least engage in a fair debate on why this is an important bill.

I am delighted actually that the other side of the aisle is actually talking tax relief. I remember being accused last year of being reckless with the budget of the United States when we had proposed somewhere in the nature of \$600 billion of tax relief and, lo and behold, this year the Democratic

substitute is well over \$900 billion. So at least we are heading in the right direction.

How anybody could stand on this floor and defend the current tax structure that is punitive to families is beyond me.

Now I am single, and I certainly do not want to spread the tax burden on to single people after we pass this bill and I want to make certain we do not do that, but I would suggest that 51,000 families in my district are suffering a penalty under the marriage tax as it is structured. Twenty-five million couples in America pay an average of \$1,400 more in taxes simply because they file as married couples. This bill provides relief and it provides important relief.

Now, a lot of people are babbling around this place about the fact that the bills that we have passed are not front-loaded that they do not provide immediate relief. Well, I beg to differ. This bill provides immediate relief. This bill provides substantial relief and this bill finally clarifies what is an erroneous provision in the Tax Code.

It is bipartisan. It was mentioned earlier today that 51 Democrats voted for our approach last year, and I believe it will even grow this year. It is pretty hard to go home to communities, to districts around America, to the 435 districts around this country, and suggest on a Sunday at church or a temple or synagogue that one believes in keeping this kind of onerous burden.

I encourage those who feel so compelled that they can go to their communities this weekend and inform them of the fact that they chose not to relieve the burden on families.

I am delighted that the Democrats offer a substitute because at least they recognize there is a problem. I do not support the approach. I support ours, but I am delighted that they are advancing a number of proposals.

I heard once again on this floor that we are to be criticized because we did tax bills before budgets.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting on this floor kind of listening to the debate today, and I first of all would like to bring to the attention of this body a couple of things that I think are interesting going on around the country, and particularly in my home State of Florida. This year they are facing deficits. They have some real critical issues going on there. It has been interesting, as I have read some of the comments over the last couple of weeks, that there are now those in the majority, in the Florida legislature, being Republicans, who are now concerned about a vote that they took last year, which was to do a tax cut.

□ 1215

Now they are in about a \$1 billion deficit and cannot meet their own expense needs. I think that is something we should be thinking about and heeding, which is I think what the Democrats are saying. We do not have to rush so quickly to do everything at the 1.6 or the \$3 trillion that is looking like we are going to spend on tax cuts, but we could take it in a little bit smaller direction. We can still give the relief that we have been asked to do in a bipartisan fashion, which is what was offered last year and continues to be offered, but has never been acted upon.

I also have heard on this floor from the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), who I know has worked very long and hard on this piece of legislation, about the families in each one of our districts that will not be helped if we do not support this. Well, there are also the numbers that are not talked about, and that is of the people that will not be helped.

Mr. Speaker, in Florida, in Florida, there are 1 million children that will not receive this tax relief. That is a lot of children. I do not know how many families might get tax relief, but I know how many children will Florida are not going to see any of these dollars. And I can say in Georgia, it is probably about 700,000 children that will not receive this tax relief, and in Maryland.

So let us be honest about this. Let us be fiscally responsible. Let us keep this country in the right direction.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), who has been a real leader in the effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty and help families by expanding tax credits.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time, for his hard work on the subject, and for the hard work of the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) in leading the effort in allowing the American families to keep more of what they earn.

The marriage penalty is not about politics. This is not a political issue. It is not about rich versus poor. The marriage penalty is about fairness to American families. There are 75,000 couples in South Dakota who pay higher taxes because they chose to get married. That is wrong.

I am going to give my colleagues a specific example in my State of how this works. I have people come into my office all the time and they bring in their tax forms. There was a young couple that came in in 1999, a two-earner couple, they have two children, they made \$67,000 between them and they paid \$1,953 more in Federal income taxes because they were married. The Tax Code punishes married couples in this country, and that is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that we realize the impact this has, not just in the general term, and we hear the numbers thrown out, but

in very specific terms, how it affects families across America. I talked to another lady in South Dakota who was talking about a young couple, they were not married, they had four kids between them. She said, well, why do you guys not get married? She said, well, because today, when we get our taxes back, we get \$4,000 back in our tax return. If we got married, we would only get \$1,500 back.

Mr. Speaker, it is wrong for the Tax Code to affect people's decisions; it is wrong to penalize married couples for choosing to get married. We need to do what is right for the American family; we need to do what is right for America. We need to make the Tax Code fair again to American married couples. We need to eliminate the marriage penalty.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation today.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. MCCARTHY).

(Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for marriage penalty tax reform. Americans should not have to pay additional taxes simply because they have made the decision to get married. Unfortunately, the marriage penalty tax relief as proposed by the President provides little relief to families with incomes under \$30,000; and much of the benefit that is designed for middle-income families does not even start to take effect until after 2004.

The Democratic alternative offers relief to all married couples with an income tax liability starting next year. The Democratic plan also protects transfers that are supposed to be made to the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the week I was with the President in my district in Kansas City as he outlined the details of his tax proposal; and as I listened, I found myself thinking that most of the workers in the small business facility where we gathered would benefit more from the provisions of the Democratic alternative tax plan, lowering payroll taxes and providing relief within the next year, rather than waiting for the complicated credit system in the President's plan.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, a very important issue has been brought to the House floor this morning, and one that certainly has to be addressed by both Republicans and Democrats.

We do have an alternative, and we soon will be able to debate that, that not only provides a better way to take care of this very serious problem, but fits into an actual budget that no matter what the surplus actually turns out to be, we can have some assurances that this relief will be there.

What the majority is doing is not bringing to us the full tax bill that

they are talking about, because they know that the various parts of this tax bill just does not fit into the \$1.6 trillion tax cut that the President wants. It is almost like trying to get a big size 12 foot into a size 6 shoe. It just does not fit.

If we take a look at the illustration that has been shown before on the House floor and think that this pie represents \$1.6 trillion, \$958 billion in rate reduction has already been spent. Today we are talking about \$399 billion that is going to be in the marriage penalty and child credit bill. If we really think they are sincere about \$1.6 trillion, then that just leaves \$243 billion to be left for the rest of the tax cut. So we are not saying that we are closing out today, that this is it, that they have done what the compassionate, conservative President wants, because we know that we soon will be discussing how we can give estate tax relief.

Now, this is going to be really a giant-sized foot getting into a size 6 shoe when this comes to the floor next week. Because even though they may estimate that it will be \$2 billion or \$3 billion to take care of this problem, those that are looking for estate tax relief should really take a hard look and find out when is that relief expected. I suspect it will not be for a long, long time.

The Joint Committee on Taxation was asked to give an estimate as to in the long run what would it cost. They say \$663 billion over 10 years. Now, the Republicans have a tendency that when joint committees agree with them, they waive it around; but when joint committees disagree with them, they attempt to ignore it. In any event, it is going to be really educational to see how they attempt to swallow the cost of estate tax repeal as opposed to what we have attempted to do in our bill, H.R. 1264, and that is to make certain that we give relief, except for the .06 people who are extremely wealthy that should be paying some taxes on those estates.

But even if we assume that they can wedge in some kind of way relief for estate tax, we have so many other things that cannot fit into this. They talk about fixing the alternative minimum tax. Some of us that come from high-income States have been able to deduct this from our Federal taxes, and this will no longer be able to be done, and that costs us \$292 billion if we tried to bring some equity to those people from high-income States.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say, in recognition that we have a bipartisan proposal before us today, supported by Democrats and Republicans, that it is a great opportunity to work to eliminate the marriage tax penalty for 25 million couples and help millions of children throughout America by increasing and doubling the child tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wis-

consin (Mr. RYAN), the most junior member of the Committee on Ways and Means, who, by the way, is a newlywed himself, to close on our side.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. First of all, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), my friend and colleague, for taking the lead on this issue, not only through this Congress, but through the past Congresses. The American people and all married people in this country owe him a debt of gratitude once this becomes law. So our thanks to the gentleman for his effort on this.

Mr. Speaker, we are hearing all of these excuses on the floor of Congress today as to why we should not do this. What is the excuse? Well, I am hearing this excuse that it would be fiscally irresponsible for us to pass this legislation. We cannot afford to spend this money on tax cuts. That is essentially the opposition that we are hearing from the other side.

Well, it really comes down to a philosophy, a difference of opinion. It is not the Federal Government's money in the first place to afford to spend this money on tax cuts. This is a surplus which came to Washington because taxpayers overpaid their taxes. That is what a tax surplus is.

On top of it, it has fit very well within our budget, which pays down the debt, which stops the raid on Medicare and Social Security; and on top of that, as taxpayers continue to overpay their taxes, we are taking a look at the problems in the Tax Code, and we are looking at this great problem. Is it right for the American economy, for the Federal Government, to tax people because they get married? No, it is not right. We should not be doing this. It is a horrible disincentive built into our Tax Code that penalizes the greatest institution of our culture: marriage.

That is why it is important that we vote for this bill. That is why it is important that since we tried to pass this before and it was vetoed by the past President, we have an amazing opportunity, on a bipartisan basis, with Democrats and Republicans joining together, as have the authors of this bill, to pass this and tell the American people, you are no longer going to be penalized for getting married.

I urge a yes vote.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I support changing the tax laws so that people will not pay higher income taxes just because they are married. And I also support increasing the child credit, to assist families who are struggling to make better lives for their children.

So, reluctantly, I am voting to pass this bill.

I do so without illusions. I recognize that the bill is very far from perfect. I wish it were better. And it would have been better if a majority of our colleagues had joined me in voting for the Rangel substitute or for the motion to recommit. But that did not happen, and I am voting for the bill because the Republican leadership has made it clear that they will not allow the House to pass a better one.

As was made clear in the debate, the bill does far more than is needed to deal with the problem of the so-called "marriage penalty"—in fact, many of the married couples covered by the bill already pay lower income taxes than they would if they were single. But it does respond to the problem faced by those people who do pay a "marriage penalty." And, the bill does not do all that should be done regarding the child credit. For starters, it is slow, so that the full increase does not take effect until 2006. And, while it does allow the credit to offset the alternative minimum tax, it does not make the credit fully refundable. That is something that we should be doing—and something that I will work to achieve in the future. But, I have concluded that the bill is enough of an improvement on the current law that I can support it.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in joining me today in voting to eliminate the so-called marriage penalty that makes many couples pay more in taxes than they would if they were not married. I have been pushing for marriage tax relief since I was elected 2 years ago. In the last Congress, I was proud to be one of the Democrats to cross party lines and vote for this measure when it passed the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, the bill was vetoed by President Clinton and did not become law.

Today we have another chance to correct this inequity in our Tax Code. Since President Bush is likely to sign this bill, we can now solve this problem. All of us know the problem. Under present tax law, a couple may pay more taxes than they would as two single people because the rate brackets and standard deductions for joint filers are not twice as large as those for single filers. According to a study by the Treasury Department, about 48 percent of couples pay a marriage penalty.

When a couple chooses to get married, it's almost as if the tax collector is joining them at the altar as they take their vows. Couples I hear from in my central New Jersey congressional district tell me all the time: The marriage penalty is unfair, and it should be corrected. This bill gets the job done. H.R. 6 provides true tax relief to New Jersey families. It increases the child tax credit and fixes the "marriage penalty" by: increasing the standard deduction, expanding the 15 percent tax bracket, doubling the earned income tax credit for low-income families and adjusting the alternative minimum tax (AMT).

It's a good proposal that all of us should support. Before voting for H.R. 6, I will first vote for the substitute amendment by Representative RANGEL, the ranking Democrat on the Ways and Means Committee. The Rangel substitute not only eliminates the marriage penalty, it makes bigger and quicker tax cuts than H.R. 6. It cuts everybody's taxes by lowering the tax rate on the first \$20,000 of income (for a couple) from 15 percent to 12 percent. It expands the income eligible for the earned income tax credit (EITC) by \$800, increases by \$2,500 the income level at which the credit begins to phase out for a married couple with children, and simplifies the calculations to determine the earned income credit. It makes all of the tax cuts being considered by Congress more real for more people—especially in states with high income tax rates, like New Jersey—by adjusting the alternative minimum tax so it does not take away with one hand what these tax bills purport to

give with the other hand. The Rangel substitute makes more of these tax cuts take effect this year, to help people hurt by the slowing economy and to rebuild consumer and investor confidence. All in all, the Rangel substitute cuts taxes by \$585 billion over 10 years, compared to H.R. 6's \$399 billion.

Our tax code should not penalize marriage. We must come together in a bipartisan way to address this problem. I will continue to work in a bipartisan way to see that marriage tax relief becomes law.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, most of the talk on tax relief this year has focused on how cutting taxes would stimulate the economy . . . and that it would. But let's not lose focus of the other important issue here, the issue of tax fairness. The marriage tax, is most simply stated, unfair. A couple's wedding day should never be an excuse for the government to siphon off more money from taxpayers. Our tax laws should never discourage couples from marrying by making it financially undesirable.

H.R. 6 is a step in the right direction on the road to tax fairness. The bill corrects the glaring inequity in our tax code that discriminates against married couples. In my home State of West Virginia, over 137,000 married couples will no longer be burdened by the marriage tax. Now, 137,000 couples may not sound like a lot of people to my colleague from California or Texas or Florida; but in a state where the total population is 1.8 million, that's a lot of people who will now see meaningful tax relief.

Married life and raising children are never easy tasks. They require constant work, stewardship, compromise loyalty and responsibility. Today, Congress has an opportunity to make it a little bit easier on married couples and parents. Today, we have the opportunity to remove needless financial burdens, allowing Americans to focus more on where our country's future lies: in our homes, with our children. Let's do the common sense thing. Let's do the fair thing. Let's do the right thing and end this inequity and repeal the marriage tax penalty.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I must oppose H.R. 6, the Marriage Tax Elimination Act of 2001. The marriage penalty is an unfair burden on many working families and I strongly support legislation to eliminate it. However, the Republican bill that is on the House floor today costs far too much and does far too little for Wisconsin families.

Half of the relief from the legislation would benefit tax filers that currently pay no marriage penalty. Also concerning is that families that need relief the most . . . families making less than \$27,000 . . . would not benefit from the changes to the refundable child tax credit. The relief promised by the bill will not arrive for several years, providing no stimulus to the economy. Fully 70 percent of the bill would not take effect until after 2006. Finally, this bill will cost \$400 billion over the next 10 years. Combined with the tax cut passed in the House earlier this month, the total cost for these tax cuts is already at \$1.8 trillion, including interest. The overall size of these tax cuts jeopardizes the fiscal health of this nation.

I was absent from the House today due to a death in my family. However, had I been in Washington, I would have supported the Democratic substitute. I believe this substitute targets immediate tax relief to average working families and individuals in Wisconsin in a fiscally responsible way. This substitute would

create a 12 percent tax bracket for the first \$20,000 of taxable income for married couples and \$10,000 for single people. This bracket is phased in beginning in 2001 and is fully effective in 2003, offering immediate relief to those who need it most. Also, the substitute would increase the standard deduction for married couples filing jointly to twice the standard education for single filers. This provision would take effect beginning with the 2001 tax year. I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 6 and support responsible tax relief for working families provided in the Democratic substitute.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the hard-working families in my Congressional district to support H.R. 6, the Marriage Penalty and Tax Relief Act. I am here today to ask for fairness and common sense to protect families and secure our children's future.

The Marriage Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act of 2001 (H.R. 6) will provide roughly \$400 billion over 10 years in tax relief to families by increasing the child-care tax credit and fixing the marriage penalty tax. In addition, this legislation also increases the standard deduction, expands the 15 percent tax bracket, doubles the earned income tax credit for low-income families and adjusts the alternative minimum tax.

Twenty-five million couples pay the marriage tax penalty each year to the tune of \$1,400, including over 60,000 couples in my congressional district alone. It is unfair that married couples should shoulder this burden, simply because they chose to say "I do." This legislation is critical to simplifying the tax code more simple, and making it more fair.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 6 and finally ending the marriage tax penalty. I am also pleased that the House will continue its work on reviewing President Bush's tax plans when we consider the repeal of the estate tax in the coming week.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this important legislation to repeal the marriage penalty and provide greater relief through the child tax credit.

And, I want to thank my friend from Illinois, JERRY WELLER, for holding steadfast to this legislation, and Speaker HASTERT for standing firmly on the side of the American family by bringing this bill to the floor today.

As I travel around Florida's fourth district, I speak to a lot of couples who are concerned about how much they pay in taxes, in particular for the unfair marriage penalty. In fact, nearly 57,000 couples in my district pay an average of \$1,400 more per year than if they were filing their taxes as single people.

A lot of attention is paid to the young couples—just married and trying to start a family—and the hardship they suffer as a result of the marriage penalty. But, I met a wonderful couple in my district last year, a widow and widower, both in their sixties, that had made a conscious decision not to marry because they were very aware of the effect it would have on their limited retirement incomes. It's just commonsense to let these people marry without concern about how their wallets would be impacted.

These couples were so pleased when Congress passed relief for married couples. And, they were outraged when President Clinton vetoed this fair legislation. That's why I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 6, which will finally give these married couples

the relief they deserve. This bill not only puts married couples back on equal footing with single taxpayers by expanding the 15 percent tax bracket and doubling the standard deduction, but also doubles the child tax credit. The bill helps all families keep a little bit more of their hard-earned money in their households.

With passage of this legislation, the House is letting the average family of four keep \$1,600 to pay their own bills and debts, save for a rainy day, or send their kids to the little league, ballet lessons, and tutors that they want to be able to afford. It seems the least we can do to let these families keep the dollars they earn. They've done with a little less when dollars were short in their households, due in part to the fact that they overpaid in taxes to the government. It's time we put America's families first and pay back some of the money these families have overpaid to the government.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to dispel any notion that the tax bill before us here to help families. The total sum of the tax package is so large—\$2.5 trillion and counting—that it cuts into vital spending programs that benefit families across the Nation.

Today's bill is one more tax bill to make the American public believe that this Congress is going to right the wrongs of the Tax Code and spur the economy out of a recession, while simultaneously maintaining fiscal discipline and addressing the vital spending needs of our Nation. This tax bill is nothing more than an excuse for why Congress will be forced to privatize Social Security and Medicare when the baby boomers begin to retire; why we can't give a worthwhile Medicare prescription drug benefit to our seniors today; and why we need to cut vital child care programs.

The tax cut before us today clearly demonstrates a lack of commitment to our children when it forces cuts in other programs that directly help children. Republicans reduce funds for the Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG) by \$200 million in 2002 and freeze funds after 2002 in order to pay for their tax package. The child care provided through the CCDBG is a critical component to assist poor families' move from welfare to work. At the moment, the block grant only has enough money to serve 12 percent of the eligible children. We need more funding in this program, not less. As Secretary of HHS Tommy Thompson said, "welfare reform does not come cheap."

The Republicans let Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Supplemental Grants expire in 2001. Even worse, the Republican budget encourages States to divert the remaining Federal funds to pay for State income tax credits for charitable contributions. These funds would otherwise provide critical welfare-to-work services. The Democrats' tax package is moderate in cost, allowing an increase to at least \$2 billion in 2002 in title XX Social Services Block Grant Funding.

Families who earn less than \$27,000 will not see any of the benefit from the promised increase in the child tax credit. Furthermore, many families who earn more than \$27,000 may not see a benefit in the child tax credit. In fact, 31.2 million taxpayers (24 percent of taxpayers) will get no income tax cut from the GOP tax plan. The bill promises a \$1,000 family credit but nobody is honest enough to tell

the American people that many families won't see the child credit doubled because the child will be over 16 years old when the credit takes effect in 2006. Families with children over the age of 11 are being promised an additional \$500 but won't actually see it unless they have additional children.

Let's be honest about the bill before us—it will not affect the economy anytime soon. Most of the provisions in this bill don't take effect until 2006 and some don't take full effect until 2009. The U.S. economy is facing a recession today. That being the case, why are we offering tax breaks 5, and even 8 years from now? It's quite obvious. The GOP tax plan is too expensive to fit in today's budget. My Republican colleagues have been tasked with fitting a size 12 foot into a size 6 shoe.

This legislation is one of several that will be combined to create excessive tax cuts that will provide a disproportionate amount of benefits to the wealthiest in our society. Later today, the Ways and Means Committee will mark up a bill to repeal the estate tax that is clearly designed to help the most affluent few in the United States.

The Rangel substitute bill on the floor today is the responsible choice for family tax relief. The bill is honest, fair, fiscally responsible, and encourages economic prosperity. The Rangel substitute spends a fraction of the comprehensive Bush tax proposal, leaving room to pay down the debt and for other critical spending needs such as education and a Medicare prescription drug benefit. A lower national debt means lower interest costs leaving us in better fiscal shape to meet the demands of a retiring baby boom generation. The Rangel substitute benefits all families by giving all families a rate reduction; doubling the standard deduction for married couples to twice that of single individuals; adjusting and simplifying the earned income credit so lower-income families will see tax relief. Finally, the substitute fixes the alternative minimum tax (AMT) so when it appears that a family will receive tax relief, they won't be denied the relief due to the AMT.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the equitable and responsible Rangel substitute and oppose the "voodoo" economics tax plan before us. It didn't work in the 80's and it won't work in the new millennium.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to start by thanking Chairman THOMAS for moving the next installment of President Bush's tax relief plan so quickly.

Today, we are helping to fulfill a promise made to the American people and delivering \$400 billion in relief to families suffering the marriage penalty and families struggling to raise children.

We need to provide urgent relief to families suffering from the unfair marriage tax penalty.

About 25 million married couples currently pay an average of \$1,400 more in taxes than they would as single taxpayers. In my own congressional district alone, 80,000 married couples pay higher taxes simply because they are married. That is wrong.

Consider what \$1,400 a year would mean to a family struggling to make car or mortgage payments, to buy groceries and clothes for their kids, or to save for their child's college education. If opponents of this measure don't believe marriage penalty tax relief will make a real difference in the lives of real families, then frankly—they are severely out of touch.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support real relief for real families, right now. Sup-

port this important measure today and put money back in the pockets of American families.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6, the "Marriage Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act of 2001." With this important legislation today we are fulfilling our pledge to finally begin easing the tax burden on every American family. H.R. 6 will eliminate the marriage penalty and raise the child tax credit. This bill is an essential part of restoring fairness to our tax system and helping Idaho families.

Many married couples today have to pay a tax penalty of more than \$1,400 per year. For young people on limited incomes this is often an insurmountable barrier to marriage. The Marriage Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act will increase the deduction for a jointly filed return to twice the level of a single deduction. Millions of people who are considering marriage will no longer have to worry about paying the taxman on their wedding day.

This bill also reaffirms our commitment to families with children. We will double the child tax credit from \$500 to \$1,000. America's children deserve to have their parent's income spent on their welfare, not stolen by the government and grudgingly returned. This bill will give the families of more than 79,000 children in Idaho's first district the money they need to meet the rising costs of raising a family in this country.

The Marriage Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act is an important and needed first step. It will lift children out of poverty, encourage family formation, and stimulate our economy. I urge this house to send the surplus home to America's families, and pass H.R. 6.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 6, the Marriage Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act of 2001.

H.R. 6 will provide \$399 billion in tax relief over the next 10 years for almost 50 million American taxpayers and their families. First, H.R. 6 will increase the standard deduction and expand the lowest 15 percent income tax bracket for married couples who file a joint tax return, increasing the current basic deduction from \$7,350 to \$8,800. And for families, H.R. 6 increases the child tax credit from \$500 to \$600 this year and will increase it to \$1,000 over the next 5 years.

The Marriage Penalty Tax is inherently unfair. The Federal Government should not force working couples, through an unfair, archaic Tax Code, to pay higher taxes simply because they choose to be married. And worse yet, the Marriage Penalty Tax impacts the second wage earner in a family the hardest, which in most cases, is usually a woman. This flaw in our Tax Code is wrong. By passing H.R. 6, Congress will right this wrong, once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I want the 72,000 married couples in my District alone to know that they will no longer be forced to pay more taxes. I can think of no more unfair and ridiculous part of the current Tax Code than the marriage tax penalty.

And as I travel across New Jersey's 11th Congressional District, I am constantly reminded of the need for prompt tax relief. I hear it when I get my coffee and paper in the morning, at my local barbershop or at any one of my weekend town meetings or the pancake breakfasts I attend on Sunday mornings.

Mr. Speaker, not only do Americans want tax relief, our economy needs one. Congress

is off to a terrific start in providing the kind of tax relief that will help stimulate our economy. By passing H.R. 3, the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Act of 2001, on March 8, we acted to give Americans the first across-the-board income tax cut in two decades.

So today, I urge my colleagues to build on our ongoing efforts to provide tax relief for all hard working Americans. Let's pass Marriage Penalty Tax relief for the millions of working couples who should not be penalized by the IRS just because they are married. And let's strengthen our families by making sure that parents receive a break from the IRS to help care for their children. It's difficult to make ends meet, especially when working to feed, clothe and educate a young family—let's double the child credit from \$500 to \$1,000 per child and make it easier for parents to provide for their children.

Mr. Speaker, let's pass the Marriage Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act of 2001 and let's help strengthen both our families and our economy.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6 the Marriage Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act. I urge my colleagues to support this worthy, long overdue, legislation.

