Washington, Thursday, March 29, 2001

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 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 The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.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 (Mr. WELDON) 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 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
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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 Ways and Means 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, if agreed to, shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit 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 reads as follows:

Modification to amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Ms. Pryce of Ohio: Page 11, after line 8, add the following: "(3) 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 gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. Pryce of Ohio. 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 appalled to find that their tax bill has increased by hundreds and maybe thousands of dollars.

Hopefully, these couples have not caught 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 of 2001. The marriage penalty and family tax relief are urgently needed to correct the inequity in 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 unfair to 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 meaningful tax relief for 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 fine for a budget. 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 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 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 spend more money than 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 shell game. And the tax cuts the Republican majority is rolling through the Congress in 2001 are just another version of the same scam.

As I have said before, if it looks 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 Americans. Where do they get this? This is not about big government, this is about responsible government. This is about keeping anyone’s money, this is about paying off the debt and investing for the future.

Mr. Speaker, the 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 taxpayers, why is it most of the marriage penalty relief in their bill does not become available until the year 2007? Why is it their bill will not be fully effective until the year 2009? And why, Mr. Speaker, is it that the Republican majority would do something as simple as 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 real realities often fall in 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. The President is 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, see the promise of a better life for their children. 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 according to the unanimous consent request we made to 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.

The second point I would make is something like this: on page 4, first paragraph B of section 1(f) 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 things like 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.

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 everyone 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 insinuating 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 yet, we have only passed it up in 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 will cut 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 support her expenses 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 $25,000 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. And that is a one-cent insult that is left on the table by the very waitresses that the President of the United States asked us to think about.

It is hard 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 premature 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 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 to think about, and when a family is paying a little more in taxes than the child credit, that is the way that the child credit gets used. What we are doing today is allowing the President to go out and make promises that will be used in the next election.

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. Current tax law is structured so a married couple pays higher taxes 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 save 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 from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) 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 difference 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.

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. RILEY. 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 is strange to me is why we are 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 is a devastating problem to 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 young families. 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 and earn outside the home. Where 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 Indiana, 424,956 married couples will benefit from this legislation. Mr. Speaker, I support this rule, pass 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 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. 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—yes 249, nays 171, not voting 12, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burr</td>
<td>Hilleary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>Radanovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td>Ramstad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callahan</td>
<td>Ranieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>Regula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>Rehberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>Royce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantor</td>
<td>Rogers (RI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capehart</td>
<td>Rogers (KY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carper</td>
<td>Roybal-Allard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadakis</td>
<td>Royce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot</td>
<td>Ryan (WI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chellis</td>
<td>Ryan (KS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>Sandlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combest</td>
<td>Saxton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooksey</td>
<td>Scarborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox</td>
<td>Schaffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson (IL)</td>
<td>Schrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonas</td>
<td>Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones (NC)</td>
<td>Shadegg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelleher</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley</td>
<td>Shaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy (MN)</td>
<td>Sherrill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kucinich</td>
<td>Shinkwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusmoff</td>
<td>Shorey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson (NY)</td>
<td>Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson (TX)</td>
<td>Skelton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kogovszky</td>
<td>Smith (MI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King (NY)</td>
<td>Smith (NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>Smith (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk</td>
<td>Snyder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knollenberg</td>
<td>Souder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolbe</td>
<td>Spence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaHood</td>
<td>Stearns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaHood</td>
<td>Stump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dine-Balart</td>
<td>Sununu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dooley</td>
<td>Swearengin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doolittle</td>
<td>谭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis (CA)</td>
<td>Tancrude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis (KY)</td>
<td>Taullin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindaman</td>
<td>Taylor (NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lohoeh</td>
<td>Terry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas (OK)</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas (NY)</td>
<td>Th电子产品</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarthy (NY)</td>
<td>Thune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCrery</td>
<td>Tiahrt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAuliffe</td>
<td>Tiberi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melancon</td>
<td>Toomey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney</td>
<td>Tradoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mica</td>
<td>Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller (FL)</td>
<td>Upton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Gary</td>
<td>Vitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, George</td>
<td>Walden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, John</td>
<td>Walsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Pete</td>
<td>Wamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Warrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGovern</td>
<td>Welsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell (KS)</td>
<td>Weldon (FL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morell</td>
<td>Weldon (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morritt</td>
<td>Welner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrick</td>
<td>Whalen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nethercutt</td>
<td>Wheeler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ney</td>
<td>Wicker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northup</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood</td>
<td>Woolard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunes</td>
<td>Young (FL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ortiz</td>
<td>Young (OH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osborne</td>
<td>Young (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otter</td>
<td>Young (OH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ose</td>
<td>Young (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>Young (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quigley</td>
<td>Young (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangel</td>
<td>Young (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baca</td>
<td>Young (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird</td>
<td>Young (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balducci</td>
<td>Young (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Young (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett</td>
<td>Young (PA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAYs—171

