Sherman	Stupak	Udall (NM)
Shows	Tanner	Velazquez
Slaughter	Tauscher	Visclosky
Smith (WA)	Taylor (MS)	Watt (NC)
Snyder	Thompson (CA)	Weiner
Solis	Thompson (MS)	Wexler
Spratt	Thurman	Woolsey
Stark	Tierney	Wu
Stenholm	Turner	
Strickland	Udall (CO)	

NOT VOTING—43

Ackerman	Hastings (FL)	Moakley
Baca	Hefley	Oberstar
Barton	Hoeffel	Ose
Becerra	Honda	Quinn
Bentsen	Isakson	Rahall
Bishop	Jones (NC)	Rodriguez
Blumenauer	Kaptur	Rush
Boyd	King (NY)	Scarborough
Brady (TX)	Lipinski	Skelton
Clayton	McCarthy (MO)	Towns
Coyne	McDermott	Walsh
Cubin	McIntyre	Waters
Doggett	Meek (FL)	Waxman
Gillmor	Millender-McDonald	Wynn
Hall (OH)		

□ 0823

Mr. SANDLIN changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 148, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Stated against:

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 148, due to difficulties associated with my travel logistics, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 1990

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the following names of Members as original cosponsors of H.R. 1990. These names were inadvertently included as cosponsors of H.R. 1990. I also ask that the first printing of the bill reflect these changes:

SANFORD BISHOP, Georgia;
LUIS GUTIERREZ, Illinois;
DENNIS KUCINICH, Ohio;
PATSY MINK, Hawaii;
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia;
JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY, Illinois;
DAVID BONIOR, Michigan;
ELIJAH CUMMINGS, Maryland;
BENJAMIN GILMAN, New York;
RUBEN HINOJOSA, Texas;
SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, Texas;
STEVE LATOURETTE, Ohio;
CONSTANCE MORELLA, Maryland;
MAJOR OWENS, New York; and
ROBERT C. SCOTT, Virginia.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1836, ECONOMIC GROWTH AND TAX RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2001

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 153, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1836) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 104 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 153, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report, see prior proceedings of the House of today.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

Well, the day has arrived. There was a contest for President last year. There were very clear and particular themes underscoring the candidacies of each of the gentlemen running for President. One of them said he wanted to bring a different atmosphere to Washington and he wanted to return some of the taxpayers' money. Governor George W. Bush became President. There is a different climate in Washington, and this morning we are returning some of the taxpayers' money. The conference agreement on H.R. 1836 is clear evidence of that different environment.

I want to thank the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT). Without his ability to focus, guide, support and nurture, this conference report would not be before us. I want to thank the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), for his willingness to stand shoulder to shoulder in trying to produce a responsible product. But probably more important than that, I want to thank the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, and the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Finance, the gentleman from Montana, Mr. BAUCUS, because they decided that the only way legislation as significant and sweeping as this could pass the Senate would be if from the beginning it was a bipartisan effort.

It does not take too much analysis to realize that if you have a Committee on Finance divided evenly between 10 Republicans and 10 Democrats, you are not going to be able to move anything unless it is bipartisan.

□ 0830

But they were committed to returning the taxpayers' money enough that they built a bipartisan product from its instigation in the Senate, carried it through the floor and into conference. And along with the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), we put together a bipartisan product coming out of the conference.

Now, I know there is some consternation because not every member of the conference signed the conference report. What is important to note is there was a bipartisan signature structure because the underlying legislation is bipartisan in itself.

There have been a number of statements about this piece of legislation which I do think need to be addressed. There are individuals who are still using a statistical analysis of a fictitious piece of legislation in terms of the distributional effects on the taxpayers based upon the tax changes.

I would urge my colleagues in a number of places on the floor to pick up the material entitled Distributional Effects of the Conference Agreement for H.R. 1836 prepared by the bipartisan Joint Committee on Taxation to give you some feeling of the way this bill has been constructed. Notwithstanding the rhetoric you are going to hear once again about how this goes only to the wealthy, if you will simply look at the change in Federal taxes and the percent of the benefit going to particular income groups, for example: in those income categories between $10,000 and $20,000, in this calendar year, 11.5 percent of the benefits go to the $10,000 to $20,000; $20,000 to $30,000 9.4 percent; $30,000 to $40,000, 6.4 percent; $40,000 to $50,000, 5.4 percent; $50,000 to $75,000, 4.5 percent; $75,000 to $100,000, 3.5 percent; $100,000 to $200,000, 2.6 percent; $200,000 and over, 1.3 percent. In other words, those who have the lowest income get the greatest benefit.

In other words, if your income category is $10,000 to $20,000 a year, you get 11.5 percent of the benefit. If it is $200,000 and over, you get 1.3 percent. In fact, it is a numerical cascading structure in which every increment moves in the direction you would expect if it is a fair distributional structure.

In addition to that, I have heard statements about the fact that this particular package will destroy Medicare, that once again Social Security is under threat. I wonder how long the bumper sticker political rhetoric is going to be continued. The Senate Budget Committee, the House Budget Committee, those responsible for examining the budgetary structure, say in every year of this agreement, the HI or the Medicare Trust Fund is fully protected and the Social Security Trust Fund is fully protected. This agreement meets the requirement of the budget that we passed to protect Social Security and Medicare in every year of the 10 years of the agreement.

Now, let me address the 10 years because that clearly was one of the most popular themes during the rule. I am sure there will be a number of speakers to take the well to say, hey, this agreement is phony because it only lasts 10 years.

This legislation was considered under the budget reconciliation rules that apply to the Senate. Under budget reconciliation, it is possible to pass legislation limiting the rules of the Senate