This bill provides approximately \$400 billion of tax relief to families. It doubles the highly successful child tax credit enacted in 1997 and applies that credit to the alternative minimum tax. Moreover, it also increases both the standard deduction and the 15 percent tax bracket for married couples to double that of single filers. Finally, it increases the income amount eligible for the earned income tax credit (EITC), making additional families eligible for this credit.

The 106th Congress visited this issue last year, and passed repeal legislation by wide margins. Regrettably, the then-President vetoed our legislation because he opposed expanding the 15 percent bracket. We now have an opportunity to correct this mistake, and help those couples with combined incomes of \$40,000–\$60,000, who by no means are wealthy.

The current Tax Code punishes married couples where both partners work by driving them into a higher tax bracket. The marriage penalty taxes the income of the second wage earner at a much higher rate than if they were taxed as an individual. Since this second earner is usually the wife, the marriage penalty is unfairly biased against female taxpayers.

Moreover, by prohibiting married couples from filing combined returns whereby each spouse is taxed using the same rate applicable to an unmarried individual, the Tax Code penalizes marriage and encourages couples to live together without any formal legal commitment to each other.

The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that 42 percent of married couples incurred a marriage penalty in 1996, and that more than 21 million couples paid an average of \$1,400 in additional taxes. The CBO further found that those most severely affected by the penalty were those couples with near equal salaries and those receiving the earned income tax credit.

This aspect of the Tax Code simply does not make sense. It discourages marriage, is unfair to female taxpayers, and disproportionately affects the working- and middle-class populations who are struggling to make ends

meet. For all of these reasons, it needs to be repealed.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of marriage penalty tax relief. I strongly believe that we should reduce the marriage tax penalty that couples incur and relieve millions of married couples from an unfair tax burden.

Reducing the marriage penalty is the right thing to do. It must be part of a tax plan, however, that is fair and fiscally responsible.

We must consider it as part of a responsible budget framework that would give priority to using the emerging budget surplus to address our existing obligations, such as investing in education and defense, providing a prescription drug benefit for seniors, shoring up Social Security and Medicare, and paying down the \$5.7 trillion national debt.

That is why I support the measure to eliminate the marriage tax penalty offered today by representative RANGEL. It would do a better job of fixing the marriage penalty and cost significantly less than H.R. 6.

H.R. 6, if passed, would bring the total cost of the Republican tax cut to \$1.4 trillion and even though the President claims to spend only \$1.6 trillion on tax cuts. The remaining Republican tax promises and the increased payment on the national debt could easily reach \$2.9 trillion.

More importantly, the surplus projections on which these tax cuts are based are already outdated given the recent slowdown in the economy. Furthermore, the tax cuts are so backloaded that families will not benefit, if at all, for at least 3 years. In fact, 74 percent of the tax relief wouldn't occur until 2007 or beyond under H.R. 6, and its based on projected budget surpluses that may not occur in that time.

The Republican numbers just don't add up, and the surplus estimates they are using are completely unreliable. There is no way the House Leadership can keep all of its remaining tax cut promises without putting the Social Security and Medicare trust funds at risk.

The bulk of the tax relief provided in the Republican bill is not marriage penalty relief, but instead, is a widening of tax brackets that benefit higher income individuals. In fact, half of the relief goes to those who do not pay any marriage penalty today; instead those couples receive a marriage "bonus."

Another concern of mine is that H.R. 6 discriminates against single taxpayers. It provides tax relief for those who choose to marry, but does nothing for those who are and remain single.

I find the Rangel substitute to be more responsible and fair. The substitute, like the bill, would reduce the marriage tax penalty by increasing the basic standard deduction for a married couple filling a joint income tax return to twice the basic standard for an unmarried individual.

The substitute would also reduce the marriage penalty by modifying the Tax Code in order to make more married couples eligible for the earned income tax credit (EITC). It would increase the income level at which the credit begins to phase out by \$2,500. A family with one child will get \$272 and a family with two or more children will get \$320 beginning in 2002.

H.R. 6 does not provide the same relief for those working families with children as the alternative does. I realize H.R. 6 proposes an

increase in the current \$500 per child tax credit to \$1,000 per child.

This credit, however, is only refundable for a family with three of more children. Therefore, a family who has two children and income less than \$27,000 would get no tax relief from the child credit at all.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to do what is right for the American people and support marriage tax penalty relief offered by Representative RANGEL. This substitute provides genuine relief for citizens who are truly penalized by the current tax structure. I know this kind of tax relief is supported by many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and I was sincerely looking forward to have the opportunity to vote today on a bipartisan tax relief bill. But given the backwarding of tax relief in H.R. 6 or the speculative notion of budget surpluses occurring 8, 9, or 10 years from now. I cannot in good conscience gamble with my two young boys' future and risk embarking on an economic course that could return us to the days of budget deficits.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill before us.

It is immoral to tax marriage, but that is what our current tax law does. Americans should not be forced to pay higher taxes just because they get married. For years the Republican lead Congress has struggled to repeal this immoral tax. Unfortunately, President Clinton would not allow us to repeal this tax. I am pleased that President Bush has proposed and pledged to sign into law, legislation to repeal this tax.

Some in Washington believe that the federal government is entitled to this money. I disagree. Every dollar that comes into Washington comes out of someone's pocket. This bill recognizes this and focuses on getting rid of this tax that unfairly penalizes one segment of the American people—those who get married. This bill will provide marriage tax relief to 53,000 couples in my Congressional District.

The bill before us also doubles the child tax credit to let parents keep more of what they earn. It is expensive raising children today. Unfortunately, the child deduction in the tax code has not kept pace with inflation. Today this deduction amounts to less than half of what it would be if it had kept pace with inflation since the 1950s. We begin to further address this erosion, by doubling the per child tax credit from \$500 to \$1,000. This will provide tax relief to the parents of 84,000 children in my Congressional District.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6, the Marriage Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act. I would also like to commend the excellent work of Ways and Means Chairman BILL THOMAS for reporting this important legislation.

The marriage penalty represents one of the more onerous aspects of our overly-complex tax code. It results in more than 21 million married couples incurring an average additional tax liability of \$1400, just for being married. In the 11th District of Virginia, which I represent, it affects over 66,000 couples. It is troublesome glitches such as this that confuse taxpayers—that make them question whether the federal government is really there to help them, or whether it merely exists to exert its power in capricious and arbitrary ways. Mr. Speaker, I ask you, if we cannot afford to fix problems such as this when we are enjoying surpluses, when can we do it? When can we

take the necessary steps to make our tax code fairer, to do away with the unintended consequences of past actions? I say that we can do it now.

H.R. 6 is a clear reflection of what our priorities should be. We should encourage couples however we can. We should send the message that staying at home to raise your children has real value. We should say that we realize staying married is not an easy task. There are pressures and difficulties which too frequently rend asunder what God has joined—and most often these pressures are financial. We should wisely use the power entrusted in us by the American people to reduce this financial strain that causes many families to break apart. We should use that power to give them more of their own money to help raise their children. Mr. Speaker, how do we have any hope of stemming the flow of divorce, broken homes, and childhood violence if we do not support marriage and strong families at every turn?

This bill will fix the marriage penalty. It will help more couples keep one spouse at home to help raise the children if they choose to do so. It will help with the expenses of raising a family by doubling the child tax credit to \$1000 per child. In the 11th District alone, that will help the parents of over 120,000 children buy clothes for school, buy the gasoline to get them there, pay the heating bill to keep them warm, and buy the food to make them strong. It will send a message to couples, young, and old, that we support them. Mr. Speaker, it is time to divorce ourselves from this unfair tax. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 6 and against an unfair tax.

The issue before us is the marriage penalty tax. But clearly the deeper issue here is fairness—and from whatever angle you view the marriage penalty tax it is unfair. It is unfair to impose different tax burdens on couples of equal income simply because one of those couples chose to get married and begin a life together.

Isn't it enough that we tax their wages, their automobile, their gasoline and nearly everything else they will purchase or acquire? Must we also ask couples to write a check simply because they say, "I do" to each other?

This tax is bad public policy and I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the bill that will once and for all eliminate the marriage penalty tax.

This bill not only benefits married couples; it benefits families with children as well. H.R. 6 doubles the child tax credit from \$500 to \$1,000 and expands the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), allowing families in Connecticut's Second District to keep more of their hard-earned income. That's more money for a mortgage payment, a new home computer, an electric bill or shoes and clothing.

When I came to Congress, I pledged to work toward the elimination of the marriage penalty tax. I made a promise. And I am proud to join my colleagues in keeping this promise and providing a long overdue element of fairness to the way that our nation taxes married families.

The institution of marriage represents important values to our culture. We need to support our values, not tax them. It's time to end this tax and support America's families.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this legislation.

I have consistently supported efforts to fix the marriage penalty, and I support increasing the size of the child tax credit as well. In the past, I have cosponsored legislation to fix the marriage penalty, and I voted in favor of the 1997 legislation which created the child tax credit. But I cannot support this legislation today.

The concerns that I have about this legislation are threefold.

First, I am disturbed that a bill that will cost \$400 billion over ten years does little or nothing—especially in the short term—to help many low- and moderate-income couples. While the bill would provide partial refundability for the child tax credit—promising aid to lower-income families—the provision's interaction with the earned income tax credit would provide no benefit to families with, for example, two children until their income exceeds \$27,000. And while the bill would provide marriage penalty relief to families that don't itemize their deductions—predominantly low- and moderate-income families—that provision doesn't take effect until 2004 and is not fully phased in until 2009.

Second, I am concerned that this bill is only one part of a series of tax cuts that, when taken as a whole, will seriously reduce the federal government's ability to carry out its existing obligations and address the pressing problems that confront our country—obligations like keeping Social Security and Medicare solvent and problems like improving education, providing affordable health insurance for the uninsured, and ensuring that prescription drug prices are affordable for all Americans. I consider the piecemeal consideration of this series of tax cuts to be a disingenuous attempt to conceal the true size of the total package—and to hide the important trade-off implicit in enacting the President's package of tax cuts and addressing other federal priorities like improving education, ensuring all Americans' access to affordable health care, and caring for our senior citizens. Moreover, the fact that so many of these tax cuts are phased in over the next 10 years tends to conceal their true cost—which will only be evident ten years from now. At that point, the government is projected—even under the most optimistic estimates—to begin running deficits again. And lest anyone paint those deficits as the result of an irresponsible, freespending Congress, I should note that those deficits will be produced almost exclusively by a doubling in Social Security and Medicare caseloads. I believe we should use most of any anticipated surpluses to prepare for that imminent challenge.

Finally, I am puzzled by the President's characterization of his \$1.6 trillion package of tax cuts as essential for jump-starting the slowing national economy. Most of the \$1.35 trillion in tax relief considered so far would not be phased in until after 2006. The tax relief provided by this bill in 2001 is miniscule. I don't consider that timely intervention in terms of getting the economy back on track this year.

Consequently, I must oppose this legislation, and I will support a smaller, more responsible package of tax cuts that provide more of their tax relief to low- and moderate-income families. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, ever since coming here to Congress, enacting common-sense tax relief for the people I represent

back in Oregon has been one of my biggest priorities. So, it should hardly be surprising that I am going to vote for H.R. 6 today—just as I voted for it last year—and just as I'll continue to vote for any bill that effectively ends the marriage penalty.

The sole purpose of this bill is to ease the federal income tax burden on married couples and low-income families with children. By easing this burden, we're making sure that families will have more money to save up for a mortgage down payment or additional income to set aside for college expenses.

I do want to talk about a troubling aspect of our tax code that is going to have to be addressed sooner rather than later, and that's reforming the alternative minimum tax, or AMT. Originally adopted in 1969 to ensure the wealthy pay their fair share of taxes, the AMT hasn't been indexed for inflation since the early 1990s. And as incomes and deductions have risen in recent years, middle class families are more often than not receiving a love letter from the IRS after they've filed their returns notifying them that they owe the AMT.

Now H.R. 6 does include some AMT relief—specifically, it wouldn't cancel out the gains of the bill for married couples. But the problem is that the minimum tax requires a different set of calculations and disallows many deductions—including deductions for state and local taxes paid. For Oregonians, who pay some of the highest income taxes in the nation, that means that more and more families over the next decade are going to receive a notice from the IRS saying that they own money—and not receive much of the relief we're promising to give them right now.

That's a big problem for me, and it's going to be a big problem for tens of millions of middle class Americans. For example, as of 2006, a family of four in Oregon with a combined income of \$72,747 will be liable for the AMT—while the same size family in Texas, which has no income tax, will only be liable if their income exceeds \$146,307.

So while I am in favor of reforming the marriage penalty here today, I strongly urge my colleagues to keep the AMT in mind when or if we conference this legislation with the Senate. I understand the Senate Finance Committee chairman has indicated that he intends to include comprehensive AMT adjustments in the tax reform legislation his Committee will write. We can work together to ensure our tax code is a fair one.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today to express his support for H.R. 6, the Marriage Tax Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act, of which this Member is once again an original cosponsor. This bill will have a positive effect, in particular, on middle- and lower-income married couples as H.R. 6 not only provides tax relief to married couples, but also expands the per-child tax credit.

This Member would like to thank both the main sponsor of the marriage tax penalty relief portions of H.R. 6, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER] and the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] for their instrumental role in bringing H.R. 6 to the House Floor. This Member appreciates the efforts of these distinguished colleagues as this Member has been an enthusiastic and active proponent of reducing and eliminating the marriage tax penalty as soon as possible.

While there are many reasons to support the marriage tax penalty relief provisions of H.R. 6, this Member will specifically address the following two reasons.

First, H.R. 6 takes a significant step toward eliminating the current marriage penalty in the Internal Revenue Code, as H.R. 6 would double the standard deduction, expand the 15 percent bracket so that it is equal to twice that of singles and at the same time this bill would hold down costs by phasing in that change between 2004 and 2009, and provide relief from the alternative minimum tax so that a married couple who gets the tax cut would not be hit subsequently with a tax increase.

Second, H.R. 6 takes a step toward reaching the overall goal that the Federal income tax code should be marriage neutral. Currently, many married couples pay more Federal income tax than they would as two unmarried singles. Generally, the more evenly divided the earned income of the two spouses, the more likely they are to have a structural marriage tax penalty. Hence, married couples where each spouse earns approximately 50% of the total earned income have the largest marriage tax penalties. However, the Internal Revenue Code should not be a consideration when individuals discuss their future marital status. The goal for marriage penalty tax relief is that the individual income tax should not influence the choice of individuals with regard to their marital status—that is a guiding principle for this Member in voting for marriage tax penalty relief.

Additionally, and quite importantly, H.R. 6 provides additional family tax relief by expanding the per-child tax credit. Specifically, H.R. 6 would gradually double the child tax credit to \$1,000 per child under age 17 by 2006. The tax credit would be raised from \$500 to \$600 effective this year, which would give families a quick tax break in the current 2001 tax year (i.e., retroactive increase to January 1, 2001). Also, H.R. 6 would retain the current income eligibility limits for the child tax credit. This Member supports the expansion of the child tax credit to give more relief to lower-income couples and to those couples with a stay-at-home spouse. Finally, as in current law, the measure would continue to allow the child tax credit to be refundable to families with three or more children that receive the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC).

Therefore, for these reasons, and many others, this Member urges his colleagues to support the Marriage Tax Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, every year more than 58,000 couples in Michigan's eighth district pay the federal government's penalty for saying "I do." Until we remove this tax on marriage, families across Michigan and the country will continue to pay more in taxes than they should. The elimination of the marriage penalty will allow hard-working families to keep more of their own money to provide for their needs.

The average penalty paid by Michigan families is \$1,400 every year. This is real money that can make a real difference in the lives of working, two-income families. Let me share with you a few examples of what \$1,400 means to families in Michigan.

Seventeen hours of college credit at Lansing Community College; nearly 10 months of electrical utility bills; 100 packages of size 2 Huggies Diapers; 3 months of child care; a well-deserved family summer vacation.

Today's vote reduces the burden on two-income families and is an important step toward our goal of removing all tax penalties on marriage and the family found in the federal tax code. I strongly support the efforts to remove this penalty and urge adoption of the Marriage Penalty and Tax Relief Act.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today, Congress debated further tax cuts under the guise of fixing the so-called "marriage penalty." Ultimately, like yesterday's discussions about the budget, today's debate is about priorities: more tax benefits for those who need help the least, versus tax relief for all working Americans and fixing serious flaws in our tax system.

Only a small portion of the legislation proposed today would go to taxpayers that actually pay the "marriage penalty."

It does not address the growing problem posed by the alternative minimum tax (AMT). The AMT was passed to ensure the wealthy did not avoid paying their fair share of taxes. According to the Wall Street Journal, if the Bush proposal is fully implemented, an Oregon family of four with an income of \$72,747 will be forced into the AMT. I assure you that such a family is not wealthy. If we are to ensure that all Americans are able to enjoy tax relief, no matter what bill we pass, Congress must address the alternative minimum tax.

The Republican proposal puts the financial health of our country at-risk. Passing tax cuts based on dubious surplus estimates, threatening the strong fiscal health of our country by sending us back into the era of big deficits.

The Democratic alternative fixes the "marriage penalty" and provides immediate rate reductions in order to stimulate our economy. It also addresses the AMT. The cost of the Democratic proposal is consistent with our goals of protecting the nation's fiscal health. Additionally, the Democratic alternative provides relief to low income families whose tax problem is the payroll tax. I support this alternative.

I remain convinced that Congress can work together to pass reasonable tax reform without putting our fiscal health at risk. Hopefully the American public will be heard during the next phase of the legislative process.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation designed to bring fairness to the tax code by removing the penalty many married couples now face when paying Federal income tax. Correcting the marriage penalty is a commonsense answer to a quirk in the tax code that costs American families an average of \$1,100 a year in additional Federal tax. As one part of a larger tax cut proposal, I believe that eliminating the marriage penalty is perhaps the single most effective way that Congress can provide balanced and fair relief.

As an original cosponsor of this bill, I have met with many married couples throughout my district who do not understand why their tax burden is higher simply because they file jointly. By passing this bill, Congress will remove the inequity faced by many of these families and provide real tax relief to thousands of people throughout east Texas.

Our efforts to provide tax relief also reflect the values of our fellow citizens. At the very least, Congress must be neutral in our treatment of the institution of marriage and remove any obstacles that discourage marriage. Congress regularly uses legislation to discourage

one kind of behavior and encourage another, all the while being careful to balance the interests of our divergent country. By passing a law that will end the practice of penalizing marriage, Congress is making a sound decision that will produce incalculable benefits.

Today, along with eliminating the marriage penalty, Congress is considering a provision to double the child tax credit from \$500 to \$1,000 for each child under the age of 17. Mr. Speaker, the original law providing for this credit was one of the first votes I made as a Member of this body—it is also one of my proudest. By doubling the child credit, Congress is building on the sound economic policy of the previous administration. Along with the earned income tax credit (EITC), the child tax credit is one of the best tools working families have to lower their tax burden. Designed for working and middle class families, the child credit is the counterpoint in our efforts to eliminate the marriage penalty.

I do have only one disagreement with today's effort to double the child tax credit—it is not phased-in fast enough. Although the credit will double, the phase-in is over too long a period—5 years. I believe the phase-in should be faster, particularly given indications that our economy is slowing. Enacting this provision over the next 2 years, rather than the proposed 5-year phase-in, would provide a quicker stimulus and greater infusion of tax dollars back in the pockets of taxpayers. Therefore, I also support legislation that would instruct Congress to provide more of the proposed tax benefits during this fiscal year. I support long-term tax relief, but it is a mistake for Congress to pass only long-term tax measures when the need for economic stimulus is urgent. Congress will have the opportunity to address this concern throughout the tax writing process, and I sincerely hope, that as with today's debate, a bipartisan agreement can be reached to provide substantial tax relief this year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). All time for general debate has expired.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE
OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute
offered by Mr. RANGEL:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Tax Reduction Act of 2001".

(b) **AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.**—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) **SECTION 15 NOT TO APPLY.**—No amendment made by this Act shall be treated as a change in a rate of tax for purposes of section 15 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

TITLE I—INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATE REDUCTIONS; EXPANSION OF EARNED INCOME CREDIT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 101. INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATE REDUCTIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) 12 PERCENT RATE BRACKET.—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000—

“(A) the rate of tax under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) on taxable income not over the initial bracket amount shall be 12 percent, and

“(B) the 15 percent rate of tax shall apply only to taxable income over the initial bracket amount.

“(2) **INITIAL BRACKET AMOUNT.**—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the initial bracket amount is—

“(i) \$20,000 in the case of subsection (a),

“(ii) 80 percent of the dollar amount in clause (i) in the case of subsection (b), and

“(iii) 50 percent of the dollar amount in clause (i) in the case of subsections (c) and (d).

“(B) **PHASEIN.**—The initial bracket amount is—

“(i) $\frac{1}{4}$ the amount otherwise applicable under subparagraph (A) in the case of taxable years beginning during 2001, and

“(ii) $\frac{1}{2}$ such amount otherwise applicable under subparagraph (A) in the case of taxable years beginning during 2002.

“(3) **INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of any taxable year beginning in a calendar year after 2003, the \$20,000 amount under paragraph (2)(A)(i) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under subsection (f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2002' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(B) **ROUNDING RULES.**—If any amount after adjustment under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of \$50, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of \$50.

“(4) **ADJUSTMENT OF TABLES.**—The Secretary shall adjust the tables prescribed under subsection (f) carry out this subsection.”

(b) **ADJUSTMENT IN COMPUTATION OF ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.**—Paragraph (2) of section 55(a) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) the sum of—

“(A) the regular tax for the taxable year, plus

“(B) in the case of an individual, 3 percent of so much of the individual's taxable income for the taxable year as is taxed at 12 percent.”

(c) **REPEAL OF REDUCTION OF REFUNDABLE TAX CREDITS.**—

(1) Subsection (d) of section 24 is amended by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(2) Section 32 is amended by striking subsection (h).

(d) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Subclause (II) of section 1(g)(7)(B)(ii) is amended by striking "15 percent" and inserting "12 percent".

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

(f) **PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE.**—The amounts transferred to any trust fund under the Social Security Act shall be determined as if this Act had not been enacted.

SEC. 102. MODIFICATIONS TO EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT.

(a) INCREASES IN PERCENTAGES AND AMOUNTS USED TO DETERMINE CREDIT; MARRIAGE PENALTY RELIEF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 32 is amended to read as follows:

“(b) PERCENTAGES AND AMOUNTS.—

“(1) PERCENTAGES.—The credit percentage, the initial phaseout percentage, and the final phaseout percentage shall be determined as follows:

“In the case of an eligible individual with:	The credit percentage is:	The initial phaseout percentage is:	The final phaseout percentage is:
1 qualifying child	34	15.98	18.98
2 or more qualifying children ..	40	21.06	24.06
No qualifying children	7.65	7.65	7.65.

“(2) AMOUNTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The earned income amount and the initial phaseout amount shall be determined as follows:

“In the case of an eligible individual with:	The earned income amount is:	The initial phaseout amount is:
1 qualifying child	\$8,140	\$13,470
2 or more qualifying children	\$10,820	\$13,470
No qualifying children	\$4,900	\$6,130.

In the case of a joint return where there is at least 1 qualifying child, the initial phaseout amount shall be \$2,500 greater than the amount otherwise applicable under the preceding sentence.

“(B) FINAL PHASEOUT AMOUNT.—The final phaseout amount is \$26,000 (\$28,500 in the case of a joint return).”

(2) MODIFICATION OF COMPUTATION OF PHASEOUT.—Paragraph (2) of section 32(a) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) PHASEOUT OF CREDIT.—The amount of the credit allowable to a taxpayer under paragraph (1) for any taxable year shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the sum of—

“(A) the initial phaseout percentage of so much of the total income (or, if greater, the earned income) of the taxpayer for the taxable year as exceeds the initial phaseout amount but does not exceed the final phaseout amount, plus

“(B) the final phaseout percentage of so much of the total income (or, if greater, the earned income) of the taxpayer for the taxable year as exceeds the final phaseout amount.”

(3) TOTAL INCOME.—Paragraph (5) of section 32(c) is amended to read as follows:

“(5) TOTAL INCOME.—The term ‘total income’ means adjusted gross income determined without regard to—

“(A) the deductions referred to in paragraphs (6), (7), (9), (10), (15), (16), and (17) of section 62(a),

“(B) the deduction allowed by section 162(l), and

“(C) the deduction allowed by section 164(f).”

(4) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Subsection (j) of section 32 is amended to read as follows:

“(j) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 2002, each of the dollar amounts in subsection (b)(2) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3), for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2001’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(2) ROUNDING.—If any dollar amount, after being increased under paragraph (1), is not a multiple of \$10, such dollar amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$10.”

(B) Subparagraph (C) of section 32(c)(1) is amended by striking “modified adjusted gross income” and inserting “total income”.

(C) Paragraph (2) of section 32(f) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR TABLES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The provisions of subsection (a)(1) and the provisions of subsection (a)(2) shall be reflected in separate tables prescribed under paragraph (1).

“(B) SUBSECTION (a)(1) TABLE.—The tables prescribed under paragraph (1) to reflect the provisions of subsection (a)(1) shall have income brackets of not greater than \$50 each for earned income between \$0 and the earned income amount.