Abraham | Carsen (OK) |
| Ackerman | Clay |
| Alexander | Clayton |
| Allen | Clermont |
| Andrews | Clayborn |
| Baca | Clyburn |
| Baird | Condit |
| Balducci | Cornyn |
| Barrett | Costello |
| Bercero | Coyne |
| Benten | Crowley |
| Berman | Cummings |
| Boren | Davis (FL) |
| Bourger | Davis (FL) |
| Borski | DeFazio |
| Boucher | DeGette |
| Boyd | Delahunt |
| Bradly (PA) | Delatore |
| Brown (FL) | Del Rossi |
| Brown (RI) | DeSaulnier |
| Capper | DeSoto |
| Caputo | Dicks |
| Capuano | Dingell |
| Carroll | Doak |
| Cary | Doyle |
| Carson (IN) | Edwards |
| Israel | Edwards |
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 table on the motion was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNulty) announced the vote and instructed the Clerk to record the same.
(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 26 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:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For taxable years</th>
<th>The applicable percentage in calendar year—</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 and thereafter</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

“(i) the maximum taxable income in the lowest rate bracket in the table contained in subsection (c)(5) (other than with respect to sections 63(c)(4) and 151(d)(4)(A)) shall be $2,000.

“(ii) in the case of amounts in subsection (b)(2)(A) and (1)(i), by substituting ‘calendar year 1985’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) of section 1(f)(3), and

“(iii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under subparagraph (B) of section 26(b) 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. 5. ALLOWANCE OF NONREFUNDABLE PERSONAL CREDITS AGAINST REGULAR AND MINIMUM TAX LIABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 32(j) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating subsections 63(c)(4) and 151(d)(4)(A)) shall be applied”.

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

(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”.

“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 the standard deduction)—

“(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); and

“(3) 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)."

(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.—With respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001, as prescribed in the tables under paragraph (1)—

“(i) the maximum taxable income in the lowest rate bracket in the table contained in subsection (c)(5) (other than with respect to sections 63(c)(4) and 151(d)(4)(A)) shall be 200 percent of the dollar amount applicable under paragraph (1)(B).

“(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under subparagraph (B) of section 26(b) of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating subsections (1)(B), (2) and (3) as subparagraphs (1)(C), (2) and (3), 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 the standard deduction)—

“(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); and

“(3) 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)."

(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.—With respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001, as prescribed in the tables under paragraph (1)—

“(i) the maximum taxable income in the lowest rate bracket in the table contained in subsection (c)(5) (other than with respect to sections 63(c)(4) and 151(d)(4)(A)) shall be 200 percent of the dollar amount applicable under paragraph (1)(B).

“(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under subparagraph (B) of section 26(b) of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating subsections (1)(B), (2) and (3) as subparagraphs (1)(C), (2) and (3), 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 the standard deduction)—

“(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); and

“(3) 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)."
"(ii) $46,500 for taxable years beginning in 2006 or 2007,"  

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—  

(A) Subsection (d) 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 subparagraph:  

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

(C) The last sentence of section 55(d)(3) of such Code is amended by inserting "(by subsection (c) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001."

SEC. 4. MARRIAGE PENALTY RELIEF FOR 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 child tax credit) is amended—  

(1) by striking "(C) in the case of a joint return, the earned income amount determined under section 32(c) shall not be less than 10 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."; and  

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

"(D) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, the earned income amount determined under section 32(c) shall be the lesser of—  

(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2) and  

(B) the amount determined in accordance with paragraph (1)."

(b) EARNED INCOME TO INCLUDE ONLY AMOUNTS INCLUDIBLE IN GROSS INCOME.—Clause (ii) of section 22(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 employment compensation."  

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

SEC. 5. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS 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—  

(1) by striking "(C) in the case of a joint return, the earned income amount determined under section 22(c) shall be the lesser of—  

(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2) and  

(B) the amount determined in accordance with paragraph (1)."

(b) EARNED INCOME TO INCLUDE ONLY AMOUNTS INCLUDIBLE IN GROSS INCOME.—Clause (ii) of section 22(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 employment compensation."  

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section 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 section 31, 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 my honor 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 on 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 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.

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 time worrying about sending 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. MATSU), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MATSU. 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 about $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 two weeks from now, it 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 person. 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, the incentives are very, very strong 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 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. MATSU), 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 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.

Mr. Speaker, it is 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 scale 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 best examples of the 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 1960s, 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 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.)

Mr. 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 need to know there is no way 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. We, in fact, want to ask 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.

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 showed me a car. That body of that car looked like it was in excellent condition. I turned on the radio, and the music of the radio, the stereo just reverbared around me; and I fell in love with the car.

Mr. Speaker, more than 1 million taxpayers at the lower end of the income scale will find their tax liability reduced to zero in 2002. Tax relief in this bill is not just for young 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.

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 scale 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 best examples of the 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 1960s, 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 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.)

Mr. 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 need to know there is no way 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. We, in fact, want to ask 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.

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 showed me a car. That body of that car looked like it was in excellent condition. I turned on the radio, and the music of the radio, the stereo just reverbared around me; and I fell in love with the car.

Mr. Speaker, we need to heed the warnings 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. Speaker, we need to heed the warnings 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. Speaker, we need to heed the warnings 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. Speaker, we need to heed the warnings 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.
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 to vote your hand, 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. We must have all of those things if we have other priorities.

