''Sticking It to Working Families,'' which is exactly what the All American Tax Relief Act, which was just past in this House, has done.

Why do I say that? That is because what both the White House and the Republican House leadership refused to do was to reduce the income threshold for the child tax credit to $10,000. That level has gone up to $11,000. It means that people who are making $10,000 a year will no longer be eligible for a child tax credit. That is 4.3 million families. It is 9 million children who will be denied the child tax credit. These are working families.

The House Republican leadership has said this is a welfare program. That is the kind of disdain that they show for working families.

What is going to happen to these families is their taxes, yes, are going to increase, all under the guise of an All American Tax Relief Act. It is wrong. These families, these children, deserve better. That is what this House should be about.

HELPING AMERICAN FAMILIES

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats' Partnership for a New America is a lot about helping American families. There is no better way to help working American families than to support them as they struggle to balance work and family life, because workers need help addressing how to be both a good parent and a good employee, how to give their family the time they need without compromising their job or their career.

The Partnership with America will improve the lives of working families by encouraging debate on legislation like the Balancing Act. This Balancing Act will provide paid family leave for new parents, improve the quality and availability of child care, in-school nutrition programs, after school assistance, fund voluntary universal preschool and assist employers in establishing a family-friendly workplace.

I urge my colleagues to join me in addressing the needs of all families, thus having a true partnership with Americans.

NEED TO WORK IN A BIPARTISAN MANNER

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, what a better day it would be if we could work in a bipartisan manner. We just debated a tax bill that could have been made much better for our constituents across this Nation.

I believe in giving some relief to middle-class and working Americans, and in fact, included in this tax bill was the child tax credit, but, more importantly, to extend and to help with poor children in terms of the refundability of a child credit that so many working families need.

This is an ugly bill from the perspective of increasing tax relief for those who do not need it, but I could not overlook the importance of helping our military families and particularly those men and women in combat to get the kind of relief on their earned income tax. We do it only for 2 years, unfortunately. The Democrats, we wanted more, 5 years.

But it is a start. Today we did not make tax cuts permanent. I hope we will not see another tax bill that does not treat working men and women more fair and the middle-class more fair and responds to the economic needs of this country. I do think, however, we needed more dollars for research, and this does so.

But it is ugly when we do not work together. This is an ugly tax bill, but it gives some relief to middle-class Americans.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SMART SECURITY AND ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, in June of this year, the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water bravely stood up to the Bush White House by reducing, or flat out rejecting all of the administration's requests for nuclear weapons funding in its fiscal year 2005 appropriations bill. This subcommittee's move, under the sensible leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) is one of the only bipartisan instances of Members of Congress standing up to the heavy-handed Bush administration since this President took office in January of 2001.

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water wisely rejected White House requests of nearly $70 million for research and development of new nuclear weapons. Specifically, the White House requested $28 million for research on the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator, otherwise known as the Bunker Buster; $30 million for planning a modern pit facility to produce new plutonium triggers; and $9 million for a new nuclear weapons initiative.

Moreover, the new energy and water appropriations bill in its current form would reduce the administration's request for the Cruise Missile warhead by $40 million and limit funds for all nuclear stockpile activities. In total, the subcommittee's changes would save American taxpayers over $150 million.

The gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON) said the Bush administration's requests, quoting the chairman here, ''were technically questionable and frankly unnecessarily provocative in the international arena.'' He went on to say, ''They also cost a bunch of money.'' ''Unnecessarily provocative'' are the key words here.

Despite the unnecessarily provocative nature of these requests for new nuclear weapons, the Bush administration is trying to force the funding through anyway.

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham outlined their concerns about the lack of funding for new nuclear weapons in a recent letter to the Republican House leadership in an attempt to dismiss entirely the tried and true appropriations process. Of course, they did not send this letter to the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON) or his counterpart, Senator PETE DOMENICI, unless the letters got lost in the mail. To me, it seems like the Bush administration is up to its usual tricks.

Mr. Speaker, this White House has demonstrated nothing but callous disregard for the Congress and the congressional process. President Bush and his cohorts have given no pause when it comes to freezing out anyone who will not toe the line on their fiscally unsound, budget-busting spending plans.

When it comes to nuclear weapons in particular, President Bush just does not get it. Instead of investing in programs that will truly secure America, like nonproliferation initiatives and vigorous inspection regimes whenever possible, President Bush has spent America's money on more and bigger weapons, in an attempt, I believe, to be tough and also to avoid working with other nations.

Sometimes it seems like the Oval Office is run by a third grade bully. How many nuclear weapons can the United States possibly need? We already possess 9,000 strategic warheads. Do we really need to spend another $150 million to develop new weapons systems?

Mr. Speaker, there has to be a better way, because investing in new nuclear weapons does not prevent America from being attacked. In fact, it encourages a nuclear attack, because such investments incite our enemies and encourage other nations, like Iran, to develop nuclear weapons of their own.

That is why I have introduced H. Con. Res. 392, a Smart Security Platform For America's future. SMART