“(C) SUBSECTION (a)(2) TABLE.—The tables prescribed under paragraph (1) to reflect the provisions of subsection (a)(2) shall have income brackets of not greater than \$50 each for total income (or, if greater, the earned income) above the initial phaseout threshold.”

(b) REPEAL OF DENIAL OF CREDIT WHERE INVESTMENT INCOME.—Section 32 is amended by striking subsection (i).

(c) EARNED INCOME TO INCLUDE ONLY AMOUNTS INCLUDIBLE IN GROSS INCOME.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 32(c)(2)(A)(i) (defining earned income) is amended by inserting “, but only if such amounts are includible in gross income for the taxable year” after “other employee compensation”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 32(c)(2)(B) is amended by striking “and” at the end of clause (iv), by striking the period at the end of clause (v) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(vi) the requirement under subparagraph (A)(i) that an amount be includible in gross income shall not apply if such amount is exempt from tax under section 7873 or is derived directly from restricted and allotted land under the Act of February 8, 1887 (commonly known as the Indian General Allotment Act) (25 U.S.C. 331 et seq.) or from land held under Acts or treaties containing an exception provision similar to the Indian General Allotment Act.”

(d) MODIFICATION OF JOINT RETURN REQUIREMENT.—Subsection (d) of section 32 is amended to read as follows:

“(d) MARRIED INDIVIDUALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the taxpayer is married at the close of the taxable year, the credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) only if the taxpayer and his spouse file a joint return for the taxable year.

“(2) MARITAL STATUS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), an individual legally separated from his spouse under a decree of divorce or of separate maintenance shall not be considered as married.

“(3) CERTAIN MARRIED INDIVIDUALS LIVING APART.—For purposes of paragraph (1), if—

“(A) an individual—

“(i) is married and files a separate return, and

“(ii) has a qualifying child who is a son, daughter, stepson, or stepdaughter of such individual, and

“(B) during the last 6 months of such taxable year, such individual and such individual’s spouse do not have the same principal place of abode,

such individual shall not be considered as married.”

(e) EXPANSION OF MATHEMATICAL ERROR AUTHORITY.—Paragraph (2) of section 6213(g) is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (K), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (L) and inserting “, and”, and by inserting after subparagraph (L) the following new subparagraph:

“(M) the entry on the return claiming the credit under section 32 with respect to a child if, according to the Federal Case Registry of Child Support Orders established under section 453(h) of the Social Security

Act, the taxpayer is a noncustodial parent of such child.”

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

TITLE II—MARRIAGE PENALTY RELIEF

SEC. 201. MARRIAGE PENALTY RELIEF.

(a) STANDARD DEDUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 63(c) (relating to standard deduction) is amended—

(A) by striking “\$5,000” in subparagraph (A) and inserting “twice the dollar amount in effect under subparagraph (C) for the taxable year”;

(B) by adding “or” at the end of subparagraph (B),

(C) by striking “in the case of” and all that follows in subparagraph (C) and inserting “in any other case.”; and

(D) by striking subparagraph (D).

(2) INCREASE ALLOWED AS DEDUCTION IN DETERMINING MINIMUM TAX.—Subparagraph (E) of section 56(b)(1) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The preceding sentence shall not apply to so much of the standard deduction under subparagraph (A) of section 63(c)(2) as exceeds the amount which would be such deduction but for the amendment made by section 201(a)(1) of the Tax Reduction Act of 2001.”

(3) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Subparagraph (B) of section 1(f)(6) is amended by striking “(other than with” and all that follows through “shall be applied” and inserting “(other than with respect to sections 63(c)(4) and 151(d)(4)(A)) shall be applied”.

(B) Paragraph (4) of section 63(c) is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

“The preceding sentence shall not apply to the amount referred to in paragraph (2)(A).”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 104, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious time in our Nation’s economic history, because for the first time in many, many years, we expect to have a surplus; but we do not know the exact amount that surplus is going to be. Unfortunately, the Republicans have decided that they are going to have tax reductions in the budget based on the fact they expect \$5.6 trillion. We all know from the Congressional Budget Office that these figures that we are relying on, 50 percent of the time they are wrong, and the question is, what happens if they are wrong this time? We hope that they will not be.

It seems as though, if this tax cut is locked into place and the surplus is not there, then the funds will not be there for Social Security, for Medicare, for prescription drugs relief, for education where the President wants to leave no child behind; and we were hoping that if we could find some kind of a trigger mechanism or some way to have a tax cut that we know that we can afford this year, or maybe for the next 5 years

and then after that, take a look and see where we are in terms of our economy, where are we in terms of the programs, then not just Democrats, but even this compassionate Republican President would want to see supported.

□ 1230

So it just seems to me that if we are concerned about education and making certain our kids are going to be productive, concerned about our old folks getting decent health care, concerned about our men and women in the military, improving the quality of their lives, the question has to be: Where will the money come from?

Of course, if we find out that we do not have the funds, there are only two things that we can do: ask for another substantial tax increase, or cut out the programs, the funding for the programs.

We do know that there are many people on the other side of the aisle that believe the Social Security System never should have been created, that Medicare is not working, that the best that we should do for education is to give them a voucher.

We know that health care to some people, they believe that there should not be a Patients' Bill of Rights. But by the same token, most Americans disagree with that theory, and we should not use reduction of taxes and an increase in spending for defense as an excuse to wipe out domestic spending.

So, Mr. Speaker, it might be that the best thing that we should be thinking about doing is instructing the Congress or the conferees to recommit this bill, and to have them come back to see whether we can do something right now to spur the economy; whether we can get \$60 billion out there in the taxpayers' hands; whether we can really stimulate the economy now, instead of just letting the rich get richer 5 years from now.

We know that this tax cut has nothing to do with the stimulation of the economy, because the President thought about it in the good years. Mr. Clinton and Mr. Gore had a great economy going. Now that we are bad-mouthing the economy, now that it is sputtering, now that it is looking like it needs a shot in the arm, maybe what we ought to do, not as Republicans and as Democrats, but as Members of the House of Representatives, is to set aside this bill and tell the conferees, let us get something out to the taxpayers this year. Let us get it to the hard-working low-income people, the moderate-income people, and make certain that there is a vehicle out there that we can use.

I am certain that staff will have prepared at the end of this debate a vehicle that we can join together and use to get that money out there, stimulate the economy now, and then we can take a deep breath and take a look and see what an equitable tax cut might be.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Does the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) seek the time in opposition?

Mr. THOMAS. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I am just a little confused. My understanding is that the substitute that has been offered to this particular bill, H.R. 6, is identical to the substitute that was offered to the bill on marginal rate reductions, H.R. 3, just a short time ago.

But in listening carefully to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and his arguments, it sounded to me as if he really wanted a tax package; not the one offered as a substitute, but one that was, in fact, a stimulus for the economy.

It seems to me that if he would turn into paper the words that he offered, he would not have presented exactly the same substitute that had been presented 1½ weeks and 2 weeks ago; that, in fact, if he does want something that he professes, all he needs to do is offer a substitute that, in fact, does that.

At some point we begin to wonder whether that argument is rhetoric, just as the Lexus muffler is no longer in front of us. It seems as though it is an argument of the day, but we would think that if it is the argument of the day, they would offer a substitute to the motion in front of us that at least conformed to the argument of the day. But, in fact, we have in front of us that same old substitute, that same old substitute that is less generous.

The Democrats have talked about the various pieces that we have been passing. In fact, if we add them up, it is pretty obvious that the tax package that is contained in the budget that was passed yesterday is clearly more generous than what the Democrats are offering. In fact, in this substitute there really is not even any child credit, which is a major portion of the bill we are discussing and supports the President's proposal of doubling it from \$500 to \$1,000. And we make retroactive in this bill the first \$100 increase, from \$500 to \$600, to occur in this year, the 2001 tax year.

Some of our friends on the other side are continuing to argue that we do not have a budget in place. We, in fact, passed a budget. All the pieces fit. That argument is no longer relevant, unless, of course, they want to argue that it is not a budget yet until the House and Senate sit down and agree. Then Members may want to move to the argument that the ink on the paper of the agreement is not yet dry. Then they may want to offer another argument.

The fact of the matter is they will offer argument after argument. That budget that was passed yesterday addresses the President's concerns about Social Security, talks about modern-

izing Medicare, provides dollars for modernizing Medicare with prescription drugs. And, please, President Bush has already established himself as the education President. His bold and far-reaching proposals of placing more dollars in the hands of teachers and parents to make sure that no child will be left behind clearly indicates that education is on the front burner of this Presidency.

So I guess if we are going to argue against what is offered here today, a final adjustment on the marriage penalty contained in the Tax Code and a doubling of the credit available to hard-working taxpayers with children, that at the very least, if we are going to make arguments against the bill and offer substitutes, what we ought to do is have the arguments and the substitutes match.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman has talked quite a bit about details and very little about how this all would fit together. The main reason is this: The \$1.6 trillion Bush administration tax package was a risky proposition in the first place, that including debt service was going to use up 75 percent, 75 percent of the non-Social Security and Medicare surplus.

Now, with the dip in the stock market, that proposal becomes even more risky. So the decision seemed clever at first to break it up into pieces, but the public can add. When we add it all together, it is a very, very risky proposition. It is not fiscally responsible.

Now we have a second piece in front of us today, the marriage penalty provision, plus. It is much larger than Mr. Bush proposed before he became President. Half of the so-called marriage penalty provision goes to people who do not have a marriage penalty provision in their income tax returns.

Why are we doing this? I do not know. Maybe we have kind of a Pied Piper syndrome here. I am not sure who always is calling the tune, but I think if it succeeds, it would lead those following it over the cliff. The trouble is it would lead this Nation's economy over the cliff.

There has been some talk about bipartisanship. Whatever the vote is on this or any other piece, when we put them all together, there is not bipartisan support. The bipartisan support is almost zero. Indeed, it is a partisan effort.

There has been some reference to stimulus. We are going to have a stimulus provision on the motion to recommit. What is the impact of this majority proposal here this year? It is an asterisk, which means close to zero. Talk

about a stimulus, there is not any real stimulus. If there is any tax proposal that can stimulate the Nation's economy, this is not it, nor is it the entire package.

So in a word, I suggest this: Add it all together, I say to the citizens of this country, and when we do, we will come to the conclusion that this proposal is one that puts the Nation's economy at risk.

We fought hard for a decade for fiscal discipline. It led to lower interest rates. Let us not put that in jeopardy. Vote yes on the substitute and no on the basic bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), and I ask unanimous consent that he control the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, of course I would note that this bipartisan bill, combined with the rate reduction that we already passed out of this House of Representatives, put almost \$600 in the pockets of the average family of four this year, if we include the child tax credit, which is retroactive, plus the rate reduction.

This is a bipartisan bill. My good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), has been a partner in this effort to eliminate the tax penalty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, for yielding time to me, and I rise in support of the bipartisan bill, the underlying bill reported out by the committee.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I believe very strongly that an increased tax should not be Uncle Sam's wedding present to a newly married couple. We need to value the institution of marriage. We need to value the children. We need to recognize that doubling the tax credit for children in this country really also is sensitive to the fact of how difficult it is today in America to raise our children and to get them to schools and in braces, to make sure that we afford to raise them the proper way.

This is a value that I voted for when the Democratic President vetoed it, and I will vote for it again today. I will vote for it as the father of four children. I will vote for it because, from my farmers' market to my supermarkets, this is one of the most important tax breaks that my constituents in Indiana talk to me about all the time, the marriage penalty and helping with the tax credit to raise their children.

This bill is not perfect. It needs reform. It needs refinement. It needs

modification. It needs all of this because it is higher than even what President Bush has proposed. I have said that reducing the national debt is important. I do not think we can dig a big hole and get back into the fiscally irresponsible days that we had 5 and 6 years ago there.

Excuse the pun, but we should also marry this bill up to estate tax reform; not straight-out repeal, but reform of the estate taxes. We should also help with an AMT fix, with the marriage penalty and child tax credits, which all together would not threaten our economy, which would help us pull down the debt. That would fit in about a \$1 trillion tax cut.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and for his leadership in putting forth a very responsible Democratic alternative this morning.

Mr. Speaker, certainly Democrats strongly support marriage penalty relief and tax benefits for families with children, but that relief should be provided within the context of an overall tax plan that is fiscally responsible and is fair.

The Democratic alternative increases the standard deduction for married couples to twice the amount for single people. It also substantially increases the earned income tax credit for married couples, and lowers the 15 percent tax bracket to 12 percent for a married couple's first \$20,000 of taxable income. This helps everyone, everyone. It is fair, and it is balanced.

The Republican plan, however, uses the need for marriage penalty tax relief as an excuse, as an excuse to expand the 15 percent bracket and cut taxes for married couples in the 28 percent bracket. As a result, 80 percent of the marriage penalty relief in this bill goes to one-third of the wealthiest married couples.

If we want to change the tax rates, then we should face that issue head on and have an honest debate about that. If we are here to address the issue of concern raised by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana about the need for eliminating the marriage penalty, then we should do that, and the Democratic alternative does just precisely that.

How much is enough? When will President Bush and the Republican leadership stop asking American families who are most in need to sacrifice in order to provide a tax cut at the highest end?

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. We are debating yet another tax bill proposed by the Republicans that is seriously flawed.

The Republican proposal provides the most benefits to those who need them least. It gives short shrift to those who need relief the most. And as predicted,

the Republican leadership is attempting to go well beyond the already huge tax cut proposed by President Bush with more tax cuts on the way.

Again, Democrats strongly support marriage tax penalty relief and tax benefits for families with children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would note to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), my good friend, who spoke on behalf of the partisan Democratic alternative, that by voting for the partisan Democratic alternative against the bipartisan H.R. 6 that she would vote to deny 54,000 kids in the eighth district in California increased child tax credit relief.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), a leader on behalf of families.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. What this bill does very clearly, first, is double the child tax credit from \$500 to \$1,000, increases standard deductions for married folks, joint filers, twice that of single filers; expands the 15 percent tax bracket for married joint filers to twice that of single filers; and increases the earned income tax credit; protects child tax credit from the alternative minimum tax.

What is this bill really about? I say it is truly about family values. I know that expression has been abused over the years, but it is about the value of the institution of marriage; something that transcends faith and transcends culture.

We are saying let us not tax that institution because there are enough pressures on that institution already. Let us make it fair. Let us give them the opportunities.

One of the leading causes of a breakdown of the family is financial pressure, and we want to relieve that. That is what this bill does.

We had from the far left a welfare system that did not recognize the value of the family and said, Dad, you are not welcome here.

We truly need to recognize the value of the institution of marriage. Because why? It is about children. It is about their future, making sure that we can do everything to recognize the importance of its institution and its impact on children. That is the reason I recommend that you oppose this partisan bill and support the bipartisan bill H.R. 6.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for his leadership. I thank the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the debate is so limited that we are not able to express our concerns for the American people in longer debate. Today I will announce that I am going to vote for a marriage penalty tax relief.

Frankly, the kind of relief that if Americans were given the information that the media holds back from you, you would understand that we are trying to work in a manner that responds to the needs of working families.

In fact, I am also supportive of a \$60 billion tax cut right now, this year, that keeps us in line with the fact that we cannot guarantee that we will have a \$5 trillion surplus over the next 10 years.

I want you to have tax relief now, and so what we are supporting is to ensure that in my State of Texas, if you will, that we will not have 769,000 numbers of families with children who will get no tax cut.

Unlike the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), my good friend, he is voting for a tax cut where 362,000 of his constituents in Illinois will not get a tax cut.

We want a marriage penalty that responds to the needs of the American people. One that creates a 12 percent rate bracket for the first 20,000 of taxable income, equivalent to 41,000 of total income for a couple with two children.

We want to simplify the earned income tax credit and increase it for working families. We want the dollars to go in your pocket, unlike the \$128 billion tax cut that I am told we received in the State of Texas 2 years ago.

When I go throughout any district and I ask my constituents, did they receive a tax cut, did they get a refund, no one can document receiving any fungible dollars that they could utilize to support their family. Some people say that they thought they got a tax credit on their property taxes, which really does not show up.

So what the Democrats are saying with the alternative is it could actually get reported in the newspapers today SHEILA JACKSON-LEE will vote for a marriage penalty tax relief bill. I believe in this bill because it is fiscally responsible, and it answers the concerns of the American people and working families.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, just in quick response to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), my good friend, I would say that not only will the bipartisan bill which she spoke against provide 5 million low-income working Americans receiving the earned income tax credit, significantly more relief, in fact, \$400 a year, but that the proposal which the gentlewoman is in support of, the partisan Democratic substitute, that proposal would actually deny tax relief to millions of children throughout America, including her own district.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, for his leadership on this issue.

I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 6. As the cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, I begin by saying that I am not opposed to providing true marriage penalty relief for all Americans. I support responsible tax cuts for all taxpayers.

As the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and many of my Democratic colleagues of mine who have stated so forcefully today, the Democratic alternative is the only bill on the floor that provides true relief. Americans need a tax cut, and I am in favor of that. But we must have a tax cut that is responsible, a targeted tax cut that really will provide true tax relief during these difficult economic times.

As with the bills that my Republican colleagues brought before the 105th and 106th Congress and now in the 107th Congress, H.R. 6 is poorly targeted, too broad and too expensive.

This bill will result in spending of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds and a cut in domestic spending. This plan reverses the course that we have been on for several years and does not leave adequate money to continue paying down the national debt.

H.R. 6 is a bill tilted towards the wealthy people of this country and threatens all the priorities important to hard-working families.

It raids Medicare trust funds, and it is too back-loaded that it does nothing to help our economy today.

This bill will crowd out the priorities vital to millions of seniors, military families, women and children. It cuts services like COPS on the beat and after-school programs that are so vital for the public schools and for safety of our children.

This bill provides, Mr. Speaker, no benefits to American families who need help with child care and housing. I support the Democratic alternative, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill that gives true marriage penalty relief.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that we have a bipartisan bill before us today that is being offered as an amendment, a partisan Democratic substitute for the bipartisan bill. I would note that the bipartisan bill will benefit 25 million married working couples who pay higher taxes just because they are married.

In fact, the bipartisan bill which received the support of every House Republican last year and 51 Democrats who broke with their leadership to support real marriage tax relief will help eliminate almost the entire marriage tax penalty for almost everyone that suffers it. That is pretty fair.

I would also note that the partisan Democratic substitute fails to help

children. In fact, they fail to address the need to increase the child tax credit. And we work with the President and his proposal to double the child tax credit, doubling it to \$1,000. It is currently \$500. It will provide immediate relief this year, an additional \$100, so it will be an additional \$600 tax credit this year.

I would point out in combination with the rate reduction, as well as the child tax credit this will put an additional \$600 in the average family's pockets this year.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that if there are any Members who believe that President Bush had this marriage penalty tax solution correct last year during his campaign, they need to vote against this proposal, because this bill rejects the Bush solution to this marriage penalty problem.

Indeed, the only witness that the Republicans brought forward on this issue said President Bush's approach was worse than doing nothing. Now after I said that earlier in the debate, a piece of paper was advanced that the Administration has endorsed today's proposal. I have not seen that yet, but certainly this would not be the first campaign promise that the President has chosen to reverse himself on this year.

Mr. Speaker, I would just emphasize that the better approach is not to place an additional penalty on single individuals, whether a widow, a single mom or simply some person that chooses to live as a single individual. Our tax system ought to be based on equity and be designed so as not to discriminate based on marital status. This particular Republican proposal discriminates instead of following the approach that President Bush recommended last year.

One of the issues that has not gotten as much attention in this debate as I think it needs is the question of what stimulus, if any, comes out of this tax package.

Members will recall that the Bush tax proposal was not developed during hard times, at least not economic hard times, they were developed during campaign hard times, when he feared Steve Forbes' challenge in the Republican primary.

The economy was doing well. His campaign was faltering a little bit. So he tried to come up with an approach that would stimulate the financial statements of the wealthiest people in our society and to out-Steve Forbes, Steve Forbes. I think that that is what his overall tax proposal was designed to do last year.

Now we face more challenging economic times, and it would seem to me that we ought to focus tax relief in ways that might help with our economic slowdown.

We do not know how long or how deep this Bush economic slowdown will be, since he began talking down the economy, but we can be certain that there is no economic stimulus to turn the economy around found in today's piece of legislation.

Like their estate tax proposal, this tax package has a better chance of resurrecting the dead than of resurrecting the economy.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 14½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, one might think the only thing before us today is the marriage penalty and the child credit. I think to legislators we can take a look and clearly we would see that the Democratic substitute that is before us today is more equitable. It is fairer, and it takes care of the problems that we have been talking about.

Let no one believe that by voting for the substitute that they are not voting for not only equitable relief, but they are voting for a child credit that is going to reach the kids that come from families that make less than \$30,000, which is not true of the majority's program.

But even more importantly than that is the different pieces of the tax bill that is coming to the floor, not as a comprehensive tax program within a budget that we know what to expect, but each week that we come here, we are asked to vote on different pieces. It is this that we do not know how much can we digest since already before the next week is out they would have completed the \$1.6 trillion and start moving towards the \$2 trillion tax package that they really have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the distinguished minority leader, who is the final speaker on our side.

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1300

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask Members to vote against the Republican tax bill and for the bill sponsored by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and our ranking member on the Committee on Ways and Means.

I take this position for several reasons. First, I ask Members to consider the real differences between these two tax cut proposals. The Republican bill increases the child credit, but only for some families. Their child credit does not fully phase in until the year 2006, which means that some families will not see any relief because their chil-

dren will turn 16 before then, and they will be too old to be eligible for the tax cut.

Millions of families of all income levels will be disappointed because Republicans give people nothing in the marriage penalty relief until the year 2004, and they will not get the full tax cut that the Republicans promise until 2009.

What does all of this delay and all of these gimmicks really say to the American people? That despite all of the rhetoric about cutting taxes to help with the immediate economic downturn, I do not think my friends on the other side are serious. They are not serious about providing relief this year when it is most needed. Their tax bill does not help people for another 3 to 5 years; in some instances, 8 years. This delayed phase-in is the direct result of a larger tax plan that spends the entire available surplus that is not even there yet that may never materialize.

Well, this is not right and it is not fair. I ask Members to consider our bill, which is responsible, balanced and fair. Our bill doubles the standard deduction for married couples so they get relief this year. Our bill recognizes that we are in a period of economic uncertainty, so we give people immediate tax relief which we think will help them get through the uncertainty of the time we are in.

But the most important reason to vote against the Republican bill is that it is part of a much larger tax plan that leaves no room for the other important priorities of the American people.

After today, this House will have already passed \$1.8 trillion in tax cuts when we include the interest. If Republicans continue with their plans and put forward, as they are apparently planning, the estate tax and their other tax bills, then the additional tax breaks that they have said they will pass as part of the President's plan, which is a floor, will cost about \$3 trillion once the smoke clears.

The Republican tax cut package raids the Medicare trust fund as early as 2005. It does nothing to help the economy because it is so back-loaded. It crowds out other priorities vital to millions of seniors, military families, and women and children. It results in a budget that cuts existing services like Cops on the Beat and after-school programs to make our public schools safe for our children.

Most damaging, the Republican tax plan could bring back the high deficits, high interest rates, and slow growth that we saw at the end of the last Bush administration.

We have to keep in our mind that the goal is to keep the economy moving, to keep unemployment down, to keep growth going up. One of the best ways to do that is to keep interest rates down.

So I argue to the Members, think about the effect on the economy and what the Republican tax cut does not

do, what it crowds out our ability to do for the ordinary families in this country who pay interest costs on house payments and car payments and furniture payments every month.

Married families and children would be better off with our plan. We provide sensible tax relief for all taxpayers. We focus relief on those in the middle and those trying to get in the middle who need our help the most.

Plus, we give people a country free of debt by 2008; a Medicare prescription drug program for all seniors who want it; a Social Security and a Medicare trust fund extended to 2050 in the one case and 2040 respectively, at least 11 to 12 years added solvency of the Medicare and Social Security trust funds; more quality teachers; more Cops on the Beat; and school buildings in repair and enlarged and rehabilitated.

We give people lower interest rates. For an average family of four, 1 percent off interest rates means \$1,500 a year in savings on a car payment and on house payments. If one adds a reasonable tax cut, about \$700 a year, one is going to wind up putting more money in the pockets of a typical family than the larger tax cut that would likely keep interest rates a point higher.

So I urge Members to consider this argument when they cast their vote on these two bills. Consider the actual real-life consequences of the decision we are making on the floor today. Consider what happens if these surpluses do not materialize. Consider what happens if the projections turn out to be wrong.

What if we find ourselves in debt again, as we did in the 1980s, as far as the eye can see? We have been there. We have run this experiment. We ran it for 15 years, from 1981 to 1995. It did not work.

We should be more humble about our thoughts about economics. We should be more reticent to take this risky river boat gamble to go out into the deficits when we could keep the surpluses.

It is time to keep interest rates down, unemployment down, inflation down. This is a 20-year decision of this body. It is easy to make this decision. It is hard to correct it. It took us 15 years to 20 years to get over the last mistake. Why would we want to do that again?