The Republican witness came and said 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 all now 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 and file separate tax returns, 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 than the single 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. Secretary, I yield myself 15 seconds. Mr. Speaker, let 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


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 substantive amendment thereof, that would also reduce revenues, will be subject to the pay-as-you-go requirement. The Administration 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 knows more about 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 the legislation through.

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, 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 a bill 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 co-sponsors, 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. We built 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 bit more than $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, fully eliminates 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 be able to do 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?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no objection.

Mr. RANGEL. 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 motion initiated by 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 families actually get penalized, and their penalty is $24 billion. Sixty percent of married couples actually get a bonus for having gotten married, 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 is trying to fix a problem is to make it worse. The cost of fixing it is $24 billion on the children of these very nice people who are getting married.

I cannot imagine someone 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. 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 a bigger child tax credit. Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH). 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 is 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. Mr. Speaker, I cannot see the photo.

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

Mr. RANGEL. If you could just tint 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 absurd.

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 a lot 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 Committee 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 $500 billion left, and we have the estate tax, the charitable deduction, and we have the AMT fix. This train is running backwards because they are loading up the gift in the front and not telling people what is coming in the back.

I sit on the Budget Committee, and now again in the current session, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Barcia), my good friend and colleague, who has been a champion of this bill. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Weller), my good friend and colleague, who has been a champion of this 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. Weller. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your kind words, Mr. McDermott. I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Barcia).

Mr. Barcia. Mr. Speaker, I 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. Weller. 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. Weller. 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 personal 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. Barcia. Mr. Speaker, I 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. Weller. 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. Weller. 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 personal 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 concur 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 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. Weller. 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
Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SAM JOHN-son) of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I know that there are a lot of married people in Georgia. As my col- leagues know, I am from Texas, and I want to divorce the 1.7 million married Texans from the government-imposed, IRS-enforced marriage tax penalty. It is just plain wrong for the Federal Gov- ernment 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.

Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues, I strongly support marriage penalty re- lief and tax benefit for families. That is why I support the Democratic sub- stitute. 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 well today, but we cannot ignore the fact that it is only part of a $3 trillion Re- publican 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 should we be doing today is paying down the na- tional 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 col- leagues to vote against it and vote for the Democratic substitute.

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

Mr. Speaker, I note to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), who dis- cussed the consequences of alternative minimum tax. Of course, the alter- native minimum tax was increased with the 1993 tax increase that President Clinton and the Democratic ma- jority enacted back in 1993. I would note that their proposal provides actu- ally less AMT relief than our proposal that we are offering today. I would note that in the marriage penalty re- lief that is in H.R. 6 that taxpayers are held harmless. They do not see the con- sequences of AMT, the alternative min- imum tax. If this bill goes through and is signed by the President, there is going to be no revenue left to fix alter- native minimum tax.

The Democratic alternative is a sound piece of legislation. It is cer- tainly 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 loom- ing problem of AMT. Get past sloganeering. Get down to policy. Fix alternative minimum tax.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. 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 dis- cussed the consequences of alternative minimum tax. Of course, the alter- native minimum tax was increased with the 1993 tax increase that Presi- dent Clinton and the Democratic ma- jority enacted back in 1993. I would note that their proposal provides actu- ally less AMT relief than our proposal that we are offering today. I would note that in the marriage penalty re- lief that is in H.R. 6 that taxpayers are held harmless. They do not see the con- sequences of AMT, the alternative min- imum tax. If this bill goes through and is signed by the President, there is going to be no revenue left to fix alter- native minimum tax.
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 penalty and reducing the tax rates 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 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 American families. 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 with 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 on Ways and Means is marking up a bill that 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 regard to the rate problems until the year 2004. The problems that I have with the Republican bill, and why I am going to vote against it, is that it is back-loaded. That means in order to get everything to fit together, most of the relief is provided in the first five years, not in the first five years.

In the first five 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, the tax relief that is going to solve all of their problems 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 bit of heart here, it is impossible if that is everything 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 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 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 working hard 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 in, 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 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. Our sweat is taxed. Our blood is taxed. Our legal marital status is taxed. Our spouses are taxed. Our children are taxed. Our labor is taxed. Our investments are taxed. Our savings are taxed. Our profits are taxed. Our sweat is taxed. Our blood is taxed. Our legal marital status is taxed. Our spouses are taxed. Our children are taxed.

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), and I want to commend the Republican Party that if we are to be family friendly we should start right at the beginning of it and get it 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 decrying relief 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. I suggest that 510,000 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 a substitute because 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 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, and 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 have 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, i.e., the House, acting like Republicans, who are now concerned about a vote that they took last year, which was to do a tax cut.

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 11th hour. We do not need to be 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 (Mr. WELLER), and we are going to be criticized because we did 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 many children will Florida and I would 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 Kansas (Mr. THOMAS) in leading the effort to 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, in South Dakota, 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 your guys not get together? 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.

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

Ms. MCCAVERY. 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 proposed 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 home State of Missouri 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.

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.

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.
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, $858 billion in rate reduction, early 2001 is 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 of the rest of the tax bill. 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 Republican tendency was 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 the 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 approach that it will be $2 billion 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 Wisconsin (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, and I 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 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. It 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 national 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 the American family.

That is why it is important that we vote for this bill. That is why it is important that we pass this bill that we passed 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 ends meet for their children.

So, regardless, 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 then they would if they were single. But it does reduce 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 of New Jersey. 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 1992 when I introduced the Rangel substitute not only eliminating the marriage penalty is unfair, and it should be corrected. This bill gets the job done. H.R. 6 provides the tax relief to married couples. 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 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.

If a couple chooses to get married, its 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 the tax relief to married couples. 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).
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, or $599 billion monthly.

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 the 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, 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, our tax code offers the married couple a break 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, 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, our tax code offers the married couple a break 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, 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.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I must oppose H.R. 6, the Marriage Tax Elimination Act of 2001. The 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, cutting through the red tape and paperwork that baby boomers begin to retire; why can’t we 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 tax relief 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 Congress reduced the child care provided through 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 Funds. 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 lose a benefit in the child tax credit. If anything, the bill will result in 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 been married for 3 years.

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 and providing the case where we are offering tax breaks, 5 and even 8 years from now? It’s quite obvious. The GOP tax plan is too expensive to fit it 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 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 saving. 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 rates, helping 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 all of us 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. 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 2 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. Support 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 the current Tax Code, to pay higher taxes simply because they choose to be married. And worse yet, the Tax Code penalizes marriage and encourages couples to stay unmarried.

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 building the taxman on their wedding day.

This bill will also double the child tax credit from $500 to $1,000. America’s children deserve to have their parents’ income spent on their welfare, not stolen by the govern- ment and gradually 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. FREILINGHUYSEN, Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of 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 increase the child tax credit. It will also increase the earned income credit (EITC), making additional families eligible for this credit.

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
meeting. 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 penalty tax 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 tax 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 penalty by increasing the basic standard deduction for a married couple. It would provide tax relief to the parents of children as well. H.R. 6 would reduce the marriage penalty by eliminating 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 or more children. Therefore, a family who has two children and income less than $27,000 would get no tax relief from the credit.

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 marriage penalty. I know that 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 backwashing 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 your 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 reframe the marriage tax penalty. 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 been reduced to a mere pittance. 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 the 11th District alone, that will help the parents of over 120,000 children buy clothes for school, buy the gasoline to get 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 in support of H.R. 6 and against 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 they can buy? Don’t we tax their 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 earned income. That’s what they choose to do. They select 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 families, not tax them 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—on a short-term basis—to address the 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. Now H.R. 6 fails to fully provide a marriage penalty 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—so it keeps 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.

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 we finish this bill. If we let the Senate, the Finance Committee chair has indicated that he intends to include comprehensive AMT adjustments in the tax reform legislation the 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 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. 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 tax law. By doubling the standard deduction, 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 tax 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 tax penalty 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 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. That’s 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.

- A young couple has received a $1,400 credit at Lansing Community College; near 10 months of electrical utility bills; 100 packages of size 2 Huggies Diapers; 3 months of child care; a well-deserved family summer vacation.
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 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 strength 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 cornerstone 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 to reflect our nation’s fiscal health. To strengthen the economic stimulus and quicken recovery, Congress must provide faster relief. We need to put our fiscal health in order to stimulate the 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 people will hear 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 $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 Democratic alternative fixes the ‘‘marriage penalty’’ and provides immediate rate reductions in order to stimulate the 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.

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:

SEC. 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 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.
SEC. 102. MODIFICATIONS TO EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT. 

(a) INCREASES IN PERCENTAGES AND AMOUNTS.—(1) PERCENTAGES.—The initial phaseout percentage, and the final phaseout percentage, shall be determined as follows: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Qualifier</th>
<th>Initial Phaseout Percentage</th>
<th>Final Phaseout Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 qualifying child</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more qualifying children</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) AMOUNTS.—

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Qualifier</th>
<th>Earned Income Amount</th>
<th>Initial Phaseout Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 qualifying child</td>
<td>$10,650</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more qualifying children</td>
<td>$21,300</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) REPEAL OF DENIAL OF CREDIT WHERE INVESTMENT INCOME.—Section 32 is amended by striking subsection (1). 

(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: 

“(v) the requirement under subparagraph (A) (i) that such amount be includible in gross income shall not apply if such amount is exempt from tax under section 7875 or is deferred 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 containing an exception provision similar to the Indian General Allotment Act.” 

(d) MODIFICATION OF JOINT RETURN REQUIREMENT.—(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) MARRITAL 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. 

(e) MODIFICATIONS TO EARNED INCOME AMOUNTS.—(1) IN GENERAL.—The earned income amount for the taxable year in which the taxable year begins, determined by subtracting “‘calendar year 1991’” for ‘‘calendar year 1991’” 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. 

(f) EXPANSION OF MATHEMATICAL ERROR AUTHORITY.—Subsection (4) of section 6223(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 of the Social Security Administration.” 

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

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

So it just seems to me that if we are concerned about education and making certain our kids are going to be productive, 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 thing that we should do for education is to wipe out domestic spending for defense. And we should not use reduction of taxes and an increase in spending for defense as the same old substitute, that same old substitute, that same old substitute, that same old substitute that is less generous.