I urge Members to examine their conscience, examine the facts. Vote against this Republican bill. Vote for the more sensible common sense Democratic alternative.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I note that the bipartisan plan before us, H.R. 6, combined with the rate reduction we passed earlier this year, will put \$600 in the pockets of the average family of four this year. I also note in the minority leader's district that his partisan Democratic alternative would deny relief to 102,000 children in his own district, the Third District of Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS), the distinguished House Republican Conference Chairman.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois, my friend, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me set something straight at the outset. I think it is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that what we are talking about today is not the government's money, but the American people's money. One of these days, it is going to register to the 535 Members of Congress that vote on these issues that it is not Washington's money, it is the people's money.

I think it is time to put partisanship aside and enact a plan that will protect families, strengthen the economy, and secure our children's future. H.R. 6 is a common sense plan to strengthen families and secure our children's future. It stops the unfair tax that simply penalizes two people for saying "I do." I think it is wrong. I think it is unfair.

The problem that we have is, and I would make the point, families are working longer and harder than ever; yet Washington continues to take more and more. The marriage penalty requires more time at work, and that means less time at home with the family and with the kids.

Should two people pay higher taxes just because they are married? Should families spend 50 percent of their income in Federal, State and local taxes? Should families pay more in taxes than for food, clothing, and shelter combined? Should not parents be allowed to spend their own money to meet the needs of their own children?

On behalf of hard-working families, what we are doing today is asking for fairness and common sense to protect families and to secure our children's future.

The average family of four will save \$560 this year through our tax plan, H.R. 6, and the rate reduction plan that we have already passed. All Americans will benefit because giving people money back, that creates job security and a strong economy.

Nearly 25 million couples will save money from repeal of the marriage penalty, 53,000 couples in the Fourth District of Oklahoma, the district that I represent. More than 81 million children will qualify for the \$1,000 per-child tax credit; 81,000 kids in the Fourth District of Oklahoma will qualify for that.

At least 4 million African American married couples will benefit immediately from repeal of the marriage tax penalty. This means more money for college, for groceries, for house payments, for car payments, for car insurance, maybe to buy a new washer and dryer, new appliance.

It is time that we enact common sense legislation today to strengthen families and secure our children's future and stop taxing people for simply saying "I do." That is unfair. It is wrong.

I urge a yes vote on H.R. 6.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this whole idea that Democrats do not understand that what surplus we are talking about is not the government's money, but it is the people's money, we understand that. We understand even further that whatever surpluses we are talking about is the hard-working people that pay the Social Security tax and the payroll tax that give us what is the so-called surplus.

There is no surplus there. The fact that under the Clinton-Gore administration we have been able to get a better cash flow does not mean that there is a surplus. We owe \$3.4 trillion. We pay debt service on that money.

It is safe to say that, when we work together and try to reduce our national debt, that that is the true way to say that we are giving back their money by reducing the national debt.

In addition to that, it is abundantly clear that many on the other side do not believe we should have a Social Security system. I cannot argue with you if that is what you believe. You do not believe in Medicare. You do not believe in providing for affordable prescription drugs.

What we are saying is that, yes, those are the people's programs. We are here as Democrats; and hopefully we can convince some Republicans to work together and not just say it is the people's money. It is the people's country. It is the people's debt. It is the people's Social Security program. It is the people's Medicare program. It is the people's children that need education to make them productive. All of these things belong to the people.

We should not take a river boat gamble on what is going to happen 6, 7 years from now and put people in jeopardy for their kids and those people today that will soon become eligible for Social Security and Medicare benefits.

We have to agree that you are coming our way as it relates to child credits and things like that, but you are giving us a little piece at a time. Already we are up to a trillion dollars, and we have to stop you before you hurt somebody. Because we know that piece by piece you will never be able to get this off of the ground.

Even the President is against the things that you are going to come up with. Well, how do I know? Well, first of all, it is because I go over and I talk with the President from time to time. He is a very likable chap. He likes Democrats. He likes Republicans.

He told us, which I assume he shared with you, that he does not want the tax cut lower than \$1.6 trillion, like Democrats want it, nor does he want it higher than \$1.6 trillion like some Republicans want it. He wants it just like this. He thinks that this just fits.

I am telling the President, get your troops in order and try to get some of that compassion or conservatism on

the other side of the aisle; because, Mr. President, this just does not fit.

Already we have got \$950 billion that has already passed the House, \$399 billion we are trying to defeat today, \$267 billion they say is going to come up next week. We have health related, education related. We have got research and development, which is going to cost us \$50 billion. We have the alternative minimum tax fix, \$292 billion.

When we get finished with all of this and add debt service to it, \$556 billion, Mr. President, the Republicans will be giving you a \$3 trillion tax burden which you say is too big.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, let the Democrats join in and say we are going to stop this majority in the House. We have a substitute that is more in line with what you are thinking about, Mr. President, and the people will have an opportunity, including Republicans, to work in a bipartisan way to vote for the substitute and to stop the majority's bill.

Mr. Speaker, then what can we do? Then we can really come together, sit down as Republicans and Democrats, and see whether we can agree to a bill that does not pass on the partisan vote, but a total bill taking in consideration all of the things.

Mr. President, in order to make it easier, we Democrats have come up with a bill that we really believe Republicans should consider. It is H.R. 1264, and it would allow for us to look at the entire budget that we have and to divide it into one-third for the tax cut, one-third in order to reduce the debt, and one-third for the programs that the American people and even the President of the United States support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, we have one remaining speaker on behalf of our legislation. Has the minority concluded?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has no time remaining. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have a bipartisan bill, H.R. 6, before us that eliminates the marriage tax penalty, as well as doubles the child tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the House majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Committee on Ways and Means and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) in particular for his fine work on this legislation. I also want to personally thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for speaking one more time on

this bill, because his having done so punctuates a fact that we oftentimes try to disguise in this body, and the gentleman from New York has made that fact profoundly clear to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, this is a partisan debate. Mr. Speaker, that is as it should be, because, indeed, this body is almost wholly divided between two very distinct and two very separate political parties, parties that do, in fact, congregate around different visions of America, and to a large extent what you see in this debate today is a conflict of visions.

My colleagues who congregate on my side of the aisle have a vision of America that is based on our profound belief that America is made great and America is built, its economy is built, by real people at home in America earning and spending their own money on behalf of their own best interests and on behalf of their families.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party on the other side of the aisle tend to congregate around the belief that America is built great by big government. This is not a new debate. We have it every time we put a tax bill on the floor; and the foundation issue is do we give people part of their money back and hold taxes down so that the greatness of America can continue to be built at home by people who actually earn the money themselves, or are we going to keep it here in town so that people in Washington can spend it on their behalf and build programs.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is we have seen demonstrated time and time again that whenever Washington has the good grace to leave people more of their own money in what we call take-home pay, America does well with that.

I was a young economics student in 1961 and 1962, and this lesson was brought home to me by President Kennedy, and the Democrats do not like us to mention this fact, but he taught us this lesson in economics in the early 1960s. When President Kennedy faced an economic recession, he said, cut taxes and let America grow the economy back with their own money. And bless our hearts, we did; and he was right.

Mr. Speaker, the animosity towards growing America at home through your own money is so heartfelt on the other side of the aisle that today they even resent us citing this great lesson from this great President, because indeed the idea is bigger than the man, and this idea is not the idea around which they congregate.

And so we come again to the early 1980s, Mr. Speaker, and Ronald Reagan did the same thing, and America did grow. It is a fact that revenue to the United States Government doubled in the 1980s after the American economy began to grow again in consequence to the Reagan tax cuts.

The deficits that we experienced in the 1980s were not because the American people were not doing their part;

we did our part. We sent Washington twice as much money by the end of that decade. The problem is that Washington did not do its part. It did not control its gluttony. Washington has had an addiction that we are trying to cure, and that is an addiction for other people's money. Throughout the entire decade of the 1980s, spending in this town grew by \$1.56 for every \$1 that we sent this town.

If you want to stop the deficits, that is where you stop it. You stop that spending growing out of control, and that is what we did when we took over in 1994, and that is why we have the surpluses we have today; because we stopped the spending gluttony of this town.

Mr. Speaker, now we come to another time where America is once again concerned about their economic stability, their future. The American people are saying that we need relief. We need encouragement in a Tax Code. Give us some more of our own money back. Take a little less away. We have good things that we want to do with it. And this bill that we bring to the floor today speaks to the heart of the American dream. The idea that we will say to our young men and women in this country, Go ahead, fall in love, get married, and you will not be penalized for it should never be an idea that is resisted by anybody.

Now, I do not have a reputation for being much of a romantic fellow around here, but I have enough romance in my soul to realize this: If young people fall in love and get married, the Federal Government should applaud them, not tax them. And once you are married, and once you retain some take-home pay that is commensurate with what you did before you were married, go ahead and have those precious babies and spend on them. I hope you spend a lot on them.

On behalf of my grandson, for example, I happen to be a big fan of Blues Clues toys. I think every baby ought to be able to play with Blues Clues toys. There are many things we can do for our babies, and we ought to have a little more take-home pay, so we increase the child tax credit so those families can enjoy those things. That should be applauded in this Chamber, especially by those of us that are at the age of myself and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), who have the great joy of grandchildren in our lives. Far better for them than it was for our kids. And we should applaud this.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important move. This is an important change in the Tax Code. Not only does it have the ability to encourage the American family to work harder, do more, but it allows them to take a larger share of their own paycheck home and do the most important thing they will ever do in their life, raise their children.

Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been throughout this entire discussion, from the inception going back to the campaign, on shift-

ing sand. First it was no tax reductions. We cannot afford that. I always laugh when I hear the government cannot afford that. How much will it cost the government to give tax reductions?

Then it was you have the wrong kind of tax reductions. But they continued to move on this matter. Then it was it is not your tax cuts we want, it is our tax cuts that we want. And then finally, you have got to do this on a bipartisan fashion. You cannot do it on a bipartisan fashion if one party wants no tax cut and the other party wants a tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, but even then we try to accommodate. What can be more bipartisan than a bill that was passed just a year ago with more than 50 votes from the other side of the aisle? That looks like a generous bipartisan effort.

This is an important thing that we do, and we are working hard for it. We can talk about the growth of the American economy through the efforts of the American family, and we can talk about the prosperity and happiness of the American family by having more of their own pay as take-home pay, and we can talk about resolving fundamental inequities and inanities in the Tax Code.

Mr. Speaker, I must say we should be embarrassed to have a Tax Code on our books that says to our sons and daughters, if you should fall in love, and if you should wed, we will punish you. Again, let me applaud the gentleman from Illinois and the Committee on Ways and Means. It is time to put an end to that, and we will do that with this vote.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 104, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 196, nays 231, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—196

Abercrombie	Barrett	Blumenauer
Ackerman	Becerra	Bonior
Allen	Bentsen	Borski
Andrews	Berkley	Boswell
Baca	Berman	Boucher
Baird	Bishop	Boyd
Baldacci	Blagojevich	Brady (PA)

Brown (FL)	Insee	Owens	Kerns	Oxley	Skeen
Brown (OH)	Israel	Pallone	King (NY)	Paul	Smith (MI)
Capps	Jackson (IL)	Pascarell	Kingston	Pence	Smith (NJ)
Cardin	Jackson-Lee	Pastor	Kirk	Peterson (PA)	Smith (TX)
Carson (IN)	(TX)	Payne	Knollenberg	Petri	Souder
Carson (OK)	Jefferson	Pelosi	Kolbe	Pickering	Spence
Clay	John	Peterson (MN)	LaHood	Pitts	Stearns
Clayton	Johnson, E. B.	Phelps	Largent	Platts	Stump
Clement	Jones (OH)	Pomeroy	Latham	Pombo	Sununu
Clyburn	Kaptur	Price (NC)	LaTourette	Portman	Sweeney
Condit	Kennedy (RI)	Rahall	Leach	Pryce (OH)	Tancredo
Conyers	Kildee	Rangel	Lewis (CA)	Putnam	Tauzin
Costello	Kilpatrick	Reyes	Lewis (KY)	Quinn	Taylor (MS)
Coyne	Kind (WI)	Rivers	Linder	Radanovich	Taylor (NC)
Cramer	Kleczka	Rodriguez	Lipinski	Ramstad	Terry
Crowley	Kucinich	Roemer	LoBiondo	Regula	Thomas
Cummings	LaFalce	Ross	Lucas (KY)	Rehberg	Thornberry
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Royal-Allard	Lucas (OK)	Reynolds	Thune
Davis (FL)	Lantos	Rush	Manzullo	Riley	Tiahrt
Davis (IL)	Larsen (WA)	Sabo	Matheson	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Sanchez	McCrery	Rogers (MI)	Toomey
DeGette	Lee	Sanders	McHugh	Rohrabacher	Trafficant
Delahunt	Levin	Sandlin	McInnis	Roukema	Upton
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Sawyer	McKeon	Royce	Visclosky
Deutsch	Lofgren	Schakowsky	Mica	Ryan (WI)	Vitter
Dicks	Lowey	Schiff	Miller (FL)	Ryun (KS)	Walden
Dingell	Luther	Scott	Miller, Gary	Saxton	Walsh
Dooley	Maloney (CT)	Serrano	Moran (KS)	Scarborough	Wamp
Doyle	Maloney (NY)	Sherman	Morella	Schaffer	Watkins
Edwards	Markey	Shows	Murtha	Schrock	Watts (OK)
Engel	Mascara	Skelton	Myrick	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (FL)
Eshoo	Matsui	Slaughter	Nethercutt	Sessions	Weldon (PA)
Etheridge	McCarthy (MO)	Smith (WA)	Ney	Shadegg	Weller
Evans	McCarthy (NY)	Snyder	Northup	Shaw	Whitfield
Farr	McCollum	Solis	Norwood	Shays	Wicker
Fattah	McDermott	Spratt	Nussle	Sherwood	Wilson
Filner	McGovern	Stark	Osborne	Shimkus	Wolf
Ford	McIntyre	Stenholm	Ose	Simmons	Young (AK)
Frank	McKinney	Strickland	Otter	Simpson	Young (FL)
Frost	McNulty	Stupak			
Gephardt	Meehan	Tanner			
Gonzalez	Meek (FL)	Tauscher	Baldwin	Ros-Lehtinen	Sisisky
Gordon	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (CA)	Lampson	Rothman	
Green (TX)	Menendez	Thompson (MS)			
Gutierrez	Millender	Thurman			
Hall (OH)	McDonald	Tierney			
Hall (TX)	Miller, George	Towns			
Harman	Mink	Turner			
Hastings (FL)	Moakley	Udall (CO)			
Hill	Mollohan	Udall (NM)			
Hilliard	Moore	Velazquez			
Hinches	Moran (VA)	Waters			
Hinojosa	Nadler	Watt (NC)			
Hoeffel	Napolitano	Waxman			
Holden	Neal	Weiner			
Holt	Oberstar	Wexler			
Honda	Obey	Woolsey			
Hooley	Olver	Wu			
Hoyer	Ortiz	Wynn			

NAYS—231

Aderholt	Combest	Goodlatte
Akin	Cooksey	Goss
Army	Cox	Graham
Bachus	Crane	Granger
Baker	Crenshaw	Graves
Ballenger	Cubin	Green (WI)
Barcia	Culberson	Greenwood
Barr	Cunningham	Grucci
Bartlett	Davis, Jo Ann	Gutknecht
Barton	Davis, Tom	Hansen
Bass	Deal	Hart
Bereuter	DeLay	Hastings (WA)
Berry	DeMint	Hayes
Biggett	Diaz-Balart	Hayworth
Billirakis	Doggett	Hefley
Blunt	Doolittle	Herger
Boehler	Dreier	Hilleary
Boehner	Duncan	Hobson
Bonilla	Dunn	Hoekstra
Bono	Ehlers	Horn
Brady (TX)	Ehrlich	Hostettler
Brown (SC)	Emerson	Houghton
Bryant	English	Hulshof
Burr	Everett	Hunter
Burton	Ferguson	Hutchinson
Buyer	Flake	Hyde
Callahan	Fletcher	Isakson
Calvert	Foley	Issa
Camp	Fossella	Istook
Cannon	Frelinghuysen	Jenkins
Cantor	Gallegly	Johnson (CT)
Capito	Ganske	Johnson (IL)
Capuano	Gekas	Johnson, Sam
Castle	Gibbons	Jones (NC)
Chabot	Gilchrest	Kanjorski
Chambliss	Gillmor	Keller
Coble	Gilman	Kelly
Collins	Goode	Kennedy (MN)

the Virginia General Assembly and were elected for the first time to this House in the same year.

I wish to express my deepest sympathy to his family and to his many friends. In the passing of NORMAN SISISKY, we have lost a dear friend; and this Nation has lost a valuable public servant.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer sympathy to NORMAN's family. Everyone was NORMAN's friend on both sides of the aisle. There will be a resolution that we will offer from both sides of the aisle after the last vote for an hour, and anyone who would like to speak at that time will have the opportunity immediately after the last vote. But our hearts and prayers go out to NORMAN's family, his staff, and his friends.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RANGEL. Yes, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANGEL moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. REFUND OF 2000 INDIVIDUAL INCOMES TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter B of chapter 65 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to rules of special application) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 6428. REFUND OF 2000 INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, each individual shall be treated as having made a payment against the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such individual's first taxable year beginning in 2000 in an amount equal to 100 percent of the amount of such individual's net Federal tax liability for such taxable year.

“(b) MAXIMUM PAYMENT.—The amount treated as paid by reason of this section shall not exceed \$300 (\$600 in the case of a married couple filing a joint return).

“(c) NET FEDERAL TAX LIABILITY.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘net Federal tax liability’ means the amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

“(A) the sum of the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) plus the tax imposed by section 55, over

“(B) the sum of the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A (other than the credits allowable subpart C thereof, relating to refundable credits).

“(2) FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN.—In the case of a taxpayer with 1 or more qualifying children (as defined in section 32) for the taxpayer's first taxable year beginning in 2000,

NOT VOTING—5

□ 1349

Messrs. CALVERT, BERRY, COOKSEY and KANJORSKI changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. SHOWS and Mrs. THURMAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(Mr. BOUCHER asked and was given permission to speak out of order for 1 minute.)

EXPRESSION OF SYMPATHY AT THE PASSING OF NORMAN SISISKY, MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty of reporting to the House the passing this morning of our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY).

For 18 years, NORMAN represented Virginia's 4th Congressional District with distinction in a manner that was highly effective for the interests of his constituents, for our State of Virginia, and for the Nation. His wit and his charm and his gracious manner endeared him to the Members of the House and to the Virginians who have been well served by his representations, first as a member of the Virginia House of Delegates and more recently as a Member of this body. His many legislative contributions on matters ranging from national security policy to economic advancements to educational improvements have made his State and our Nation a better place.

I have personally known NORMAN for many years and have been glad to name him among my personal friends. We began our public service together in

such taxpayer's net Federal tax liability for such year shall be the amount determined under paragraph (1) increased by 7.65 percent of the taxpayer's taxable earned income for such year. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term "taxable earned income" means earned income as defined in section 32 but only to the extent includible in gross income.

"(d) DATE PAYMENT DEEMED MADE.—The payment provided by this section shall be deemed made on the later of—

"(1) the date prescribed by law (determined without extensions) for filing the return of tax imposed by chapter 1 for the taxable year, or

"(2) the date on which the taxpayer files his return of tax imposed by chapter 1 for the taxable year.

"(e) CERTAIN PERSONS NOT ELIGIBLE.—This section shall not apply to—

"(1) any estate or trust, and

"(2) any nonresident alien individual.

"(f) WITHHOLDING CREDIT CERTIFICATES IN LIEU OF PAYMENTS IN CERTAIN CASES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that the amount treated as paid under this section would (but for this subsection) exceed the taxpayer's net income tax liability for the taxable year—

"(A) the amount of such excess shall not be treated as paid under this section, and

"(B) the Secretary shall issue to the taxpayer a withholding credit certificate in the amount of such excess.

"(2) UTILIZATION OF WITHHOLDING CREDIT CERTIFICATE.—A withholding credit certificate issued under paragraph (1) may be furnished by the individual to such individual's employer.

"(3) FURNISHED TO EMPLOYER.—If a withholding credit certificate issued under paragraph (1) is furnished by an individual to such individual's employer, the amount of the certificate shall operate as a reduction in the liability for employment taxes that would otherwise be withheld from the individual's wages.

"(5) NET INCOME TAX LIABILITY.—For purposes of this subsection, the term "net income tax liability" means net Federal tax liability determined without regard to subsection (c)(2)."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 65 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"Sec. 6428. Refund of 2000 individual income taxes."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

(d) PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE.—The amounts transferred to any trust fund under the Social Security Act shall be determined as if this Act had not been enacted.

(e) COMPLIANCE WITH BUDGET RULES.—The aggregate amount of refunds and withholding credit certificates provided by this Act before October 1, 2001, shall not exceed \$15,000,000,000. The Secretary of the Treasury may implement the limitation of the preceding sentence by providing pro rata reductions or otherwise. The limitations of this subsection shall cease to apply at such time as the congressional budget resolution for fiscal year 2001 is adjusted to permit full payments authorized under this section.

Mr. THOMAS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFEL).

Mr. HOFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we need to put money in people's pockets today. We should not start next year or 5 years from now or 10 years from now. We need to pass a tax rebate that would give people now \$300 per person, \$600 per family. This would give the American economy an immediate \$47 billion stimulus this year.

We have spent the last few weeks debating and passing tax bills that give more relief than is prudent and most of which will not affect the average taxpayer for 7 to 10 years. In fact, the bill before us today provides only \$50 million in stimulus this year, \$50 million to rebate that we want to propose would establish almost \$50 billion in economic stimulus. That is almost 1,000 more economic stimulus, 1,000 times the economic power, the spending and saving power this year.

We must support a tax package that includes sensible rate reductions for everyone that will not threaten our fiscal footing and allows us to pay down all of our national debt, a tax package that will include targeted marriage penalty relief, a tax package that does not threaten Social Security and Medicare. Pass this motion to recommit. Do it today.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the early warning signs are all around us. Manufacturing has lost 230,000 jobs in the last 3 months alone. The stock market has lost about \$5 trillion in value in the last year. We must act to stimulate the economy now.

The Progressive Caucus proposed a \$300 dividend for every American this year. We must act now. According to economists, the \$300 dividend is about enough to counteract the effect of a stock market decline. This motion would pay that dividend now and stimulate the economy. The majority's bill gives people only pennies this year. It does not stimulate the economy, because it will not give more than 80 percent of the tax cut until 2005.

The choice is clear. Americans get pennies under the majority's bill or \$300 under the motion to recommit.

□ 1400

They get economic slowdown under the majority's tax bill, or a stimulus and restore prosperity under the motion to recommit.

Vote yes on the motion to recommit.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, we are not just here dealing with the child credit or removing the marriage penalty. I think that is a bipartisan issue that we all have worked on, and we could have worked on effectively had the other side seen fit to attempt to come up with something that is bipartisan.

Instead of this, they have, in a very bipartisan way, brought before this floor a \$953 billion tax cut all geared toward the top 1 percent, at least half of it, of the taxpayers.

The President, who asked for this \$1.6 trillion tax cut, he asked for this during the time that we had the prosperous Clinton and Gore years. Now, Mr. Speaker, we do not hear the President of the United States talking in such a compassionate way as he did during the campaign about leaving no child behind. We do not hear him talking about the viability of the Social Security System or Medicare. We do not hear him talking about prescription drugs. He is going around in different communities talking about the sputtering economy and how the stock market is falling, and how he needs this \$1.6 trillion to give it a jolt in the arm.

Most of us know, who write the bills, that they have not shared with the President that he will not be getting any part of this \$1.6 trillion until the next 5 years. And if he is really serious about wanting to do something now, do not depend on the high-rollers to go out and buy that refrigerator or that washing machine, but let it be to the American people who work every day and try to send their kids to school, that are struggling to pay the mortgage. Give them the money now, and they will be able to give this economy the shot in its arm to bring it back to what we did have when we had sound fiscal policy under President Clinton and under Vice President Gore.

All we are saying with this motion to recommit is do not give up on the tax cut, but take a deep breath, go back to the committee, and see whether or not we can get \$60 billion in the economy now, this year, in the pockets of the people to spend.

Then let us try to come together once again as Republicans and Democrats and try to work out something that is not as extreme as the \$1.6 billion; that does not totally repeal the estate tax for the rich, but really gets out there for the working poor, the moderate-income people, and give a fair tax break to everybody.

We have not given up on Republicans on this side, and we have not given up on our President. The motion to recommit really means let us go back and let us see whether we work out something now to stimulate this economy, and to make certain that the American people have confidence not

only in the economy, but have confidence in this Congress.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize to my friends on the other side of the aisle, because I have the unfortunate habit of actually reading their motions to recommit.

So, first of all, I would call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the motion to recommit says, "Strike all after the enacting clause." That means, number one, no marriage penalty relief and no child tax credit. But what they are offering instead is the idea that we can have an immediate stimulus.

Okay, let us talk about that trade-off. Keep reading, Mr. Speaker. By the time we get to page 5, after we go to page 4 of the motion to recommit, on which there is a kind of a homemade attempt to make this motion in order, with handwriting in the margin and the rest, but when we get through with that, we actually get to the heart of the proposal.

The gentleman from New York said we get an immediate stimulus of \$50 billion. Now, remember, with the "Strike out all after the enacting clause" we have given up the marriage penalty and the child credit.

But if we read what the motion to recommit actually does, it says, "In fiscal year 2001, no more than \$15 billion." No matter how impassioned they say now, \$35 billion comes out of next year, 2002. Fair enough. In 2001 and in 2002, we get the \$50 billion stimulus.

Hang on. This House has already passed H.R. 3, and we are going to pass H.R. 6. Let us take a look at what those two provisions do in fiscal year 2001 and 2002.

Quite ironically, when we combine H.R. 3 and H.R. 6 and look at the effect in fiscal years 2001 and 2002, we get a \$54.6 billion permanent tax reduction.

Here is the choice: Vote for the motion to recommit, and we do not get marriage penalty relief, we do not get the child credit doubling, we do not get permanent marginal relief, but we do get \$50 billion of one-time money.

If we vote against the motion to recommit, we get marriage penalty relief, we double the child tax credit, we get permanent marginal rate relief, and we get \$54.6 billion worth of relief.

I think this motion to recommit is easy. If Members vote for them, they get \$50 billion. Vote for us and Members get \$54.6 billion plus marriage penalty relief, child credit, and permanent rate reduction.

This one is easy. Vote no on the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A vote on final passage, if ordered, will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 240, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

AYES—184

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Mollohan
Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Moore
Allen	Harman	Moran (VA)
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Murtha
Baca	Hill	Nadler
Baird	Hilliard	Napolitano
Baldacci	Hinchev	Neal
Barrett	Hinojosa	Oberstar
Becerra	Hoeffel	Obey
Bentsen	Holden	Olver
Berkley	Holt	Ortiz
Berman	Honda	Owens
Berry	Hooley	Pallone
Blagojevich	Hoyer	Pascrell
Blumenauber	Inslee	Pastor
Bonior	Jackson (IL)	Payne
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi
Boyd	(TX)	Phelps
Brady (PA)	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Brown (FL)	John	Price (NC)
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E.B.	Rahall
Capps	Jones (OH)	Rangel
Capuano	Kanjorski	Reyes
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rodriguez
Carson (OK)	Kennedy (RI)	Ross
Clay	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Clayton	Kilpatrick	Rush
Clement	Kind (WI)	Sabo
Clyburn	Kleczka	Sanchez
Conyers	Kucinich	Sanders
Costello	LaFalce	Sandlin
Coyne	Langevin	Sawyer
Crowley	Lantos	Schakowsky
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Scott
Davis (FL)	Lee	Serrano
Davis (IL)	Levin	Sherman
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
DeGette	Lofgren	Slaughter
Delahunt	Lowey	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Luther	Solis
Deutsch	Maloney (CT)	Spratt
Dicks	Maloney (NY)	Stark
Dingell	Markey	Strickland
Doggett	Mascara	Thompson (CA)
Dooley	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	McCarthy (MO)	Thurman
Edwards	McCollum	Tierney
Engel	McDermott	Towns
Eshoo	McGovern	Turner
Etheridge	McIntyre	Udall (CO)
Evans	McKinney	Udall (NM)
Farr	McNulty	Velazquez
Fattah	Meehan	Visclosky
Filner	Meek (FL)	Waters
Ford	Meeks (NY)	Watt (NC)
Frank	Menendez	Waxman
Frost	Millender-	Weiner
Gephardt	McDonald	Wexler
Gonzalez	Miller, George	Woolsey
Gordon	Mink	Wu
Green (TX)	Moakley	Wynn

NOES—240

Aderholt	Blunt	Camp
Akin	Boehkert	Cannon
Armey	Boehner	Cantor
Bachus	Bonilla	Capito
Baker	Bono	Cardin
Ballenger	Boswell	Castle
Barcia	Boucher	Chabot
Barr	Brady (TX)	Chambliss
Bartlett	Brown (SC)	Coble
Barton	Bryant	Collins
Bass	Burr	Combest
Bereuter	Burton	Condit
Biggert	Buyer	Cooksey
Bilirakis	Callahan	Cox
Bishop	Calvert	Cramer

Crane	Johnson (CT)	Rivers
Crenshaw	Johnson (IL)	Roemer
Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Culberson	Jones (NC)	Rogers (MI)
Cunningham	Keller	Rohrabacher
Davis, Jo Ann	Kelly	Roukema
Davis, Tom	Kennedy (MN)	Royce
Deal	Kerns	Ryan (WI)
DeLay	King (NY)	Ryun (KS)
DeMint	Kingston	Saxton
Diaz-Balart	Kirk	Scarborough
Doolittle	Knollenberg	Schaffer
Dreier	Kolbe	Schrock
Duncan	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Dunn	Largent	Sessions
Ehlers	Latham	Shadegg
Ehrlich	LaTourette	Shaw
Emerson	Leach	Shays
English	Lewis (CA)	Sherwood
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Shimkus
Ferguson	Linder	Shows
Flake	Lipinski	Simmons
Fletcher	LoBiondo	Simpson
Foley	Lucas (KY)	Skeen
Fossella	Lucas (OK)	Smith (MI)
Frelinghuysen	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Gallegly	Matheson	Smith (TX)
Ganske	McCarthy (NY)	Snyder
Gekas	McCrery	Souder
Gibbons	McHugh	Spence
Gilchrest	McInnis	Stearns
Gillmor	McKeon	Stenholm
Gilman	Mica	Stump
Goode	Miller (FL)	Sununu
Goodlatte	Miller, Gary	Sweeney
Goss	Moran (KS)	Tancredo
Graham	Morella	Tanner
Granger	Myrick	Tauscher
Graves	Nethercutt	Tauzin
Green (WI)	Northup	Taylor (MS)
Greenwood	Norwood	Taylor (NC)
Grucci	Nussle	Terry
Gutknecht	Osborne	Thomas
Hall (TX)	Ose	Thornberry
Hansen	Otter	Thune
Hart	Oxley	Tiahrt
Hastings (WA)	Paul	Tiberi
Hayes	Pence	Toomey
Hayworth	Peterson (MN)	Traficant
Hefley	Peterson (PA)	Upton
Herger	Petri	Vitter
Hilleary	Pickering	Walden
Hobson	Pitts	Walsh
Hoekstra	Platts	Wamp
Horn	Pombo	Watkins
Hostettler	Portman	Watts (OK)
Houghton	Pryce (OH)	Weldon (FL)
Hulshof	Putnam	Weldon (PA)
Hunter	Quinn	Weller
Hyde	Radanovich	Whitfield
Isakson	Ramstad	Wicker
Israel	Regula	Wilson
Issa	Rehberg	Wolf
Istook	Reynolds	Young (AK)
Jenkins	Riley	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Baldwin	Ney	Sisisky
Hutchinson	Ros-Lehtinen	Stupak
Lampson	Rothman	

□ 1425

Mr. DELAY changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. KILPATRICK and Messrs. MORAN of Virginia, GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. McNULTY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall vote No. 74, the motion to recommit, because I was stuck in elevator number 7A over in the Rayburn building.

Had I been here, I would like to inform the House I would have voted "yes" on the motion to recommit.

Stated against:

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, today I had an urgent matter to attend to. As a result I missed

rollcall vote No. 74. Please excuse my absence from this vote. If I were present, I would have voted "no".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes have it.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote on passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 282, nays 144, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—282

Aderholt	Dunn	Kolbe
Akin	Edwards	LaHood
Army	Ehlers	Langevin
Bachus	Ehrlich	Largent
Baird	Emerson	Larsen (WA)
Baker	Engel	Latham
Ballenger	English	LaTourette
Barcia	Etheridge	Leach
Barr	Everett	Lewis (CA)
Barrett	Ferguson	Lewis (KY)
Bartlett	Flake	Linder
Barton	Fletcher	Lipinski
Bass	Foley	LoBiondo
Bereuter	Ford	Lucas (KY)
Berkley	Fossella	Lucas (OK)
Berry	Frelinghuysen	Luther
Biggart	Gallely	Maloney (CT)
Bilirakis	Ganske	Manzullo
Bishop	Gekas	Mascara
Blagojevich	Gibbons	Matheson
Blunt	Gilchrest	McCarthy (NY)
Boehrlert	Gillmor	McCreery
Boehner	Goode	McHugh
Bonilla	Goodlatte	McInnis
Bono	Gordon	McIntyre
Boswell	Goss	McKeon
Boucher	Graham	McKinney
Boyd	Granger	Mica
Brady (TX)	Graves	Miller (FL)
Brown (SC)	Green (WI)	Miller, Gary
Bryant	Greenwood	Moore
Burr	Grucci	Moran (KS)
Burton	Gutknecht	Morella
Buyer	Hall (TX)	Myrick
Callahan	Hansen	Nethercutt
Calvert	Harman	Ney
Camp	Hart	Northup
Cannon	Hastert	Norwood
Cantor	Hastings (WA)	Nussle
Capito	Hayes	Osborne
Capps	Hayworth	Ose
Carson (IN)	Hefley	Otter
Carson (OK)	Hерger	Oxley
Castle	Hill	Paul
Chabot	Hilleary	Pence
Chambliss	Hobson	Peterson (PA)
Clay	Hoekstra	Petri
Clement	Holden	Phelps
Coble	Holt	Pickering
Collins	Hooley	Pitts
Combest	Horn	Platts
Condit	Hostettler	Pombo
Cooksey	Houghton	Portman
Costello	Hulshof	Pryce (OH)
Cox	Hunter	Putnam
Cramer	Hyde	Quinn
Crane	Isakson	Radanovich
Crenshaw	Israel	Ramstad
Cubin	Issa	Regula
Culberson	Istook	Rehberg
Cunningham	Jenkins	Reynolds
Davis (CA)	John	Riley
Davis (FL)	Johnson (CT)	Rodriguez
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson (IL)	Roemer
Davis, Tom	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Deal	Jones (NC)	Rogers (MI)
DeLay	Keller	Rohrabacher
DeMint	Kelly	Ross
Deutsch	Kennedy (MN)	Roukema
Diaz-Balart	Kerns	Royce
Doolittle	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Doyle	Kingston	Ryun (KS)
Dreier	Kirk	Sandlin
Duncan	Knollenberg	Saxton

Scarborough	Souder	Turner
Schaffer	Spence	Udall (CO)
Schiff	Stearns	Upton
Schrock	Stump	Vitter
Sensenbrenner	Sununu	Walden
Sessions	Sweeney	Walsh
Shadegg	Tancredo	Wamp
Shaw	Tauscher	Watkins
Shays	Tauzin	Watts (OK)
Sherwood	Taylor (MS)	Weldon (FL)
Shimkus	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (PA)
Shows	Terry	Weller
Simmons	Thomas	Whitfield
Simpson	Thornberry	Wicker
Skeen	Thune	Wilson
Skelton	Tiahrt	Wolf
Smith (MI)	Tiberi	Wu
Smith (NJ)	Toomey	Wynn
Smith (TX)	Towns	Young (AK)
Smith (WA)	Traficant	Young (FL)

NAYS—144

Abercrombie	Honda	Obey
Ackerman	Hoyer	Olver
Allen	Inslee	Ortiz
Andrews	Jackson (IL)	Owens
Baca	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Pallone
Baldacci	Jefferson	Pascrell
Becerra	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor
Bentsen	Jones (OH)	Payne
Berman	Kanjorski	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Kaptur	Peterson (MN)
Bonior	Kennedy (RI)	Pomeroy
Borski	Kildee	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Kilpatrick	Rahall
Brown (FL)	Kind (WI)	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Kleccka	Reyes
Capuano	Kucinich	Rivers
Cardin	LaFalce	Roybal-Allard
Clayton	Lantos	Rush
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Sabo
Conyers	Lee	Sanchez
Coyne	Levin	Sanders
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Sawyer
Cummings	Davis (IL)	Schakowsky
Davis (IL)	Lofgren	Scott
DeFazio	Lowey	Serrano
DeGette	Maloney (NY)	Sherman
Delahunt	Markey	Slaughter
DeLauro	Matsui	Snyder
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)	Solis
Dingell	McCollum	Spratt
Doggett	McDermott	Stark
Dooley	McGovern	Stenholm
Eshoo	McNulty	Strickland
Evans	Meehan	Stupak
Farr	Meek (FL)	Tanner
Fattah	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Filner	Menendez	Thompson (MS)
Frank	Millender-McDonald	Thurman
Frost	Miller, George	Tierney
Gephardt	Mink	Udall (NM)
Gonzalez	Moakley	Velazquez
Green (TX)	Mollohan	Visclosky
Gutierrez	Moran (VA)	Waters
Hall (OH)	Murtha	Watt (NC)
Hastings (FL)	Nadler	Waxman
Hilliard	Napolitano	Weiner
Hinchey	Neal	Wexler
Hinojosa	Oberstar	Woolsey
Hoefel		

NOT VOTING—7

□ 1438

Mr. TOWNS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Stated for:

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I was unavoidably delayed by official business during the vote on final passage for H.R. 6. Accordingly, I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 75. If I had been present I would have voted "yea".

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

"A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the marriage penalty by providing for adjustments to the standard

deduction, the 15-percent rate bracket, and the earned income credit, to increase the child credit, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on H.R. 6, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purposes of inquiring of the schedule for the day and the remainder of the week and next week.

Before I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), let me say to the gentleman from Michigan State (Mr. STUPAK), from the upper peninsula, I just wish that the Arizona Wildcats get stuck in elevator 7A and they do not make it to the ball game on Saturday.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the great home of Oscar Robertson.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan. I am from Cincinnati, Ohio; therefore, not in the Final Four.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has completed its legislative business for this week.

The House will meet next for legislative business on Tuesday, April 3, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 o'clock for legislative business. The House will consider a number of measures under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices tomorrow. On Tuesday, we expect no recorded votes before 6 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means will meet this afternoon shortly to consider H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act. It is my expectation that that bill will be ready for consideration in the House on Wednesday, April 4. That being the case, the vote on the Death Tax Elimination Act in the House next Wednesday would be our last vote for the week heading into the Spring District Work Period.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding to me.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if I could just inquire, does the gentleman from Ohio expect any other legislation to be offered on the floor other than that which he has mentioned in his statement?

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, there may be additional measures other than H.R. 8. It is my understanding that nothing else is scheduled at this point,

but there may be other business before the House.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the statement that the gentleman from Ohio read said that the Death Tax Elimination Act in the House next Wednesday will be our last vote for the week. So I assume that when we have finished that, we will not meet on Thursday or Friday; is that correct?

Mr. PORTMAN. That is correct, Mr. Speaker. We do not expect votes on Thursday or Friday of next week.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for an inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I was not to my feet quickly enough to enter directly in the discussion about Michigan State and Arizona and some team from North Carolina that is playing.

But one ought to fear the turtle. I want everybody to understand that the Terrapins are coming to play, Gary Williams and his 10 starters.

This is on scheduling for Saturday night, Mr. Speaker, so I presume it is, therefore, relevant that everybody be aware that, at 8:20 p.m. on Saturday evening, they certainly ought to be watching when Maryland, who of course beat Duke worse than any other team this year at their place, will again have the opportunity of doing that.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

Mr. HOYER. Michigan State wants his time back.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, they did beat Duke; but I might also say to the gentleman from Maryland that they blew a 10-point lead with a minute left against Duke as well.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan would not bet on that happening a second time, would he?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, in case they do emerge victoriously against Duke, I have wagered with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR), a friendly wager I might say, Mr. Speaker, Michigan apples from my district in Romeo versus his tamales from Arizona if, in fact, either of us win this game.

I would say, when the Spartans go on to win, I would venture a friendly bet with the gentleman from Maryland, a bushel full of crabs versus a bushel full of Romeo apples. What does the gentleman from Maryland think?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the value of a bushel of crabs is so much greater than a bushel of apples that it is really not a fair bet. But Maryland's talent puts me at no risk, so I will be glad to accept that wager.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY,
APRIL 3, 2001

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns on Friday, March 30, 2001, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 3, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. PORTMAN. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

□ 1445

EXPRESSING SORROW OF THE
HOUSE AT THE DEATH OF THE
HONORABLE NORMAN SISISKY,
MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM
THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIR-
GINIA

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 107) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 107

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Norman Sisisky, a Representative from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee of such Members of the House as the Speaker may designate, together with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of applicable accounts of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided and controlled between the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I join my fellow members of the Virginia congressional delegation and other Members of the House today in remembering NORMAN SISISKY, a true gentleman and a real patriot.

We had learned the news earlier this week that NORMAN's recent surgery had gone well, and he had returned home to recuperate before his expected return to Washington after the upcoming recess. And today we heard the shocking news that he had passed away.

Mr. Speaker, his untimely passing reminds us all of our own mortality and how important it is to live our lives with honor and integrity, as NORMAN did, and to make the most of every opportunity to serve our fellow man, as NORMAN did. NORMAN was hard-working, friendly, honest, ethical, decent and moral. He was a Member who worked in a bipartisan way. He reached across the aisle to work for the best interests of America, and it was a privilege to serve with him for the 18 years that he was in Congress and to work with him on the congressional delegation on issues of importance to our State and Union.

NORMAN was born June 9, 1927, and graduated from John Marshall High School in Richmond, Virginia. He joined the Navy after high school and served through World War II until 1946. He graduated from Virginia Commonwealth University in 1949 with a degree in business administration. He transformed a small Pepsi bottling company in Petersburg, Virginia, into a highly successful distributor of soft drinks throughout Southside Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, he began his public service career when he was elected as a delegate to the Virginia House of Delegates in 1973 representing Petersburg. He served five terms in the Virginia General Assembly before being elected to Congress in 1982. NORMAN, like another of our late colleagues, Herb Bate-man, was a senior member of the House Committee on Armed Services, and from that vantage point was the protector of our national security, and probably no man or woman in this body did more to work with regard to national security and working in a bipartisan way.

NORMAN was the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement and also served on the Subcommittee on Readiness, and the Subcommittee on Morale, Welfare and Recreation Panel. He had recently been appointed to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. NORMAN was also a Member of the Blue Dog Coalition in the 104th through the 107th Congress, and led bipartisan efforts that worked. In 1993, he was one of six Democrats for a strong defense and worked to mobilize against military cuts.

NORMAN was instrumental in working to get funding to build the newest aircraft carrier, the USS Ronald Reagan, which was recently christened. He worked tirelessly as an advocate for production of shipbuilding and strengthening our national defense. He represented with pride Virginia's Fourth Congressional District in the southeastern corner of the Commonwealth, the home of the first permanent English settlement in North

America, and today the home of one of the largest concentrations of military power in the world.

This Congress, the Commonwealth of Virginia and this Nation have lost a faithful servant and a wonderful man, but our lives are forever enriched for having had NORMAN SISISKY as a friend and colleague.

Mr. Speaker, our deepest sympathies are extended to Congressman SISISKY's family, his wife of over 50 years, Rhoda, and his four sons, Mark, Terry, Richard and Stuart, and his seven grandchildren; and also to his congressional family, his staff here on Capitol Hill and in his district offices, and all of the close friends that he had among the Members of Congress and staff. We share in that loss.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, NORMAN SISISKY was a good man. He was a hard-working colleague, and he was a dedicated public servant to the citizens of his southeast Virginia district. I think we were all struck by his unflinching consideration of his colleagues. He loved this institution. He did not need the salary that it paid, he was independently wealthy, but he lived and talked and acted without pretense.

He leaves a great legacy to the people of Virginia and to our whole Nation. He will always be remembered for standing behind our military families and our veterans.

NORMAN was one of the most effective advocates in the Congress for a strong Navy and its shipbuilding program. He knew that this Nation must always remain militarily strong, and through his public service helped in a substantial way to make our military second to none.

We will all miss NORMAN's friendship and his great leadership within the Congress and to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my friend and colleague from Virginia, NORMAN SISISKY, who served this body with dignity, honor and extreme dedication since 1983.

I first met NORM in 1974 when I was an aide in the Virginia General Assembly. He was a freshman member at that time, and he was known at that time as one of the smartest guys in the general assembly and a gentleman and someone if he wanted to pursue public service could go a long way, and he did.

Virginia's Fourth Congressional District and the Nation has lost a first-class public servant. NORM was a true gentleman and a great patriot. I will never forget his kind and valuable tutelage when I first came to Congress, nor will I forget how he demonstrated to all of us the importance of doing good rather than getting credit. He cer-

tainly earned his reputation as a hard worker and skilled negotiator.

During his 18 years in Congress, NORM secured committee assignments that paid dividends to the residents and businesses in his district. He played a role in reforming the Department of Defense's financial management system and worked tirelessly to preserve the nuclear shipbuilding industrial base so vital to employment rates in the Hampton Roads area. His was the proper and responsible balance: protect Virginia's military facilities, but also make sure that military spending decisions are fiscally prudent and fair to taxpayers nationwide.

NORM was a businessman. Just as he transformed a small bottling company into a highly successful distributorship throughout Southside Virginia, NORM toiled in the Congress to improve procurement practices and streamline government to make it more effective and efficient. He leaves this country stronger and better for his tireless efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I mourn the loss of NORM SISISKY as a friend and colleague. More than just a Member of Congress, he will be remembered as a husband, father, businessman, State legislator and patriot.

I want to extend my deepest sympathies to his wife Rhoda and their four sons and extended family and staff. I cannot express how much I will miss this great public servant.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), NORM SISISKY's neighbor.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. It is with a heavy heart I come to the floor to speak of one of my colleagues and dear friends, NORMAN SISISKY of Virginia's Fourth Congressional District.

I have known NORMAN since we served together in the House of Delegates, over 20 years ago, and for 8 years I have had the great fortune to represent a district adjacent to his in Hampton Roads. The proximity of our districts allowed us to work together on a lot of different issues, and, as a result, we became close, and our staffs in Washington, D.C., and the district staffs became extremely close.

Hampton Roads, Virginia, indeed all of Virginia and our entire Nation, was well served by NORMAN's leadership on the House Committee on Armed Services. He was the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement and also a member of the Subcommittee on Military Readiness, where he worked diligently to ensure our Nation's military was second to none. He took pride in that responsibility and never let anyone forget it.

He had a unique leadership style; one without fanfare, behind the scenes, and it was effective. Newport News Shipbuilding has remained a world leader in nuclear shipbuilding because of his efforts. We have been able to continue

nuclear aircraft carrier and submarine construction because of NORMAN SISISKY.

When Virginia's military facilities came under threat of being closed during the base closings of the 1990s, Congressman SISISKY successfully protected Fort Lee and other bases in Virginia that have been critical to the readiness of the Armed Forces. NORMAN SISISKY was also well-respected for his understanding of fiscal responsibility.

He will be remembered as a committed husband, a good father, and a proud Virginia gentleman. He will be sorely missed by the Virginia delegation, his other House colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and others who have had the privilege of knowing and working with him.

Our condolences go out to his wife Rhoda, his four sons and other family members, his staff, and especially Jan Faircloth, who has served him and the Fourth District for almost 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, Virginia has lost an effective servant who will sorely be missed.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE).

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, today Virginia and the Nation has lost an outstanding representative.

NORMAN SISISKY has helped many citizens throughout the Fourth District of Virginia. He fought for fiscal constraint and worked tirelessly for the defense of our Nation. Through his leadership, the seas and the skies are safer for America and her Armed Forces. Our Armed Forces would not be what they are today without the steadfast support that he gave to our national defense.

NORMAN was one of the finest businessmen in Virginia, and he shared his success not only with his family, but with many charitable endeavors throughout the Fourth District, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the Nation. His contributions to institutions of higher education in south central Virginia have helped many students gain a college degree.

It was an honor to serve in this body with NORMAN SISISKY, and also in the Virginia General Assembly, where he was a member of the house appropriations committee. He helped tremendously the Petersburg area of the Commonwealth and also all of Southside.

NORMAN was a personal friend, and I shall always remember the guidance he provided when I was first elected to the House of Representatives. I, like many others, am thankful for the opportunity to have known and worked with NORMAN SISISKY.

My deepest sympathies go to his family and his staff.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the senior Democrat of the Committee on Armed Services, on whose committee Mr. SISISKY was so proud to serve.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, words are difficult at a moment like this,

when we are all saddened and shocked at the loss of our friend NORMAN SISISKY, the true gentleman from Virginia. We will miss him so.

I sat next to him on the Committee on Armed Services now for some 19 years and shared friendship, comments, wit, knowledge, and advice from him. And all of this will be a lingering memory not just for me, but for those of us who worked with him.

The word "great" is used so often, particularly in this body, but NORMAN SISISKY was a great friend. He was a great legislator; Member of this body. He thought greatly. He had a vision for our national security, and yet he had great fondness for the young men and women in all uniforms.

As has been spoken, he was such a champion of shipbuilding. But it was more than that. He was a champion for a strong and safe and secure America.

We will long remember NORMAN SISISKY as a great person. Longfellow once penned in his poem "Psalm of Life" the words, "Lives of great men all remind us we can make our lives sublime, and, departing, leave behind us footprints on the sands of time." Well, NORMAN SISISKY left some wonderful footprints along Virginia, here in Washington, D.C., in this Chamber, and in our country.

Our sympathy goes to Rhoda, his four sons, and the rest of his family.

□ 1500

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS).