We do 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 conference 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 see aside the bill and tell the conference, 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 it slow broom 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 1/2 weeks and 2 weeks ago; that, in fact, if he does want something that he professes 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 more and more, 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 now in front of us, 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 in this proposal, which means close to zero. Talk to make sure that the 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 flat 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. 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 coalition of mixing the old, the new, that including debt service was going to 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 it is someone that, you know, the one who brings the others that has never been passed. And then once it is in the water, that is what the President wants, that is how he wants to present it. And the President is for sure the one who has a clear idea of how to present this or any other piece, when we put it all together, he does not want partisanship. Whatever the vote is on this or any other piece, when we put them all together, the vote will be non-partisan support. The bipartisan support is almost zero. Indeed, it is a partisan effort.

There has been some talk about bipartisanship. Whatever the vote is on this or any other piece, when we put them all together, the vote will be non-partisan 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 in the motion to recommit. What is the impact of this major-
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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, Speaker, have fought 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, 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 underlining 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 voted 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 the.

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 children, 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 gentleman 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?

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.

We, Speaker, have fought 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. Speaker, of course 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, I 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 H.R. 6 has been around 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. 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 they might 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 work. And 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, in my own district.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLER-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 gentlewoman 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 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 to 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 in my amendment, a bipartisan 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 penalty tax for almost everyone that suffers it. That is pretty fair.

I would also note that the bipartisan 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, an additional $100, so it will be an additional $600 in the average family's pockets 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 2 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman 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 has 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 reality 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 sentiments of the 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 a 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 piecemeal tax cut proposals. Let no one believe that by voting for the substitute that 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 another 8 to 12 years to get over the last mistake. Why would we want to do that again?

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he 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 talked 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 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 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.

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.

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). Their child credit does not fully phase in until the year 2006, which means that some families will not see any relief because their children will turn 16 before then, and they then will not 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, except 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 the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing; 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.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to 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 children. Their child credit does not fully phase in until the year 2006, which means that some families will not see any relief because their 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.

We give people lower interest rates. For a 15-year 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 and 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 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 rise to ask Members to vote against the Republican tax bill and for the bill sponsored by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL). Their child credit does not fully phase in until the year 2006, which means that some families will not see any relief because their children...
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 on taxes and 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 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. Most 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 and college savings, 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, to 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 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 not because 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 riverboat gamble on what is going to happen 6, 7 years from now and put people in jeopardy for their kids and those people that are already 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 before that, we fight 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 assure you 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 is 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 in the Senate. We have health related, education related. We need a 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, $536 billion, Mr. President, the Republicans will be giving you a $3 trillion tax burden which you say is too big.

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 with the Republicans, 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 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. WELLE) 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. But, 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 tax and spend 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 as 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 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 want to spend a 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’s tax cuts do not do it. 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 to spend their entire lives away from 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 going 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 back some 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 children that you can enjoy those things 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 some 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 the prosperity and happiness 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 Ackerman Ackerman Allen Andrews Baca Baird Baldacci Blagojevich Blumenauer Beccerra Bentsen Berkley Berman Bishop Boucher Bubn

Yeakel Baca Beck Blumenauer MD Boyd Bracy Brady (PA)
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 that will be voted on by 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. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk reads 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:

STICK all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. REFUND OF 2000 INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES.

SEC. 1. REFUND OF 2000 INDIVIDUAL INCOME 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.

(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) of the federal tax liability for such taxable year.

(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 6406(b)) plus the tax imposed by section 55 over

(B) the sum of the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 (other than the credit its 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,
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.

(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 (e).

(6) Effective date.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

(d) Protection of Social Security and Medicare.—(1) The amount of such excess shall not be treated as paid under subsection (a) if

(1) payment of the tax imposed by such section shall be made by the taxpayer on or before 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 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) Certification of Withholding Credit Certificate.—A withholding credit certificate issued under paragraph (1) may be furnished by the individual to such individual’s employer.

(g) 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.

(h) 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 (e).

(i) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

(j) Protection of Social Security and Medicare.—The amounts transferred to any insurance authorities provided by this Act before October 1, 2001, shall not exceed $15,000,000,000. The Secretary of the Treasury may extend the limitation of the preceding sentence by providing for pro rata reductions or otherwise. The limitations of this subsection shall cease to apply at such time as the estimated national 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. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. 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. But 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 10 times the economic stimulus, 10 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.
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, for all of us, 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 way, if I were to close out the motion to recommit, we do not get permanent marginal rate relief, we do not get permanent child tax credit doubling, we do not get the $50 billion stimulus.

And, Mr. Speaker, with the motion to recommit actually does say, “In fiscal year 2001, no more than $15 billion.” No matter how impassioned they say it 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 literally, 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, and 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 relief, 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 was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 184, noes 240, not voting 8, as follows:

aye 184

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LaHOOD). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 282, nays 2, total 284. The yeas have it.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on that I just wish that the Arizona Wildcats get to the ball game on Saturday.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I was unavoidably delayed by official business and was unable to vote on 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). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

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**

(1483)

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 Missouri (Mr. STUPAK), from the upper peninsula, I just wish that the Arizona Wildcats get stuck in elevator 7A and 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 the Speaker.
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, 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 I thought in fear of 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 his time back.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, in case they do emerge victorious 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 Rome and 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 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.

EXPRESSING SORROW OF THE HOUSE AT THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE NORMAN SISISKY, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

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.

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. He worked tirelessly to make the best opportunity to serve our fellow man, as Norman did. Norman was hard-working, 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 to this day in the Virginia General Assembly before being elected to Congress in 1982. Norman, like another of our late colleagues, Herb Bateman, 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 throughout the 107th Congress, and led bipartisan efforts throughout the 107th Congress, and led bipartisan efforts throughout the 107th Congress, and led bipartisan efforts throughout the 107th Congress, and led bipartisan efforts throughout the 107th Congress, and led bipartisan efforts throughout the 107th Congress, and led bipartisan efforts throughout the 107th Congress, and led bipartisan efforts throughout the 107th Congress.

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 Virginia’s Fourth Congressional District in the southeastern corner of the Commonwealth, the home of the first permanent English settlement in North
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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 everyone is 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 their 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, a dedicated public servant to the citizens of his southeast Virginia district. I think we were all struck by his unfailing consideration of his colleagues. He loved this institution. He did not need the salary that it paid, he lived independently healthy, 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.

Norm 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 Norm’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. 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 do 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 certainly 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 key role in modernizing 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 installations, 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 Norman 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 Norm 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 this 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. Our Armed Forces would not be what they are today without the steadfast support that he gave to our national defense.

Norm 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 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.

Norm 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 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.

Norm 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.

I want to extend my deepest sympathies 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 NORM 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, and advice. 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 our national security, and yet he had great fondness for the young men and women in all uniforms.

Our sympathy goes to Rhoda, his four sons, and the rest of his family.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may conso...
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. MORA of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), who serves on our 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 his ‘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 my 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, a man who recently left us. There was Congress, Norm has been a familiar figure in Virginia politics for many years. Norm 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.

Norm’s background in the business community proved invaluable as he later decided to enter politics. Norm served in Virginia’s general assembly several years before being elected to the House of Representatives in 1982. Here in Washington, Norm was known as a staunch defender of our national security and worked tirelessly on behalf of the men and women who served 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.

Norm 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 in the vanguard of 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 dedication and will still be sorely missed. Norm 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.

Mr. MORA of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORA), 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 Norm Sisisky wants, 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 need to look at, and 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, 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 I have stood in this House many times paying tribute to our colleagues, 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 is 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.

I want to 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) that one thing 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 give 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 best for the country.

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 he has a little bit 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 with 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, cut through, and have a little bit of humor there.

Mr. Speaker, I used to reflect on the fact that NORM was probably the best dress designer 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 perceptible of that. 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 be an important voice.

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 passing. How does that fit? What is that wisdom? Is it 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 leave 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. 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. 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. Mr. CONDIT, who has been a former Chair of the Blue Dogs of which Mr. Sisisky was a proud member.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and consider him one of my friends.

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. Mr. CONDIT, who has been a former Chair of the Blue Dogs of which Mr. Sisisky was a proud member.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and consider him one of my friends.

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. Mr. CONDIT, who has been a former Chair of the Blue Dogs of which Mr. Sisisky was a proud member.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and consider him one of my friends.
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, but yet always did so in good humor, without taking himself too seriously, but yet always did so in good humor.

As has been said by so many here, NORM SISISKY was a man who took the serious business of this Congress seriously, but yet always did so in good humor, without taking himself too seriously, but yet always did so in good humor, without taking himself too seriously, but yet always did so in good humor.

In a body where sometimes we do too many times take ourselves and our own actions seriously, it was so refreshing to hear someone such as NORM SISISKY speak, 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 he gave so much to each of us who were blessed to know him, and to so many Americans who would never have heard his 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 consent to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, when I come in and I do not see NORM sitting back there, I have 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 here, which NORM and I served on for 6 ½ years together. One of the Air Force generals was telling a story about NORM that is just so perfect, of him, which gave 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 was just 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 were unparalleled. He was 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. SPRATT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as I wanted to go.

Mr. WOLF of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as I yielded the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Wolf) for yielding the time to me.

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 of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Wolf) 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 supportive of depot, and I had the opportunity to make some comments. I thought that I was going to have some problems with him, 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, we come to the Hill and 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 to recognize the service Flor-ida (Mr. Goss), a 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 go, whatever it is that you have left out there. 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. And just literally 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 Virginia (Mr. Wolf) for yielding the time to me, and will still continue to emulate him as what I consider a model Mem-

ber of Congress.

Mr. SPRATT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Spratt), the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, a man for whom Mr. Sisisky has 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, a great soul, a great man, the kind of man whose imprint on his gentle-

man to his very core. He was always the first to see the humor in everything, always ready with a quip, his ready wit.

I 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 had 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 this country.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to speak any longer, but I do want to say how much he meant him as what I consider a model Member of Congress.

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 I had to Norm Sisisky (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. Scalise), 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.