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a patriot and true Virginia gentleman, our friend and colleague NORM SISISKY. The Commonwealth of Virginia lost a great American today with the passing of NORM SISISKY. I had the pleasure of getting to know him when I arrived here in Congress and soon established a friendship and a strong admiration for one of Virginia's most honorable public servants.

NORM served Virginia with great integrity and honor and consistently put the interest of Virginia ahead of politics. With NORM, it was not a Republican or a Democrat issue. It was a Virginia issue. NORM SISISKY's leadership within the Virginia delegation will be sorely missed. His unyielding support of our Armed Forces served as an inspiration for all lawmakers who embraced the dedication and sacrifices of our men and women in uniform.

Congressman NORM SISISKY will always be remembered for his service to Virginia and his devotion to the ideals that he held so dear. His family, staff and other loved ones will be in my prayers.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the chairman of our Policy and Steering Committee on which Mr. SISISKY served.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this body has been diminished by the loss of two very similar Americans, one early in this year, Julian Dixon. Julian was an African American. He was an American. We have now, this morning, lost NORMAN SISISKY, a Jewish American. He was an American.

Both were similar in their approach. They were not partisan nor small. They were focused on the best interests of their communities, of their State, of their Nation. They were focused on their constituents and the people who served this great land. They were examples of what has made this country great.

I was here when NORM SISISKY came to the Congress of the United States, and because Maryland and Virginia are in the same region we did a lot of work together. NORM SISISKY became my dear and close friend.

NORM SISISKY was an extraordinary individual, with a sometimes perverse sense of humor. He would berate us one time and say, oh, you cannot do that, that is the worst thing in the world, and you knew if you just waited a little bit he was going to say, but I am with you.

He loved to do that. You could go to him for advice and counsel and know that you would get the wisdom of a man who had seen life, who had seen both advantage and adversity, and who accommodated both.

NORM SISISKY, Mr. Speaker, as all of us know, had a bout with cancer a few years ago. He faced that challenge with the same kind of courage that he faced life. We believed and he believed that he had overcome that challenge, and he returned to this body to, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), and his Virginia colleagues have so aptly stated, to contribute mightily to the security of this Nation and to international security.

NORM SISISKY was one of the experts in this House on national security. He was one, as I said before and others have said, who was respected on both sides of the aisle for working in a non-partisan, nonpolitical way to ensure the strength of our armed services.

In addition to the Maryland-Virginia connection, I have two major Naval facilities in my district, Patuxent Naval Air Station and the Indian Head Naval Ordnance Station.

As we have heard, NORM SISISKY had one of the great Naval installations in the world, if not the greatest, in his district. We worked very closely together. He was a giant as an advocate for the strength of the U.S. Navy. The Navy and all its personnel have lost one of their strongest advocates and closest friends.

NORM SISISKY was not the Member who spoke most frequently on this floor. Nor was he the Member, as some

have said, who tried to take the most credit for objectives accomplished. But, Mr. Speaker, there was no more effective, no more respected Member of this House, than our friend NORMAN SISISKY.

This body is a lesser place for the loss of NORMAN SISISKY. This country is a little less secure today because we have lost such a strong voice for national defense. The strength of our country is that his voice will be succeeded by others, his example will be followed by others, and his legacy will be long remembered by those who elected him time after time after time to serve them in this body, by those of us who had the honor to serve with him and by a grateful Nation.

God blesses America, Mr. Speaker. God blesses America, in my opinion, through His children. NORM SISISKY was a blessing to his family, to his State and to our Nation. May God extend His blessing to his wife, to his children, to his extended family and, yes, to that staff whom I visited just a few minutes ago, that they will be soothed in their grief, as will the family.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) for yielding the time and join in substantial sadness at the passing of a good and great friend.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK).

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true Virginian and a great American, Congressman NORM SISISKY. Congressman SISISKY has served the Commonwealth of Virginia and our country with great distinction. He defended our Nation during World War II as a sailor in the United States Navy. The people of Petersburg elected NORM to represent them as a member of the Virginia House of Delegates for 10 years. Then in 1982, he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives to represent Virginia's Fourth Congressional District, the district that abuts mine. He became a senior member of the House Committee on Armed Services where he became a champion of our military and veterans' issues.

In the House, he has worked to break bipartisan logjams on issues such as deficit reduction and campaign finance reform. Congressman SISISKY has been recognized as a hard worker and a skilled negotiator.

During his tenure, Congressman SISISKY took a lead in protecting Virginia's Naval and military facilities while also working to ensure that military spending decisions strike the proper balance between strategic necessity and fiscal prudence.

Congressman SISISKY has been recognized for his leadership on many issues, such as national security, veterans' affairs, Social Security and Medicare, small business, protecting the environment, eliminating government waste and reducing the deficit. His record of distinguished service to our country and to the people of Virginia demonstrates to all of us his commitment

to the values and principles of freedom and public service.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman SISISKY will be missed. I certainly will miss him. To NORM's wife Rhoda, his children, and his staff, I offer heartfelt condolences. Every one of them is in our prayers.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), who serves on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, someone once said that if you want to see the future or to see what is ahead of you, you need to get on the shoulders of a giant.

NORM SISISKY was a giant of a man. I came to know him very, very well. We were elected both in 1982, sworn into office in 1983, and for 19 years NORM and I sat next to each other. There was nobody that would look out for the needs of the military, the men and women in uniform, like NORM did. We had the privilege of traveling together, working together, and he was a constant source of inspiration and humor at our hearings.

The consummate businessman, he could figure quickly what the hidden costs were to the taxpayers in any plan that came before the committee, to the point that Chairman Dellums named him the "big kahuna," and most of us remember that in the committee when something was getting a little serious, we always knew that the "big kahuna" was around.

He was dedicated to Virginia, to the Navy, and to the betterment of our fighting men and women. He was always looking after his military bases in Virginia. We are going to miss a good friend.

I would like to take this opportunity to offer condolences to all of his family and to just tell them that we are praying for them. God bless America and NORM SISISKY.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our former colleague, NORM SISISKY. It is with great sadness that I join my colleagues in honoring one of Virginia's great public servants. While I only recently came to Congress, NORMAN has been a familiar figure in Virginia politics for many years. NORMAN spent a lifetime serving Virginia and the United States and we are all deeply indebted to this distinguished gentleman.

He was a true patriot. He enlisted in the Navy as a young man during World War II. His time spent in the Navy, though short, left a lasting impression and he never forgot that we must diligently tend to the needs of the men and women serving in our military. At the conclusion of the war, he became a successful businessman and transformed a small Pepsi bottling company

in Petersburg into a highly successful distributor of soft drinks throughout Southside Virginia.

NORMAN's background in the business community proved invaluable as he later decided to enter politics. NORM served in Virginia's general assembly for several years before being elected to the House of Representatives in 1982. Here in Washington, NORMAN was known as a staunch defender of our national security and worked tirelessly on behalf of the men and women who serve our Nation in the military. His booming voice echoed in the halls of Congress, and his light-hearted personality endeared him to his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

NORMAN was particularly effective at building coalitions in support of key programs and reaching across the aisle on matters of importance to all Virginians. From ensuring adequate funding for aircraft carriers and submarines to modernizing our weapons systems, he was an ardent voice on the Committee on Armed Services and an ally of every person who wears the uniform of the United States.

Back home, his reputation as an outstanding politician was unparalleled in the Commonwealth. His legacy of constituent service, consensus building and selfless service is a model for all Members of Congress. The people of the fourth district, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the United States of America have truly benefited from his dedicated service; and he will be sorely missed. NORMAN was successful in every endeavor, public or private; and we rightly celebrate his memory today. At this time I send my sincerest condolences to Rhoda and the entire Sisisky family.

□ 1515

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and valued member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), my friend and colleague, for yielding me this time this afternoon.

As we stand here this afternoon and pay tribute to a great American, I want us to reflect on what a great and good friend NORM SISISKY was to all of us. I cannot help but think that when we talk about America's greatest generation, we talk about people like NORM SISISKY.

We talk about people that were not afraid to stand up for this country, were not afraid to stand up for the things that were important to all of us as Americans. I also think about NORM's wit and his humor, which could either cut one down or brighten one's day, depending on what his mood was and what was being discussed.

I can remember one of the first things that I talked to NORM about, or he talked to me about, was early on in my first term when the gentleman

from California (Mr. HUNTER), another good friend and colleague who is present today, came in and got me to commit to the B-2 bomber. Little did I know that it was a choice between the B-2 bomber and another aircraft carrier. Well, it was not too hard to determine what side NORM SISISKY was on, and he came to me and asked for support. I said, well, I am sorry, but I already committed to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER). So he reminded me that there are things that we have to look at in balance, there are things that we have to do as Members of Congress that are important, and there are things and consequences if we do not support the United States Navy or certainly, if we support the Air Force at the expense of the United States Navy.

That is the kind of colleague and friend that he was. He did not hold anything against you. He always was gentle in the way that only he could be in bringing you along as a new Member of Congress.

I always enjoyed and felt reassured when I went into the hearing room and looked up on the top row and there was NORM SISISKY. There was an individual that one could go to for advice, one could go to for counsel, and the great institutional memory that he had about the things that are important as we sit as members of the Committee on Armed Services.

We never know when our time is going to be up; and certainly for us, it is a great loss. It is a situation that we hope we never have to face, but we must face as Members of this body. I am haunted by a question that I was asked here on the floor by one of the young people in the Close Up Foundation who asked, do you ever have Members of Congress die in office? All too often we do. I am just in my third term, and we have stood in this House too many times paying tribute to our colleagues, too many times giving our condolences to their families; but that is what life is about. That is what Norm Sisisky was about. He was about doing the right thing. He was about being a good friend and certainly being a great American.

We as a country, I think, can be proud to have the NORM SISISKYS. Certainly his wife and his four sons and his grandkids that I know he loved dearly, because he always talked about them, and we as a country have suffered a great loss, but the legacy of NORM SISISKY is a legacy of those that sit on that top row in the Committee on Armed Services that offer the advice and the counsel and the reassurance that things are going to be okay. I know we are going to be fine, but we are still going to have to come to terms with the realization that this is a great loss of a great American for our country.

So I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I thank NORM SISISKY for his counsel, his friendship and, most of all, sharing his humor with us.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

I want to remind the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), my good friend, that while NORM SISISKY wanted you to go with that aircraft carrier and I wanted you to go with more B-2 bombers, that we launched the Ronald Reagan the other day, an aircraft carrier; but we have no B-2 bomber that has been launched lately under the Ronald Reagan name or any others, so NORM was pretty effective in securing the interests of the United States Navy and American naval power.

Mr. Speaker, I think one thing that NORM's passing does for us, for all of us, is to give us a sense of the value of our own service of this House. I think the value of our service is manifested in the people we serve with. Sometimes we do not appreciate our colleagues and sometimes we do. I feel good now about all the times that NORM and I would stand at the back and I would put my arm around him or he would put his arm around me and we would talk about national security and what was happening.

NORM was, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) just said, great counsel. He had this wonderful insight, he had a businessman's common sense, and he tempered it all with a lot of wit. I think one has to have a little sense of humor in this House of Representatives when working on these national issues. So we always looked forward to serving with NORM. When he would come in and take his seat there in the Committee on Armed Services and we were going to review a major issue, one could count on NORM SISISKY to give a lot of insight, shed some very valuable light on the subject, look at the subject very seriously, but at the same time maybe reflect a little humor, and there is a lot of humor out there to reflect on.

Mr. Speaker, I used to reflect on the fact that NORM was probably the best dresser in Congress, and it always delighted him when I would tell the assembled group, wherever it was, that his tie cost more money than my pickup truck, and it did. In fact, NORM was very kind when he remarked on the fact that I had recently put a new tire on my \$600 car. He was always very perceptive, and he saw I had a new tire on that a couple of months ago and he commented on that, and he made me feel very good about it.

NORM was a guy who was so valuable to this country, because he had the purest of American motives, and that was the national interest, at heart and we knew that. So whether one was talking to the Secretary of the Navy or the President of the United States, and I saw him engage with him here just a few months ago, one knew that he was going to cover an important subject. As a member of the team, if it was the Committee on Armed Services, you knew that your team was covering all

the bases, because NORM was out there making the points and collecting the information and analyzing and doing the right thing.

So the question came to me, it just hit me when I heard about NORM's death today, where will we get that wisdom? It is true that we will not; we will no longer be able to avail ourselves of that great wisdom and that great insight in making these judgments that are important to the country; and that is a real tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I think NORM would like us to go on and to remember that when we have a few harsh words for each other, which we sometimes have, and when our interests diverge; when it is necessary for us to get political, which at times we do, if we can just leaven all of that with a little smile and a little sense of humor, then we will be able to reengage and go forward and work for the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, when I think of NORM SISISKY, I think of the national interest.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CONDIT), who has been a former Chair of the Blue Dogs of which Mr. SISISKY was a proud member.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to stand to pay respect to NORM SISISKY and associate myself with the remarks of these colleagues up here today, many of them who have known him longer than I have. My affection for NORM SISISKY is that he was a man from the old school who believed in the strong values of this country. He believed in service and duty, and he respected service and duty. He loved this institution, he loved the House, and he loved the Members that serve here.

The best thing about NORM SISISKY for me was his sense of humor. Even though he was a very serious man, had serious thoughts and made serious dedications to public policy here in this institution, he understood that old saying that if you take yourself too serious, no one else will take you serious. So he always, I think, put a little bit of humor and wit in about everything we did. When we had meetings, he was the guy that would always break the ice. I do not care if it was a high-level meeting, sometimes his irreverent attitude would break the ice, cut through, and we would be much better and the meeting would be much more productive because of that.

So I am going to miss NORM because of that, because he was fun to be around. I enjoyed his company. He was a precious, dear person. And he would always, when he first met you, you would think he was going to be this gruff, tough, rough guy; and all of us in the House understood that we let him think that we thought that he was the rough, tough, gruff guy; but we knew inside he was a class gentleman. He was a precious, dear person that cared and had compassion for all people. I will miss that. I will miss him dearly.

Every time that I go back to that seventh row, first seat back there, I will always think of NORM SISISKY. We could find him there frequently.

So I want to take this opportunity to give my condolences to his family and just let them know, I am sure they already know this, but some of us they do not know, but he spoke of his family to all of us frequently. We know about his children; we know about his wife and his grandchildren. He loved them dearly. I am just honored that I had the opportunity to serve with NORM and consider him one of my friends.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) for making it possible for us to speak.

I was stunned and saddened earlier this afternoon when I learned about NORM's passing. He was a good friend. We do not have assigned seats here in the House, but I think everybody in the House knows that NORM SISISKY sat in the second seat from the back on the aisle. Every time we had a series of votes, we would come here and find NORM right there. He was a true and true Democrat, but he never hesitated to reach right across that aisle and work with Republicans on not only national defense issues, but issues of all kinds. He was a man of conscience, and I enjoyed working with him on many things and, above all, he was a straight shooter. You could know exactly where you stood with NORM SISISKY right from the start. He would tell you, and if he said he was with you, he was going to stick with you and if he was not with you, he would tell you that right at the outset.

NORM was very, very proud of his family, his children and his grandchildren; and he talked of them very often. He loved life. He enjoyed every day and had a wonderful sense of humor, as the gentleman from California just indicated, and was somebody that I enjoyed stopping by the second seat from the rear back there and talking to NORM on many, many days.

I am going to miss him deeply. I give my deepest sympathy to his family, to his constituents. We have lost truly a great American and someone who will be very hard to replace.

□ 1530

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), a member of the leadership team and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, this is one of those moments in life where I find myself full of feelings and emotions, and yet at a lack of words to explain how I and we all feel about the loss of NORM SISISKY, our dear friend. Just yesterday I sent NORM a note in which I said, "I hope and pray you will

be back soon, because I miss not being able to kid around with my friend on the floor."

As has been said by so many here, NORM SISISKY was a person who took the serious business of this Congress seriously, but yet always did so in good humor, without taking himself too seriously.

In a body where sometimes we do too many times take ourselves and our own actions seriously, it was so refreshing to have someone such as NORM SISISKY, who did have so much power and influence and respect in this body, yet handle his business within the proper perspective.

I will miss NORM SISISKY, my friend. I think America will miss the public servant NORM SISISKY. While he will not be with us here physically in this body, I can say that having served with him for 6 years on the Committee on Armed Services, my children and America's children live in a safer world today because of his contributions, and our grandchildren will live in a safer and better world tomorrow because of NORM SISISKY's contributions.

It has been said that when we leave this world, we leave all behind that we have, but we carry with us all we have given. By that standard NORM SISISKY had much to carry with him in his death, because he gave so much to each of us who were blessed to know him, and to so many Americans who would never know him by name, but who will surely, as we are here today, benefit from his public service.

To the Sisisky family I extend my prayers, thoughts, and deep gratitude for the sacrifices of not only NORM, but his entire family in the many years of public service.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the past 2½ years I have had the privilege of serving on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Someone mentioned that NORM sat in the back row on the Committee on Armed Services. He sat in the back row next to the gentleman from California (Mr. CONDIT) on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and he was an extraordinarily knowledgeable individual, contributed so much to the Intelligence Community, and was so well respected by all of the people in the Intelligence Community, whether it was the CIA Director or the folks from the Intelligence Community at the Department of Defense. He was, if not the most respected, one of the most respected people on that committee.

It is kind of ironic that we stand here today to honor NORM, and a few months ago we honored another member of that committee, our friend Julian Dixon from California, both outstanding individuals.

We do not really get to know somebody like NORM until one serves on a committee with him and really under-

stands his depth of knowledge, his intelligence, and his humor.

When I think of NORM, I think of two things: probably the most dapperly-dressed Member of this House, NORM was a dapper fellow; and someone who really cared about the institution, cared about the committees that he served on, particularly the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and somebody who is just a decent fellow and probably, more than anything else, a true Southern gentleman in the truest sense of the word, with respect for everyone on both sides, respect for the job, a high degree of integrity.

He will be missed greatly on both sides of the aisle for so much he has contributed to the people of his district, to the State, to the country, and to so many other things he was involved in.

So to the gentlemen from Virginia, Mr. WOLF and Mr. MORAN, I thank them for devoting this time to a wonderful Member of this institution.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader of the House.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding to me, and I rise today on behalf of all Members to give our prayers and sympathy and love to NORM SISISKY's family; to say to his constituents and all of his friends that we grieve together in his passing.

It was a shock today to learn of his death. It was unexpected. It came as a bolt out of the blue this morning. It hurts all of us. We are all diminished by his loss. He was a wonderful Member of this House, a wonderful representative of his people in Virginia.

I think the thing that I most remember about him is when I would come through this door that he always sat by, he was always happy. He was always upbeat. He was always funny. He always had a wonderful way of putting things that made fun of or light of, in a way, what was serious on the floor here in the right way.

He used to kid himself in front of others about the fact that he came from some wealth, but that he voted against his own interests, and that his family would be mad at him because he did that.

He had a love of life and a love of public service that I will never forget. He was a real patriot. He loved this country, and he wanted our country to do better. He wanted us to prosper. He wanted our people to be secure.

He cared a lot about national defense. He cared a lot about our ability to have a strong defense and to have a strong intelligence effort. He asked me to be on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and I worked to get him there. He enjoyed his days there. He did a wonderful job there. He added a lot to that effort.

He was always bipartisan. I never heard him say a harsh word of anyone

on either side of the aisle. He loved the House. He loved the fact that we decide things here on behalf of 250 million-plus people, and he was humble. He never saw himself as being better than anybody else anywhere in the country, anywhere in the world.

He was a son of Virginia, and he was a son of God. He believed in helping the people that he was sent here to help. Even though he was elected to the Congress, and he had greater personal wealth than probably most people in the country, he always remembered the people that had it tough and were poor and had a hard way to go.

We are going to miss NORM SISISKY. We grieve with his family, and we pray for their comfort and understanding at this time of great sorrow. We include every Member of this body in grieving the passing of a great American patriot.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS).

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, like all my colleagues, I am just saddened and shocked by the news of the death of my good friend NORM SISISKY who was one of the folks who was kind of like the glue that helped hold this place together.

The minority leader is exactly right, there was not a partisan bone in NORM SISISKY's body. I had the pleasure of serving on the Committee on Armed Services with him, and for a short time on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Nobody cared about the men and women in every branch of the service as much as NORM SISISKY.

We were just in a hearing on the MWR panel down there, which NORM and I served on for 6½ years together. One of the Air Force generals was telling a story about NORM that is just so typical of him, in which he gave up some of his time during a break where he should have been devoting himself to his family, and he devoted himself to helping some young men and women in the United States Air Force. It just was so typical of NORM because he loved every branch of the service, and just stood for what is right about America.

NORM SISISKY stood out in this body as a man whose integrity and honesty was unparalleled. He was just a great gentleman in every respect, and I see my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CONDIT), sitting over there from California. It is really going to be strange, I say to the gentleman from California, when I come in and I do not see NORM sitting back there with you and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) and the other folks, and I do not hear that craggy old voice giving me the devil about something, like he did every time I walked in.

But we are just thankful for the time we were able to serve with NORM, and to his family we certainly extend our

heartfelt sympathy. Our prayers and thoughts will continue to be with them.

He was a great American, he was a great friend, a great Member of this body. He will truly be missed.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, a man for whom Mr. SISISKY had great respect, not only for the breadth and depth of knowledge on national security affairs, but his own personal integrity.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, NORM and I came here together in 1983, and we sat beside each other for 18 years on the Committee on Armed Services and on several of its subcommittees.

He was tough-minded, tough-talking. When he asked questions, there were no punches pulled. Any witness who came before our committee with NORM on the top row had better be on his toes.

But at the same time, he was, as everyone who has spoken here today has said, gracious, generous, thoughtful, a gentleman to his very core. He was always the first to see the humor in everything, always ready with a quip, his ready wit.

He came here rather late in life for a freshman Member of Congress. He stayed. I do not think he ever thought he would be here for 18 years when I first met him in 1983, but he stayed because he loved it.

Not only that, NORM knew just what we have testified to here today, he knew he made a difference. He made a difference in this institution, he made a difference in the Armed Forces of the United States, he made a difference in this country.

He took great satisfaction in serving his country. He had great wealth, but I do not think it gave him nearly the pleasure that he got from serving here in the House of Representatives for 18 long years. He was well into his seventies, and despite a bout with colon cancer, despite his advancing age, he was in the saddle riding herd literally every day, tireless. He never quit. He virtually died with his boots on, which I am sure is the way NORM would have wanted to go.

Sitting beside him all these years, I was privy to his commentaries. When witnesses were testifying, we would get a subtext from NORM SISISKY. He would provide a commentary: where the witness was coming from, where the question was coming from. I used to listen to the witness with one ear and to NORM with the other ear, and marvel at what he knew.

He understood the big picture. He understood the institutional aspects. He understood the Pentagon, with the four military departments, but he also understood the nitty-gritty, because he was out in the field, both in his dis-

trict, down in Norfolk, and Hampton Roads and Fort Monroe, out in the country and traveling all the time, and learning as he traveled.

This was not a pleasure trip for him. What he acquired from all of that was just enormous. We have lost a treasure-load of institutional memory with the passage of NORM SISISKY.

The House will go on without NORM, but it will not be quite the same without him. Certainly the top row on the Committee on Armed Services will not be quite the same. The questions will not be quite as hard, the inquiry will not be quite as searching, and the glue that hold us together, builds coalitions across the aisles on different issues, will not be quite as binding without NORM there putting the deals together.

It was my pleasure for all these years to know him as a friend. It was my privilege to serve with him as a colleague. My only regret is that I did not have a chance to say good-bye.

But my heart goes out to all his family, whom he talked about, whom he loved dearly and spoke of often. If it is any consolation to them, I hope they will know that a little of NORM lives in all of us who served with him, who admired and loved him, who emulated him, and will still continue to emulate him as what I consider a model Member of Congress.

□ 1545

They should know and the whole country should know that he served here and made this great institution of the Republic the kind of institution the framers intended for it to be. He was a great American, a great patriot, and we will all miss him dearly.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to speak but for a few minutes here, because I did not know NORM SISISKY nearly as long as or nearly as well as so many Members that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) just talked about that, that long relationship from day 1 with NORM SISISKY. But it was so much of the NORM SISISKY that I have gotten to know in the last 4 years, seeing him sit back there with the gentleman from California (Mr. CONDIT) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), my good friend.

I just had an opportunity less than a month ago to be on half a dozen military bases with NORM SISISKY over several days and several days where his health never came up. He was out there with the young men and young women who put their lives on the line, who give of themselves, to our country, as everybody probably in this Chamber has seen him do it one time or another responded in a beaming sort of way when those young sailors, those young airmen and women, young service people of all kinds would come to him at

a breakfast or a dinner, he knew already many of the concerns they would have, because he was working on trying to solve those problems.

He was a person who saw humor in life, and humor is one of the things that keeps this place going. In fact, whenever we fail to be able to see the human folly of some of the things that we all are a part of, we fail to enjoy life like NORM enjoyed life.

I know on sitting with him on the airplane and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), my good friend, who is Chairman on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, he was with us on that trip, but sitting with NORM on the airplane, he was telling me of a recent visit to one of the military installations in his district.