When two of 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, we come to the Hill and 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 to recognize the service Flor-ida (Mr. Goss), a 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 go, whatever it is that you have left out there. 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. And just literally 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 of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Wolf) 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 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 my concern. 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 Virginia (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. The House has lost a tremendous Member.

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 sometimes come in 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 traveler, 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. I think like us, 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 negotiation 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. SISSKY, specifically a leader of the Blue Dog Coalition and gentler side 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. NORM was going to go, and then come from the other meetings, yield to NORM for his questions. I am always regretting that I did not have the opportunity to serve with him in a committee, but I sat with him on a committee, but I sat with him on "redneck 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 SISSKY, 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, I just 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, NORM SISSKY, who served the Commonwealth of Virginia and our nation with distinction in the House of Representatives for the last 18 years of his life.

NORM'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 NORM's House colleagues were well aware of his reputation as a businessman. He transformed a small Pepsi bottling company in Petersburg into a successful distributor of soft drinks throughout southern Virginia. I know there are countless witnesses who have appeared before subcommittees and committees on which NORM sat that squirmed in their seats as they faced his probing questions concerning what structured methods by which the Department of Defense acquired its equipment, services, and construction projects.

In 1973, NORM 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, NORM 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.

He was proud 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 hailing 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, and their three sons, Richard and Stuart, and most especially to their daughter, 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 both sides of the aisle.

Norm, whose loss of a superb representative will now entertain 1-minute remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.

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 and was involved in efforts to reconcile differences 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 all of his achievements.

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. 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. GOSSE 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. SKELOTN 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 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.

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 was a migrant laborer. 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 faced 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, it's hard 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 have 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 accept what he knew was 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 national wide 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 banding 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 and 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 used 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 for Cesar Chavez.

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 respect for Cesar Chavez. This is about human dignity and only wanting to live for a better quality of life, not only for himself, but for many others.

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,
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 together to unanimously recognize 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, a man 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 wish to celebrate the poignancy 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. His efforts and strong voice led to the Federal laws that are today employed to prevent child labor, protecting the rights of farm workers. He helped to organize 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 nonviolence, 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 flight 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 memory.

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 hardworking 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 have the 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 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 apathetic workers, he uncertainty 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 they were. 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 really, that was 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 always be? 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 in the fields 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 make this country a better place. 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 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 risk 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 assault 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 sacrificed his own health by fasting for thousands 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—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 to fight 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 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).

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. PALONE, 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 105, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 30, 2001, at 10 a.m., in memory of the late Hon. NORMAN SISKISSY 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:


The Adjournment Resolution was agreed to; and to the following Members was granted the privilege of introducing one bill: Mr. NORMAN C. FISHEL, Mr. Quickly.

Mr. ANDERSON, at the request of Mr. BUCYK, to introduce the following bill:

To authorize and direct the Secretary of the Navy to provide, on the national...
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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 approval of the 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. Klump, 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.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WATTs of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. WATTs of Virginia), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

H.R. 1288. A bill to provide incentives for charitable contributions by individuals and businesses, to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of 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 of West Virginia, 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. GILMORE of Virginia, Ms. 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. MCMULLEN, Mr. BONOR, Mr. FRANK, Mr. HILLARD, Mr. KILPATRICK, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KILDER, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. KUENNING, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LEE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FINKEL, Ms. KAPTur, Mr. BACA, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 1289. A bill to amend the 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. BLAOGOEVICH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CHEN, 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. DINGLE, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. REYs, Mr. STUMP, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. RODRIGuez, Mr. BURTON, Mr. SCH SleHe, Ms. BREEKLY, Mr. MCKROn, Mr. UDLALL of New Mexico, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CRENshaw, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. EHRlich, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. KYV of Kansas, Mr. SxioN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DREJER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. JENNkS, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. LANGVEIK of Minnesota, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COSTello, Mr. ANDrewS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. SCHNER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. MCKINNNY, Mr. RANgel, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. HILLIARY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JOHNS of New York, Mr. JO ANn DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. CRAMILLIES, Ms. TAUScher, Mr. LoBuNDIo, 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 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. NEY (for himself, Mr. JONES of Ohio, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. LaTOuRette, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 1292. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide for 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. CRAMMER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WEXELS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. MCKINNNY, Mr. RANgel, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. HILLIARY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JOHNS of New York, Mr. JO ANn DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. CRAMILLIES, Ms. TAUScher, Mr. LoBuNDIo, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 1293. A bill to amend title 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. JONES of Georgia, Mr. GONzALEz, Mr. KILDER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. GRucci):

H.R. 1294. 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 Mr. BLEVINS (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BRATTON, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. BACON, Mr. WATSON, Mr. MILLS, Mr. BOURN, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. MELSON, Mr. BROWN of Connecticut, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GILL, Mr. LUCAS of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Louisiana, Mr. COBB, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 1295. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance for the renovation of schools and the construction of new schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BILDERBECK (for himself, Mr. LAMM, Mr. KRENZER, Mr. RODRIGUEZ of Texas, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SHADEEK, and Mr. BURGER):

H.R. 1296. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, in consultation with the Under Secretary for Benefits, enter into a contract with a company to develop and implement a strategy for home health care services for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
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By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