He said as he was walking through, he saw somebody and they said we knew you were coming today, we saw the message from the top brass yesterday, and the message was "daddy's coming." And he saw himself in that role for the young men and young women that defend our country.

And so for the rest of that trip after he told me the story, I would say daddy, it is time to go. Daddy it is time to do whatever it was time to do next. But he had that love for people, and there is a big bearlike reaching out to others.

He loved the service in this body. He clearly was up for every moment of it. Again, just literally less than 4 weeks ago was in a period of about 4 days and 6 far-flung military installations checking to be sure that the people who are defending our country were getting what they needed and if they were not, get what they needed, trying to figure out how he could help get it for them.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have served with him. I am honored to get to be here on the floor today as his good friends recognize the service of a great American, of a great patriot, of somebody who really was in so many ways the epitome of what can happen in this country.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), a member of the Committee on Armed Services, another friend of Mr. SISISKY's.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) for yielding the time to me allowing me this opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take this opportunity to express my condolences to the family and to the children. I want to share with you that I had the opportunity for the last 4 years on the Committee on Armed Services to have met NORM SISISKY.

When I first came, one of the first difficulties that I had, I had lost a base in San Antonio, and I knew that he was very strong, very supportive of depot, and I had the opportunity to make some comments. I thought that I was going to have some problems with him,

because I knew that he felt very strongly on the other side. But I quickly found that he was a gentle man, very respectful, despite the fact that we disagreed on that one issue.

He recognized my situation and understood where I was coming from. I wanted to come today to say thanks to the family having allowed him to serve not only the State of Virginia and his constituency, but the Nation. He is an individual that was there for our troops, was there for our Nation, and I know that he has had a tremendous impact.

I just want to quickly just indicate, there is a poem by Robert Frost that says, "Two roads diverged in a wood, and I—I took the one less travelled by, and that has made all the difference." There is no doubt that NORM has taken that road less traveled by and has made all the difference for all of us.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I will stand here and say it has been a very tough year for the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. This is the second Member we have lost, as well as a staffer in the past year. Obviously, I am devastated again to lose such a valuable Member as NORM.

To say, as others have said before me, I was watching the monitors as I was coming from another meeting, members of my committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) I heard say that NORM was the one who asked the tough questions. It is true. NORM did ask the tough questions, but he asked them in such a pleasant way, and no matter how well I knew the subject of a hearing in the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, he would inevitably surprise me with some question that had not been scripted, that nobody had thought of, right out of the wild blue yonder caught everybody off guard and that was just his hallmark and his style.

You always had to laugh. I always looked forward when it was time to yield to NORM for his questions. I am going to miss that.

It is true that NORM was an inveterate traveller, did so much business looking after our troops, our equipment, our state of readiness, what was going on around the world. He really cared about the men and women. I do not know how old NORM was, I suspect a little older than I am, and I know that I find that the early mornings seemed pretty early and the late evenings seemed pretty late, but he was always there to come down in the morning for that breakfast with the troops or the group, whoever was there that we were meeting, he was always there ahead of me. It seems like he was always getting more mileage out of the evening than I was too towards the end of the day.

I asked NORM to take a number of side trips with me on committee business, and he was always game. I got him in some mighty small planes in some mighty uncomfortable places in the course of some of those trips. I never heard him complain. He was always game for the next one when we went out, and he sure did his job extremely well.

To Rhoda and the family, Mariel and I will send our deepest condolences and our sympathy. We know you are going to miss him terribly as well all his friends here. The next time I get on that plane and look in NORM's seat, I know that I am going to have the same feelings I have now. It is not fair somehow, but it is what we have to deal with.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), another friend of Mr. SISISKY's, specifically a leader of the Blue Dog Coalition and generally a leader of the House as well.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I join with all of my colleagues in expressing our sincere regret at the passing of NORM. I never had an opportunity to serve with him on a committee, but I enjoyed the replay of many of the committee sessions on the Committee on National Security and hearing what had gone on and the tremendous role that NORM played.

One thing I never heard was anything that came from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. He respected that committee a great deal and respected the precedents of that committee. I never sat with him on a committee, but I sat with him on "red-neck row" in this House and enjoyed many of his comments as I would sit and listen to his commentary of going on with what various Members of this body do and say on this floor, including myself.

There is no greater criticism that can come, and then come from the heart of NORM SISISKY, and you take it that way. I always appreciated his concern of the Virginia peanut farmers. He always was asking me as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, Are we taking care of my peanut farmers. He had a deep-seated interest in his constituency. He was truly a Member's Member.

There are few of us that can reach the standard that NORM did in bringing a true love for this institution and a true love for the armed services of this country. I know that words cannot truly express our feelings about NORM today.

We will miss him. This body will miss him, but this Member, too. As so many others have said, our hearts and prayers go out to the family of NORM and say we appreciate you sharing him with us. The 16 years that I have had the privilege of knowing and working with him, he has made my life richer for it, and he has made this body richer

for it. And we truly, NORM, will miss you.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We know there will be a great many Members at services for NORM, and his spirit will live on in this Chamber as well as all the great accomplishments he achieved for his constituents, for the Commonwealth of Virginia and for the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to thank all the Members for coming, and every word that was said today was accurate. I listened to every word, every word, from where NORM sat, to his sense of humor, to his character, to the comment about being a Member's Member, to the comment with regard to bipartisanship, every word, I can attest and I know that Members that are listening here, and every word that was said today was accurate.

NORM made a great difference, and he will be missed.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to honor my friend and colleague, NORMAN SISISKY, who served the Commonwealth of Virginia and our nation with distinction in the House of Representatives for the last 18 years of his life.

NORMAN's devotion to his country began right after graduation from high school. He enlisted in the Navy and served during World War II. After his release from active duty in 1946, he returned to his home in Richmond and entered what is known today as Virginia Commonwealth University. He graduated in 1949 with a B.S. degree in Business Administration.

All of NORMAN's House colleagues were well aware of his reputation as a businessman. He transformed a small Pepsi bottling company in Petersburg into a successful distributorship of soft drinks throughout southern Virginia. I know there are countless witnesses who have appeared before subcommittees and committees on which NORMAN sat that squirmed in their seats as they faced his probing questions concerning what struck him as the antiquated methods by which the Department of Defense acquired its equipment, services, and construction projects.

In 1973, NORMAN was first elected to public office, representing Petersburg as a Delegate in the Virginia General Assembly. He served five terms in the General Assembly before being elected to Congress in 1982. He was currently serving in his 10th consecutive term in the House.

A senior Member of the Armed Services Committee, NORMAN was Chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee in the 103rd Congress. He was the ranking Democrat on the Procurement Subcommittee in the current Congress, as well as a member of the Readiness Subcommittee and the Panel on Morale, Welfare, and Recreation. He was also one of the Armed Services Committee's "crossover" members to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

NORMAN was a valued member of the Armed Services Committee whose commitment to the security of this country was second-to-none—Republican or Democrat. He

was also a proud member of the informal "Blue Dog" Coalition and one of its tireless advocates of increased defense spending—especially for aircraft carriers! I remember vividly NORM's handing out "Your Name Here . . . CVN 76" hats in an effort to get that carrier fully funded on schedule. I think he was as pleased as I when it was recently christened the U.S.S. *Ronald Reagan*!

I traveled abroad with NORM on several occasions, and I greatly enjoyed his friendship. He was an exceptional politician and a patriotic American. Not only shall I miss his wise counsel but also his sense of humor. I am thankful to have known and worked alongside him for the past 18 years.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife, Rhoda, his four sons, and their families.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing our deep sense of loss on the passing of our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SISISKY.

NORM has served in this body for nearly 20 years, and beyond any doubt is one of those Members whose presence made a true difference. NORM was a "gentleman's gentleman", who earned the respect of all of us on both sides of the aisle.

NORM, prior to his Congressional career, was a soft drink and beer distributor. From that experience, he was able to share with all of us what it means to be a small business entrepreneur during the latter part of the 20th century. He shared with us the trials and tribulations of the American small business owner, his sincere belief that the bureaucracy was stifling free enterprise and initiative, and his contention that it was our responsibility to cut through red tape and other burdens upon the average taxpayer. NORM was a natural fit on the Committee on Small Business, and served with great distinction on that body for many years.

NORM SISISKY, as a Navy veteran, was also proud of his service on the Armed Services Committee, and was a font of knowledge and experience on that Committee. He was devoted to assuring our Nation's strong defense.

We extend our deepest condolences to his devoted wife, Rhoda, their four sons, Mark, Terry, Richard and Stuart, and most especially to the people of Virginia's 4th Congressional District, whose loss of a superb representative is shared by all of us as a loss to our nation.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 107.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu-

nication from RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, March 29, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 228(d)(1) of the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (P.L. 106-181), I hereby appoint the following individual to the National Commission to Ensure Consumer Information and Choice in the Airline Industry:

Mr. Thomas P. Dunne, Sr. of Maryland Heights, MO.

Yours Very Truly,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now entertain 1-minute speeches.

HONORING REVEREND DR. THURMOND COLEMAN, SR.

(Mrs. NORTHUP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize someone who has devoted his time and energy to his church and his beliefs. Reverend Dr. Thurmond Coleman, Sr., pastored the First Baptist Church in Jeffersontown, Kentucky for 45 years.

Upon his retirement, he was named Pastor Emeritus. Dr. Coleman has served as the Moderator of the Central District Association for the past 6 years, and his tenure will end in July 2001.

He is a community leader serving on the Louisville League, the NAACP, and the Kentucky Human Rights Commission. Dr. Coleman is also a civil rights leader bringing about reconciliation between black and white Baptists and among all races and religion.

On Saturday, March 31, 2001, Dr. Coleman will be honored for his hard work and dedication as Moderator of the Central District Baptist Association, which has a membership of 147 churches.

Individuals such as Dr. Coleman play a vital role in reconciling the divisions in our community and in building the hope of a better future for each person. I am proud to bring your attention to Reverend Dr. Thurmond Coleman, Sr., and all of and of all of his achievements.

□ 1600

MENTORING FOR SUCCESS

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, if we could create a program that would reduce absenteeism from school by 53 percent, drug and alcohol abuse by

nearly 50 percent, teenage violence by 30 percent, and substantially reduce teenage pregnancy, gang involvement and dropout rates, would this be a desirable program? Obviously, the answer to this question is yes.

Next week, I will introduce the Mentoring For Success Act, establishing a national mentoring program through the Department of Education. This legislation will connect children who have the greatest need with a responsible adult mentor who has received training and support in mentoring, been screened through background checks, and is interested in working with youth.

An adult mentor provides a child with support, encouragement, academic assistance, and a vision of what is possible.

Each year, we spend billions of dollars on education, yet see little improvement in dropout rates and test scores. We spend billions of dollars on incarceration and juvenile justice programs, yet have very high recidivism rates.

Through one-to-one mentoring, we have a chance to make a difference. Please join me in support of the Mentoring For Success Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE 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 Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOSS 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 Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LANGEVIN 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 Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SKELTON 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 Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ACHIEVEMENTS OF CESAR
CHAVEZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had introduced a resolution, H. Res. 105, recognizing the achievements of Cesar Chavez, the founder and president of the United Farm Workers of America.

It is introduced and supported by the United Farm Workers and supported by all Members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, and many of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives.

This resolution encourages a Federal holiday for March 31 in honor of Cesar's birthday. It encourages States to make March 31 a holiday. It encourages schools to incorporate lessons on Cesar Chavez's life and work into their curriculum and to learn about their curriculum.

Cesar Chavez is a true American hero. He carried the torch for justice and freedom. He was a hope for thousands of impoverished people. He was a beacon of light for many Latinos in the community, a giant of a man. His legacy will live on in our hearts, in our hopes, in our dreams.

Chavez was born near Yuba, Arizona, and grew up in a migrant labor camp. In 1938, the Chavez family had joined some 300,000 migrant workers who followed the crops in California.

Migrant workers had no permanent homes. They lived in overcrowded quarters, without bathrooms, electricity, or running water. Can one imagine individuals living without bathrooms, electricity, or running water? Cesar Chavez lived there as a poor individual.

Going to school was not easy for a child of a migrant worker since they are always away and on the move. Can one imagine the impact it has on many of the children who want to get a good quality of education but are moving from one camp to another?

He noticed that the labor contract and landowners exploited the workers. He tried reasoning with farm owners about higher pay and better working conditions. But most of the fellow workers would not support him for fear of losing their jobs.

Yes, people want to obtain jobs and sometimes are not willing to speak up; and sometimes we do need a leader. So we had a leader in Cesar Chavez. As a

solitary voice, Chavez had no power, but was willing to stand up and speak out.

In 1944, he joined the United States Navy and served his country, a man who had fought for the same principles that many of us had fought for or served this country. For the freedoms that we enjoy, for the justice, the equality, he went in to preserve that and served in 1944.

Upon returning, he would no longer stand to see the workers being taken advantage of, watching as they worked long hours for low pay, and I state for low pay.

At the age of 35, he left his well-paid job to devote his time to organizing the farm workers into a union, a union that would help improve the quality of life for many individuals.

In the early 1960s, Chavez became co-founder and president of the United States Farm Workers. In 1968, Chavez gained attention as the leader of a nationwide boycott of California table grapes in a drive to achieve labor contracts. In fact, some of us still do not eat grapes even now today, even though that boycott is over.

He led his organization to increase protection for workers, for health and safety, to ban child labor from the fields, to win fair-wage guarantees, and to fight against discrimination in employment and the sexual harassment of female workers.

Chavez also used nonviolent tactics to bring attention to the plight of farm workers. His efforts are a shining example to young people and can provide an invaluable lesson for what he or she believes in if they work hard, perseverance, and people banning together, solidarity and in unity, that changes can come about.

He organized the farm workers to stand together and in one loud voice say, "From this day, we demand to be treated like men. We are to be respected as human beings. We are not slaves, and we are not animals, and we are not alone. We will not work for low wages.

"You live in big farm homes, but we live in boxes. You have plenty to eat while our children must work in our fields for food. You wear good clothing, but we are dressed in rags."

When one looked at Cesar Chavez and the family and many of the *camposinos*, farm workers, they did not have what many had. All they wanted was decent wages and good jobs.

"Your wives are free to make good homes, while our wives work in the field along pesticides. Fighting for social justice is one of the most profound ways in which a man can recognize another man's dignity."

Cesar Chavez's dedication to social justice meant great sacrifices. It was a great sacrifice for many all over the world, all over the United States. He often held hunger strikes to protest the farm workers' condition. These hunger strikes are believed to have helped contribute to his sudden death in 1993.

I attended the funeral where over 50,000 people attended. On September 2, 1994, California enacted a Cesar Chavez Holiday Bill designating March 31 as a State holiday, a measure that I voted for while I was in the State of California in the legislature. This measure is about respect, respect.

That is why I have introduced a similar measure here in Congress, respect for a great man who has changed the world by using nonviolence. This is about justice. This is about equality. This is about human dignity and only wanting to live for a better quality of life, not only for himself, but for many others.

The slogan that we often use and have heard is: *Si se puede*, which means, yes, you can; *viva la huelga* (long live the struggle); and *viva la causa* (long live the cause).

Let me tell my colleagues that is why, when we look at this resolution, we say that it is going to happen, and *si se puede* (it can happen), and one day we will have when we recognize Cesar Chavez.

This is the beginning of the awareness of a great man who has honored our Nation, who has served our country and sacrificed himself for the betterment of others.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity, first of all, to congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) on his efforts on this resolution. I take pride in being here with him and taking this opportunity as I rise to honor an inspired and beloved man, Cesar Estrada Chavez.

Today we honor him in anticipation of his birthday and ask the Members of the House to pay tribute and pay respect to a man who brought dignity to every man and woman and child in this country as we struggled from the fields.

Chavez was bestowed one of the greatest honors when he was introduced into the U.S. Department of Labor's Labor Hall of Fame. This honor is solely reserved for Americans whose contributions to the field of labor have enhanced the qualities of lives for millions. Not only did he enhance the lives of millions, but he touched deeply those individuals with compassion and commitment and, as we used to refer, *to la causa* (the cause).

Many of my colleagues may remember one particular time when he had 25 days of fast that was conducted by Chavez, which reaffirmed the United Farm Workers' commitment to nonviolence.

For those of us who lived through that period of time, we heard of the great odds that Chavez faced as he led the successful 5-year strike and boycott. Through these boycotts, Chavez was able to forge a national support of coalitions of unions, church groups, students, minorities, and consumers.

By the end of the boycotts, everyone knew the chant that unified all groups,

si se puede, yes we can. It was a chant of encouragement, pride, and dignity.

Although we knew him for his advocacy on behalf of farm workers, he was influential in other areas. He helped communities mobilize by assisting them with voter registration drives and insisting that the minority communities had just as much right to have equitable access to quality education.

The migrant schools that we find today is a tribute to his work and his hard efforts in assuring that those youngsters, those children of those workers should have access to a good quality education. He helped to mobilize by continuing to move forward in these areas.

Many of us today look to Chavez for the inspiration even here in the House of Congress. Those of us who continue his fight to make sure that the voice of those voiceless is heard and that the dignity that is deserved by all laborers, no matter what their work, should continue.

America has seen few leaders like Chavez. To honor his work and deeds, I ask each Member to be supportive of these efforts and this resolution.

I want to just briefly also just talk about the fact that here was a man who organized these individuals who did not even get minimum wage, a very difficult task to do. Yet he was out there struggling.

When one got a chance to meet him, he was a quiet, very dignified, very nonviolent individual, very unassuming. Yet he was a giant of a man.

I know Art Rodriguez who has followed after him. I had the pleasure of being at St. Mary's University with him as a student. To me, Cesar Chavez meant a great deal. Because as I started trying to get my degree in pharmacy, I changed and got involved in the movement during that time, even changed my degree to political science and in other fields and got involved in politics.

My wife was also involved in the boycotts, in lettuce as well as the grapes. That is how I met my wife, Carolina.

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal that he brought to us, and that was the fight and dignity that every worker should have, that every individual should be treated in an equitable manner. In terms of the struggle we see now, I know that he would be saying, if you want to bring in a bracero program or a guest worker program, you make sure that you treat those people in the same way as you treat the 300,000 that we just brought over with high-tech technology and degrees, to make sure that they get treated in the same manner.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA), and the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), who have brought forward year after year resolutions and efforts in creating a holiday for Cesar Chavez.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) for this special order and for his resolution, H. Res. 105, that will bring us toward a great national recognition for Cesar Chavez.

We call today in the strongest possible terms for Cesar Chavez's birthday on March 31 to be recognized as a Federal holiday. This great national hero should be recognized with a national holiday. This Nation, this world, lost a great civil rights leader nearly 8 years ago, when Cesar Chavez died after a tireless struggle for social change. March 31 is a State holiday in my State of California, and countless schools, roads, libraries and other public institutions have been named after Cesar Chavez. It is now time that the entire Nation honor his enduring legacy with a Federal holiday.

We will hear tonight the poignant story of Cesar Chavez's life. I want to talk about the impact of his life on my life, and on the life of my constituents, and on the life and soul of this Nation.

He brought dignity and respect to farm workers who organized themselves and became an inspiration to all people engaged in human rights struggles throughout the world. It is time we pay him the respect that he deserves.

His work was holistic, helping to empower farm workers on their basic rights. Influenced by the writings of Gandhi and other proponents of non-violence, he began to register his fellow farm workers to vote and then to educate them about their rights to a safe workplace and a just wage.

Through the use of a grape boycott, Cesar Chavez, Delores Huerta, and others in the fledgling United Farm Workers were able to secure the first union contracts for farm workers in the United States. These contracts provided farm workers with the basic services that most workers take for granted today, services such as clean drinking water and sanitary facilities.

Because of Cesar Chavez's fight to enforce child labor laws, farm workers could also be certain that their children would not be working side by side with them and would instead attend the schools that he helped to establish. He made the world aware of the exposure to dangerous chemicals that farm workers and consumers face every day.

Cesar Chavez's influence extended far beyond agriculture. He was instrumental in forming the Community Service Organization, one of the first civic groups in the Mexican-American communities of California and Arizona.

He worked in urban areas, organized voter registration drives, brought complaints against mistreatment by governmental agencies. He taught community members how to deal with governmental, school and financial institutions and empowered many to seek further education and politics.

During a time of great social upheaval, he was sought out by people from all walks of life to help bring calm with his nonviolent practices. Our country's leaders joined Cesar Chavez literally, and often figuratively, in prayers and acts of solidarity in his many fasts for justice.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., sent Cesar Chavez a message on the occasion of Chavez's first fast. Dr. King told him, "Our separate struggles are really one. A struggle for freedom, for dignity and for humanity."

There are countless stories of judges, engineers, lawyers, teachers, church leaders, organizers and other hard-working professionals who credit Cesar Chavez as the inspiring force in their lives. I count Cesar Chavez and his work and nonviolent message among his most strong early influences.

Cesar Chavez will be remembered for his tireless commitment to improve the plight of farm workers, children and the poor throughout the United States, and for the inspiration his heroic efforts gave to so many Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation in every Congress since 1995 to create a Federal holiday to honor Cesar Chavez, and, along with the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA), to teach all of America about Cesar Chavez. Surely we can do this and pass such a resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H. Con. Res. 105 or H. Con. Res. 3. We must follow the lead of California, a State that knows the fruits of Cesar Chavez's labors firsthand, and designate March 31 as a Federal holiday to commemorate his birth. We should in Congress join all of those who have paid reverence to Cesar Chavez and to make sure that we honor him from this time forward by declaring March 31 as a Federal Holiday in honor of Cesar Chavez.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) for his efforts tonight.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia MR. MORAN.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Cesar Chavez was one of the greatest labor leaders of our time. His courage was unbelievable. Before he stood up to some of the most selfish and apparently uncaring farmers, he recognized that there were thousands, hundreds of thousands of people who were absolutely powerless, had no recourse, no redress for their grievances, were being exploited in our economy, particularly the agriculture economy.

Mr. Speaker, Cesar Chavez united them. We as a Nation, many of us, boycotted grapes and lettuce and felt that we were part of a movement greater than ourselves, and, in fact, in retrospect it was.

Many good farm workers were even worse treated. They were indentured servants. They would travel up the migrant stream, their children would

have to follow with them. The children would get no education. The few children of farm workers who got an education, it would not be from bilingual teachers. They lived in hovels off the road where no one would see them. They were huts, really, that were no more than chicken coops, many of them. They would have to borrow money for their rent and food and necessities. The harder they worked, many farmers would reduce the piece rates so they would always be in debt. They would have to come back the next year to pay off their debt. This became a tradition, an institution of exploitation.

Cesar Chavez gave these families hope. He was in the American tradition. I know there are still many families who hate him today for the fact that he turned around a system that was greatly to their benefit, but this was a man that was American in all of the finest traditions. We look to him for inspiration, and I would hope that we will find ways to continue to honor him.

Many of the children and grandchildren of the families that he organized now have a good education, have broken into the middle class, and have control over their lives, and they will soon forget why it is that they have a piece of the American pie now. They have some control over their lives. But in many instances, it is because of the courage, the character, the leadership of Cesar Chavez.

So I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for being here, and his colleagues from Texas and California, and I know there are many other colleagues, if the House was still in session, who would be here, but who had to leave. This House bears a real debt of gratitude to Cesar Chavez, as does the Nation.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN). As the gentleman noted, there are many individuals that would have been here to speak, as many individuals have signed on as cosponsor of this particular legislation.

I think it is important for all of us to recognize the importance of why we are doing this. We are doing it for an individual who has given so much of his life for this country, for this area; his leadership, his vision, his struggle to help many of the poor and disadvantaged, his inspiration, and what it means to all of us.

For some of us, unless we worked out in the fields, we really do not understand what it is like. I happened to have picked peaches and tomatoes out in the field, and let me tell my colleagues, it is not the best job. And when you see a lot of the people out there that are suffering, and you see the working conditions of individuals, and you see the children, you can see the emotion and the feeling of many of the children that are out there that are being affected.

What Cesar Chavez wanted to do was to make sure that the children also had

a better quality of life, of education. He said the children need a better education. He went through 36, 38 different schools, and so he said, I want the children to enjoy the same life that other children have. I want to make sure they have the opportunity.

When he looked in their eyes, when he looked at their clothes, and realized their opportunities, he could see the feeling of what was expressed in the dignity and the respect that he wanted for all children, for all individuals. When he looked at the campesinos and the working conditions, he wanted to make sure that they had a better opportunity not only for themselves, but for their families. He wanted to make sure they could put food on the table and they could take care of their clothes and their housing, have better conditions, so they would not have to worry about not having their health, not having to get up with pain to go back to work the next day because there was no service.

He wanted a better life, and he gave a lot of himself. He gave of himself for many individuals. Our Nation should be grateful for a great hero and a great American, a veteran, a leader, a visionary, an inspiration, a man that we all look to.

It is hard to be a leader, Mr. Speaker. It is hard to really be involved. It is easy to sit on the sidelines and say it is nice if someone does lead, but he was willing to pick up the banner. And now Arturo Rodriguez has carried that struggle and banner, carried it forth to make sure equality is there.

Another person along with him was Delores Huerta, who led in the struggle and the fight. She is ill today. Who knows why she is ill today and in the hospital. It could be because of all of the involvement she had, the struggles and the sacrifices she made; and many other individuals.

Mr. Speaker, we need to support this resolution encouraging a Federal holiday for March 31 in honor of Cesar Chavez's birthday, to encourage States to make March 31 a holiday, to encourage schools to incorporate a lesson on Cesar Chavez, because if they do not know his contributions, what he has done, then we are lost, because it is by learning each others' customs and traditions and our heritage that we know the struggle of individuals and we accept history. We need to work that into our curriculum.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice in honor of Cesar Chavez.

The son of a migrant farm worker, Cesar Chavez was not born into greatness. However, he became a great leader in our nation's continuing fight for labor and civil rights.

Cesar Chavez is best remembered as the founder and president of the United Farmworkers of America. The contributions of Cesar Chavez, however, were not limited to the fields. His voice reached the urban areas across America, particularly in the East Los Ange-

les neighborhoods where I was born and raised and now am proud to represent in Congress.

Cesar Chavez was part of the Latino empowerment movement of the 40's. Even today his memory inspires Latinos to be activists at the community, state and national levels.

Cesar Chavez understood that participation was the greatest tool to implement changes in our society. He once said,

It is possible to become discouraged about the injustice we see everywhere. But God did not promise us that the world would be humane and just. He gives us the gift of life and allows us to choose the way we will use our limited time on earth. It is an awesome opportunity.

The world is a better place because of the work of Cesar Chavez. The best tribute we can pay is to find opportunities in our own lives to continue his work in the fight for civil rights, and to encourage others to join us.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, Cesar Chavez is one of the most well-known and respected Latino civil rights leader in the United States and House Resolution 105 requesting a "Cesar Chavez National Holiday" would honor his legacy.

Most importantly, we need to keep his legacy alive by encouraging schools throughout the United States to teach about who Cesar Chavez was and what he did to improve our society.

Future generations should be given the opportunity to learn about Cesar Chavez and about the migrant farm worker community's struggle to achieve better living conditions, better wages, and protection from environmental contaminants.

He was a pioneer in addressing environmental justice issues related to pesticides in food and how farm workers' health was placed at great risks due to exposure to chemicals used in the fields.

As a State Senator in California through Cesar Chavez' inspiration and Dolores Huerta's friendship, I fought to improve the working, living, and safety conditions for farm workers.

I strongly supported a ban on methyl bromide, an acutely toxic pesticide responsible for poisoning hundreds of farm workers and many have even died due to methyl bromide poisoning.

I also fought to eliminate the dangerous "short hoe" method for strawberry workers, and worked for clean housing and bathrooms for farm workers.

I am very committed to continue Cesar Chavez' legacy by supporting pro-labor and environmental legislation in Congress to help remedy some of these environmental and labor injustices.

Cesar Chavez led by example and he motivated thousands of people to become involved in the migrant farm worker struggle by joining the United Farm Workers (UFW), which he co-founded.

He led successful strikes/boycotts against the agri-business growers who exploited workers by not providing health safeguards from pesticides, deplorable housing conditions, sexual harassment towards women, and having extremely low wages.

He obtained national/international support for the United Farm Worker (UFW) movement

through non-violence and using civil disobedience as an action to achieve justice.

He sacrificed his own health by fasting for extremely long periods of time to provide a voice for the migrant farm workers who were being exploited. He was humble and did not seek personal attention or glory for himself. He was passionate about helping his fellow migrant farm workers and he treated everyone with respect.

He passed away on April 23, 1993, at the age of 66 and his passion and commitment for social change, improved thousands of people's lives and inspired many others to continue the struggle.

I am one of those who is committed to keeping Cesar Chavez' struggle alive. He fought tirelessly until the end to help his fellow farm workers.

One major step in the right direction would be if the 107th Congressional session approves this House Resolution 105 to create a "Cesar Chavez National Holiday." This would officially recognize Cesar Chavez, as one of the most outstanding national Latino leaders in modern U.S. history.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay heartfelt tribute to Cesar Chavez, a man of courage, faith and love who shared his great strength with thousands and inspired millions of Americans. As a leader in the fight for social justice, he was a hero to farmworkers, to the Latino community, to the labor movement and to me.

Cesar Estrada Chavez was born on March 31, 1927, near Yuma, Arizona. In 1962, Cesar founded the National Farm Workers Association, later to become the United Farm Workers—the UFW. With persistence, hard work and faith, Cesar Chavez built a great union that galvanized the spirit of all people through commitment to the struggle for justice through nonviolence. He devoted his life to inspire his fellow farmworkers and to fire the conscience of the rest of us.

It was my great fortune to work with Cesar Chavez as a colleague and friend. Cesar's efforts were critical in focusing public attention on our nation's deplorable treatment of migrant farmworkers. Through his leadership and his legacy, the United Farm Workers has grown in strength in its efforts to achieve a lasting justice for farmworkers.

On this anniversary of his birthday, it is appropriate to mention that today across the nation and in this Chamber there are numerous efforts to commemorate the life and work of Cesar Chavez. I am grateful for the opportunity to express my thoughts about Cesar and to be among the many to celebrate the life of one of the most heroic figures in American history.

Cesar Chavez was a great man who exemplified justice, love and humility. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Cesar, whose dedication to the plight of farmworkers has inspired us all. I salute him for his courage and commitment to La Causa (the cause).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. BALDWIN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RODRIGUEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LANGEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OSBORNE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Resolution 107, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 30, 2001, at 10 a.m., in memory of the late Hon. NORMAN SISISKY of Virginia.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Neil Abercrombie, Anibal Acevedo-Vilá, Gary L. Ackerman, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Thomas H. Allen, Robert E. Andrews, Richard K. Arme, Joe Baca, Spencer Bachus, Brian Baird, Richard H. Baker, John Elias E. Baldacci, Tammy Baldwin, Cass Ballenger, James A. Barcia, Bob Barr, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Charles F. Bass, Ken Bentsen, Doug Bereuter, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Marion Berry, Judy Biggert, Michael Bilirakis, Rod R. Blagojevich, Earl Blumenauer, Roy Blunt, Sherwood L. Boehlert, John A. Boehner, Henry Bonilla, David E. Bonior, Mary Bono, Robert A. Borski, Leonard L. Boswell, Rick Boucher, Allen Boyd, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Corrine Brown, Sherrod Brown, Henry E. Brown, Jr., Ed Bryant, Richard Burr, Dan Burton, Steve Buyer, Sonny Callahan, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, Chris Cannon, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Benjamin L. Cardin, Brad Carson, Julia Carson, Michael N. Castle, Steve Chabot, Saxby Chambliss, Donna M. Christensen, Wm. Lacy Clay, Eva M. Clayton, Bob Clement, Howard Coble, Mac Collins, Larry Combust, Gary A. Condit, John Cooksey, Jerry F. Costello, Christopher Cox, William J. Coyne, Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr., Philip M. Crane, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Barbara Cubin, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Randy "Duke" Cunningham, Danny K. Davis, Jim Davis, Jo Ann Davis, Susan A. Davis, Thomas M. Davis, Nathan Deal, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, William D. Delahunt, Rosa L. DeLauro, Tom DeLay, Jim DeMint, Peter Deutsch, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Calvin M. Dooley, John T. Doolittle, Michael F. Doyle, David Dreier, John J. Duncan, Jr., Jennifer Dunn, Chet Edwards, Vernon J. Ehlers, Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr., Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Phil English, Anna G.

Eshoo, Bob Etheridge, Lane Evans, Terry Everett, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Mike Ferguson, Bob Filner, Jeff Flake, Ernie Fletcher, Mark Foley, Harold E. Ford, Jr., Vito Fossella, Barney Frank, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Martin Frost, Elton Gallegly, Greg Ganske, George W. Gekas, Richard A. Gephardt, Jim Gibbons, Wayne T. Gilchrest, Paul E. Gillmor, Benjamin A. Gilman, Charles A. Gonzalez, Virgil H. Goode, Jr., Bob Goodlatte, Bart Gordon, Porter J. Goss, Lindsey O. Graham, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Gene Green, Mark Green, James C. Greenwood, Felix J. Grucci, Jr., Gil Gutknecht, Ralph M. Hall, Tony P. Hall, James V. Hansen, Jane Harman, Melissa A. Hart, J. Dennis Hastert, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Robin Hayes, J. D. Hayworth, Joel Hefley, Wally Herger, Baron P. Hill, Van Hilleary, Earl F. Hilliard, Maurice D. Hinchey, David L. Hobson, Joseph M. Hoeffel, Peter Hoekstra, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Darlene Hooley, Stephen Horn, John N. Hostettler, Amo Houghton, Steny H. Hoyer, Kenny C. Hulshof, Duncan Hunter, Asa Hutchinson, Henry J. Hyde, Jay Inslee, Johnny Isakson, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Ernest J. Istook, Jr., Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Sheila Jackson-Lee, William J. Jefferson, William L. Jenkins, Christopher John, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Nancy L. Johnson, Sam Johnson, Timothy V. Johnson, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, Walter B. Jones, Paul E. Kanjorski, Marcy Kaptur, Ric Keller, Sue W. Kelly, Mark R. Kennedy, Patrick J. Kennedy, Brian D. Kerns, Dale E. Kildee, Carolyn C. Kilpatrick, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Jack Kingston, Mark Steven Kirk, Gerald D. Kleczka, Joe Knollenberg, Jim Kolbe, Dennis J. Kucinich, John J. LaFalce, Ray LaHood, Nick Lampson, James R. Langevin, Tom Lantos, Steve Largent, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, James A. Leach, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, Ron Lewis, John Linder, William O. Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, Zoe Lofgren, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Ken Lucas, Bill Luther, Carolyn B. Maloney, James H. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Edward J. Markey, Frank Mascara, Jim Matheson, Robert T. Matsui, Carolyn McCarthy, Betty McCollum, Jim McCreery, John McHugh, Scott McInnis, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. McKeon, Cynthia A. McKinney, Michael R. McNulty, Martin T. Meehan, Carrie P. Meek, Gregory W. Meeks, Robert Menendez, John L. Mica, Juanita Millender-McDonald, Dan Miller, Gary G. Miller, Patsy T. Mink, John Joseph Moakley, Alan B. Mollohan, Dennis Moore, James P. Moran, Jerry Moran, Constance A. Morella, John P. Murtha, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, George R. Nethercutt, Jr., Robert W. Ney, Anne M. Northup, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Charlie Norwood, Jim Nussle, James L. Oberstar, David R. Obey, John W. Olver, Seborom P. Ortiz, Tom Osborne, Doug Ose, C. L. Otter, Major R. Owens, Michael G. Oxley, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Collin C. Peterson, John E. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, David D. Phelps, Charles W. Pickering, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Richard W. Pombo, Earl Pomeroy, Rob Portman, David E. Price, Deborah Pryce, Adam H. Putnam, Jack Quinn, George Radanovich, Nick J. Rahall, II, Jim Ramstad, Charles B. Rangel, Ralph Regula, Dennis R. Rehberg, Silvestre Reyes, Thomas M. Reynolds, Bob Riley, Lynn N. Rivers, Ciro D. Rodriguez, Tim Roemer, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Marge Roukema, Edward R. Royce, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Jim Ryun, Martin Olav Sabo, Loreta Sanchez, Bernard Sanders, Max

Sandlin, Tom Sawyer, Jim Saxton, Joe Scarborough, Bob Schaffer, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Edward L. Schrock, Robert C. Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, John B. Shadegg, E. Clay Shaw, Jr., Christopher Shays, Brad Sherman, Don Sherwood, John Shimkus, Ronnie Shows, Rob Simmons, Michael K. Simpson, Norman Sisisky, Joe Skeen, Ike Skelton, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar S. Smith, Nick Smith, Vic Snyder, Mark E. Souder, Floyd Spence, John N. Spratt, Jr., Cliff Stearns, Charles W. Stenholm, Ted Strickland, Bob Stump, Bart Stupak, John E. Sununu, John E. Sweeney, Thomas G. Tancredo, John S. Tanner, Ellen O. Tauscher, W. J. (Billy) Tauzin, Charles H. Taylor, Gene Taylor, Lee Terry, William M. Thomas, Bennie G. Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, John R. Thune, Karen L. Thurman, Todd Tiahrt, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Patrick J. Toomey, James A. Traficant, Jr., Jim Turner, Mark Udall, Robert A. Underwood, Fred Upton, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, David Vitter, Greg Walden, James T. Walsh, Zach Wamp, Maxine Waters, Wes Watkins, Melvin L. Watt, J.C. Watts, Jr., Henry A. Waxman, Anthony D. Weiner, Curt Weldon, Dave Weldon, Jerry Weller, Robert Wexler, Ed Whitfield, Roger F. Wicker, Heather Wilson, Frank R. Wolf, Lynn C. Woolsey, Albert Russell Wynn, C.W. Bill Young, Don Young.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1396. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Donald L. Kerrick, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1397. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant Jack W. Klimp, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1398. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed issuance of an export license to Canada [Transmittal No. DTC 029-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1399. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed issuance of an export license to Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 030-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1400. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed issuance of an export license to Belgium [Transmittal No. DTC 031-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1401. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed issuance of an export license to Norway [Transmittal No. DTC 007-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1402. A letter from the Director of Government Affairs, Commission On International Religious Freedom, transmitting the Com-

mission's report entitled, "Report Of The United States Commission On International Religious Freedom On Sudan"; to the Committee on International Relations.

1403. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the 2000 annual report in compliance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, pursuant to 5 app; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1404. A letter from the Vice President for Legal Affairs, General Counsel and Corporate Secretary, Legal Services Corporation, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. HASTERT):

H.R. 7. A bill to provide incentives for charitable contributions by individuals and businesses, to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of government program delivery to individuals and families in need, and to enhance the ability of low-income Americans to gain financial security by building assets; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELDON of Florida (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HORN, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 1287. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. KELLY (for herself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 1288. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, relating to the airport noise and access review program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FRANK, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LEE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FILNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BACA, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BORSKI):

H.R. 1289. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit forced overtime hours for certain licensed health care employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island):

H.R. 1290. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to make such title fully applicable to the judicial branch of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DIN-

GELL, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. REYES, Mr. STUMP, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BUYER, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. QUINN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. EHRlich, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DREIER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SCHROCK, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KING, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 1291. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of educational benefits for veterans under the Montgomery GI Bill; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SKELTON:

H.R. 1292. A bill to require the President to develop and implement a strategy for homeland security; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Judiciary, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEY (for himself, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 1293. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to ensure the continued stability of the Federal deposit insurance system with respect to banks and savings associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. REYES):

H.R. 1294. A bill to amend titles 10 and 14, United States Code, to provide for the use of gold in the metal content of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. GRUCCI):

H.R. 1295. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make matching grants available to the States in order to encourage the establishment of State license plate programs to provide funds for the treatment of breast cancer, for research on such cancer, and for educational activities regarding such cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BONO (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BUYER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms.

PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. MICA, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 1296. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 9, United States Code, to provide for greater fairness in the arbitration process relating to motor vehicle franchise contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 1297. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the expansion, intensification, and coordination of the activities of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute with respect to research on pulmonary hypertension; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 1298. A bill to provide for the expansion of human clinical trials qualifying for the orphan drug credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. KING, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1299. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit to members of the Armed Forces who serve on active duty during a taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. CARSON of Indiana (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FORD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD):

H.R. 1300. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide grants to States to encourage media campaigns to promote responsible fatherhood skills, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 1301. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to apply the capital gains tax rates to capital gains earned by designated settlement funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 1302. A bill to prohibit certain foreign assistance to countries that consistently oppose the United States position in the United Nations General Assembly; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. DUNN:

H.R. 1303. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the rules relating to lessee construction allowances and to contributions to the capital of retailers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 1304. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for recycling or remanufacturing equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr.

BONILLA, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. COX, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EHR- LICH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FROST, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KING, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. NEY, Mr. OTTER, Mr. POMBO, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ROHR- ABACHER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SXTON, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THORN- BERRY, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. QUINN):

H.R. 1305. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the tax on beer to its pre-1991 level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. HINGHEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. ROYBAL- ALLARD, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. FRANK, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. LEE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CON- YERS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FROST, Ms. SOLIS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. REYES, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 1306. A bill to amend the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to require additional disclosures relating to exchange rates in transfers involving international transactions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1307. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to increase the Government contribution for Federal employee health insurance; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HULSHOF (for himself and Mr. BISHOP):

H.R. 1308. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-free expenditures from education individual retirement accounts for elementary and secondary school expenses, to increase the maximum annual amount of contributions to such accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. ABER- CROMBIE, and Mr. MALONEY of Con- necticut):

H.R. 1309. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage contributions by individuals of capital gain real property for conservation purposes, to encourage qualified conservation contributions, and to modify the rules governing the estate tax ex-

clusion for land subject to a qualified con- servation easement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. AN- DREWS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 1310. A bill to reform the Army Corps of Engineers; to the Committee on Transpor- tation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 1311. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to reduce fees on secu- rities transactions; to the Committee on Fi- nancial Services.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 1312. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to permit leave after the death of a spouse for widows and widowers with minor children; to the Com- mittee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Govern- ment Reform, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdic- tion of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 1313. A bill to provide grants to local educational agencies that agree to begin school for secondary students after 9:00 in the morning; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GILMAN, and Mrs. KELLY):

H.R. 1314. A bill to provide an enhanced penalty for threatening to kill, injure, or in- timidate an individual, or to cause property damage, by means of fire or an explosive on school property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 1315. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects located in the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NUSSLE (for himself, Mr. TAN- NER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jer- sey, and Mr. SNYDER):

H.R. 1316. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for energy efficient appliances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NUSSLE (for himself and Mr. HERGER):

H.R. 1317. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that qualified personal service corporations may continue to use the cash method of accounting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 1318. A bill to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Kazakhstan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. ENGLISH, Ms. HART, Mr. OLVER, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. LEE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr.

GUTIERREZ, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H.R. 1319. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act and other banking laws to protect consumers who avail themselves of payday loans from usurious interest rates and exorbitant fees, perpetual debt, the use of criminal actions to collect debts, and other unfair practices by payday lenders, to encourage the States to license and closely regulate payday lenders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SABO:

H.R. 1320. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to establish an effective real annual rate of interest at 6 percent for special obligations issued to the Social Security trust funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. BOSWELL):

H.R. 1321. A bill to amend the conservation provisions of the Food Security Act of 1985 to establish a voluntary, incentive-based conservation security program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. FROST, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. OLVER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FILNER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 1322. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide emergency protection for retiree health benefits; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OWENS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BALDACCI, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1323. A bill to narrow the digital divide; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PHELPS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1324. A bill to require Federal agencies to follow certain procedures with re-

spect to the bundling of procurement contract requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 1325. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3160 Irvin Cobb Drive in Paducah, Kentucky, as the "Morgan Station"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 1326. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 203 West Paige Street in Tompkinville, Kentucky, as the "Tim Lee Carter Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 1327. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to prohibit H-2A workers from bringing law suits against employers except in the State in which the employer resides or has its principal place of business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. OSE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. LEE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NEY, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GREENWOOD, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KING, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BUYER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CANTOR, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, and Mr. KUCINICH):

H.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution memorializing fallen firefighters by lowering the American flag to half-staff in honor of the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial Service in Emmitsburg, Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. REYES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. BACA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, and Mr. HOYER):

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised and updated version of the House document entitled "Hispanic Americans in Congress"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. DOYLE):

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution recognizing the importance of increasing awareness of the autism spectrum disorder, and supporting programs for greater research and improved treatment of autism and improved training and support for individuals with autism and those who care for them; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provi-

sions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Harriet Tubman should have been paid a pension for her service as a nurse and scout in the United States Army during the Civil War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOLF:

H. Res. 107. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable Norman Siskiy, a Representative from the Commonwealth of Virginia; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. KING, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. VITTEK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GOODE, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia):

H. Res. 108. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued on the subject of autism awareness; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. THURMAN (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. FROST, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. OSE):

H. Res. 109. A resolution recognizing the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Arbroath and supporting the establishment of a National Tartan Day to recognize the outstanding achievements and contributions made by Scottish Americans to the United States; to the Committee on Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

12. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Nevada, relative to Resolution No. 9 memorializing the United States Congress that the men aboard the C-54 that crashed on Mt. Charleston on November 17, 1955, G.M. Pappas, P.E. Winham, C.D. Farris, G.R. Fasolas, J.H. Gains, E.J. Urolatis, J.W. Brown, W.H. Marr, J.F. Bray, R.H. Kreimendahl, T.J. O'Donnell, F.F. Hanks, H.C. Silent, and R.J. Hruda, will be long remembered for their contribution to our national security which cost them their lives; and to declare the crash site of U.S.A.F. 9068 near the summit of Mt. Charleston as the "Silent Heros of the Cold War National Monument"; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Resources.

13. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to Resolution No. 401 memorializing the United States Congress to urge the United States Coast Guard to provide funding from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to remove the oil contained in the 27 vessels of the United States Maritime Administration's James River Reserve Fleet classified as in dire need of scrapping; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 8: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 17: Mrs. KELLY.

- H.R. 21: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 31: Mr. HEFLEY.
H.R. 36: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BARCIA, and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 37: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. GRAVES.
H.R. 179: Mr. GRAVES, Mr. OSE, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 184: Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 199: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. OSE, and Mr. GILMAN.
H.R. 208: Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 220: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 239: Mr. HOLT and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 244: Mr. SHOWS and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 265: Mr. BALDACC, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 267: Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 280: Mr. GOODE, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. TANCREDO.
H.R. 281: Mr. VITTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 298: Mr. SCHAFFER and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 303: Mr. KIRK, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. SHAW.
H.R. 324: Mr. BARCIA, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. PETRI, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 325: Mr. BOSWELL and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 336: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 356: Mr. SHOWS and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 369: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 381: Mr. ISTOOK and Mr. MICA.
H.R. 382: Mr. BARR of Georgia.
H.R. 397: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. COYNE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 415: Mr. FROST and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.
H.R. 435: Mr. KIRK.
H.R. 436: Mr. FROST, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PHELPS, and Mr. MATSUI.
H.R. 457: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 475: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 481: Mr. LAFALCE.
H.R. 489: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. NEY.
H.R. 490: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. NEY, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 498: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. OSE, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 499: Ms. WOOLSEY and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 500: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 507: Mr. BACA and Mr. BARR of Georgia.
H.R. 510: Mr. QUINN.
H.R. 572: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 582: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 602: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. KIND, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 606: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 612: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 622: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. POMBO, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 623: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 650: Mr. BALLENGER.
H.R. 671: Mr. OLVER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. FRANK.
H.R. 674: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. OSE, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 680: Mr. FRANK.
H.R. 708: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 714: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 716: Mr. BENTSEN.
H.R. 717: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. BONO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. THUNE, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HORN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. COYNE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. PENCE, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. HART, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. WILSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MOORE, Mr. HILL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. FROST, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SABO, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. FILNER, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. NEY, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BACA, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. LARGENT, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 718: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 737: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 738: Mr. DOYLE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.
H.R. 760: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 781: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 782: Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 804: Mr. HEFLEY.
H.R. 808: Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. MOORE, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 817: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 835: Mr. LARGENT, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. OSE.
H.R. 848: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. LEE, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
H.R. 868: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BALDACC, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. BALLENGER.
H.R. 876: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 888: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 913: Mr. BARCIA.
H.R. 918: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. WU, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. HOLT, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. SANDLIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 938: Mr. BALDACC and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 950: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 954: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 956: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
H.R. 959: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 970: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.
H.R. 984: Mr. WELLER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 985: Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 990: Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. BOYD.
H.R. 993: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H.R. 1001: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 1011: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALSH, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1017: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 1020: Mr. MICA, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MASCARA, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1025: Mr. SCHROCK and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 1035: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1043: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FRANK, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1044: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FRANK, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1084: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1088: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. MATSUI.
H.R. 1090: Mr. HORN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. CLEMENT.
H.R. 1093: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. TERRY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. BALDACC, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. RILEY.
H.R. 1094: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GRAVES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BALDACC, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. RILEY.
H.R. 1097: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1100: Mr. RYUN of Kansas.
H.R. 1109: Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. SCHROCK.
H.R. 1110: Mr. HUTCHINSON and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1111: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1121: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 1129: Mr. FROST and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1130: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 1135: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1136: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. FROST, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. GANSKE.
H.R. 1140: Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KERNS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.
H.R. 1170: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. FRANK.
H.R. 1179: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
H.R. 1192: Mr. BORSKI and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1193: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 1198: Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PAUL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. POMBO, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 1201: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1212: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1215: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H.R. 1242: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1254: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BALDACC, and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 1273: Mr. GUTKNECHT.
H.J. Res. 13: Mr. HONDA.
H.J. Res. 27: Mr. GOODE.
H.J. Res. 36: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SHERWOOD, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. AKIN.
H. Con. Res. 45: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. MOORE.
H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. GOODE.
H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H. Con. Res. 73: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Con. Res. 81: Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 17: Mr. STARK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. BALDWIN.
H. Res. 18: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. KIND, Mr. MARKEY, Ms.

BROWN of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. OWENS.
H. Res. 56: Mr. GILMAN.
H. Res. 87: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, and Ms. SANCHEZ.
H. Res. 97: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ROSS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. FROST, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. WOOLSEY.