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 and acceleration of local trials qualifying for the orphan drug credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WENDT, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1299. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit for education individual retirement accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. CARSON of Indiana (for herself, Mr. NORDEN, Mr. JONES of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of Ohio, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. MICA, and Ms. POMEROY):

H.R. 1300. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the transfer of funds from the qualified conservation contributions, and to encourage contributions for conservation purposes, to encourage contributions for education individual retirement accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 1301. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the recognition of contributions to qualified organizations that agree to begin qualified activities that are determined by the Secretary of Education to meet the criteria for low-income areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRANE:

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 Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 1303. A bill to provide money to the Department of the Treasury, and to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 1304. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage contributions for qualified organizations that agree to begin qualified activities that meet the criteria for low-income areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. ARMLEY, Mr. BACIA, Mr. BERREUTER, Mr. BOEHRER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CHAMBILIS, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. COX, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EHRlich, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. GRANBERG, Mr. GRANNOY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KELLY, Mr. KING, Mr. KNOLLENDORF, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MCCRORY, Mr. MCDNIS, Mr. GAY G. MILLER of California, Mr. NERONIUS, Mr. NHAMDANA, Mr. PEREZ, Mr. PLUNKETT, Mr. RUSKIN, Mr. SANTORO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHUTT, Mr. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. Sisolak, Mr. SOUTHWICK, Mr. STEIL, Mr. STREET, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. TOOMY, 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. ENGLISH, Mr. WELKER, Mr. McEACHIN, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. KAUFMAN, Ms. PROENCA, Ms. THOMPSON of New York, Mr. VOSBURGH, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HOPPER, Mr. JONES of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WATTS, Mr. REED, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. NGUYEN, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. EVANS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. FRANK, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. LEMBERG, Mr. COLE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BERNSTEIN, Mr. ESHOO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LOWEY, Ms. NORMAN, Mr. TAXCO, Mr. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CONCannon, Mr. BLOOMBERG, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MAZUR, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. SOLIS, Ms. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BICCHERI, Mr. REYES, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. EDDIE BRINCE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HANDLEY, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. LOGREN):

H.R. 1306. A bill to amend the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to require additional disclosures concerning transfers involving international transactions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself and Mr. NORDEN):

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. HASTINGS):

H.R. 1308. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide relief against income tax for recycling or remanufacturing equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. ARMLEY, Mr. BACIA, Mr. BERREUTER, Mr. BOEHRER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CHAMBILIS, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. COX, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EHRlich, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. GRANBERG, Mr. GRANNOY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KELLY, Mr. KING, Mr. KNOLLENDORF, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MCCRORY, Mr. MCDNIS, Mr. GAY G. MILLER of California, Mr. NERONIUS, Mr. NHAMDANA, Mr. PEREZ, Mr. PLUNKETT, Mr. RUSKIN, Mr. SANTORO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHUTT, Mr. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. Sisolak, Mr. SOUTHWICK, Mr. STEIL, Mr. STREET, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. TOOMY, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. QUINN):

H.R. 1309. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage contributions by individuals of capital gain real property to qualified conservation organizations, to modify the rules governing the estate tax ex-

clusion for land subject to a qualified conservation easement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINZINGER (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BLUMENBAUER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PALLONE, 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 Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LAFalCE (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. MABREY):

H.R. 1311. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to reduce fees on securities transactions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LATOUTRETE:

H.R. 1312. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to permit leave after the death of a spouse and widowers with minor children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Government 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 jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOGREN:

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 Mr. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GILMAN, and Mrs. KELLY):

H.R. 1314. A bill to provide an enhanced penalty for threatening, attempting, or intimidating 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. NUSSELE (for himself, Mr. TANNENBERG, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BELONGIA, Mr. THURMAN, Mr. BORILES, Mr. BOSEWELL, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. TAUSCHER of New Jersey, 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. NUSSELE (for himself and Mr. HIRZBERG):

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 for elementary and secondary school expenses, to increase the maximum annual amount of contributions to such accounts, and to improve the use of the contributions 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. CHRISTENSON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. LEE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. SCHLOOM, Ms. PASCRELL, Mrs. JACKSON-Lee of Texas, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr.
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By Mr. SHAW. H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Representatives that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued on the subject of autism awareness; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. ANGELL, Mr. DISCH, Mr. DREAMS, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BIGGERT, and Mrs. J. ANN DAVIS of Georgia): H. Con. Res. 92, Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Representatives that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued on the subject of autism awareness; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. ANGELL, Mr. DISCH, Mr. DREAMS, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BIGGERT, and Mrs. J. ANN DAVIS of Georgia): H. Con. Res. 92, Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Representatives that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued on the subject of autism awareness; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. ANGELL, Mr. DISCH, Mr. DREAMS, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BIGGERT, and Mrs. J. ANN DAVIS of Georgia): H. Con. Res. 92, Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Representatives that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued on the subject of autism awareness; to the Committee on Government Reform.
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. 52: Mr. Rothman, Mr. Visclosky, 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. Bahr of Georgia, Mr. Platt, 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. Petersen of Minnesota, Mr. McNulty, Mrs. Christensen, Mr. Langevin, and Ms. Woolsey.