

Jackson (IL) McDermott
 Jackson-Lee (TX) McGovern
 Jefferson McNulty
 John Meehan
 Johnson, E. B. Meek (FL)
 Jones (OH) Meeks (NY)
 Kanjorski Menendez
 Kaptur Millender-
 Kennedy (RI) McDonald
 Kildee Miller, George
 Kilpatrick Mink
 Kind (WI) Moakley
 Kleczka Molohan
 Kucinich Moran (VA)
 LaFalce Murtha
 Langevin Nadler
 Lantos Napolitano
 Larsen (WA) Neal
 Larson (CT) Oberstar
 Lee Obey
 Levin Oliver
 Lewis (GA) Owens
 Lipinski Pallone
 Lofgren Pastor
 Lowey Payne
 Luther Peterson (MN)
 Maloney (CT) Phelps
 Maloney (NY) Pomeroy
 Markey Price (NC)
 Mascara Rahall
 Matheson Rivers
 Matsui Rush
 McCarthy (MO) Sabo
 McCollum Sanchez

NOT VOTING—12

Baldwin Lampson
 Everett Leach
 Gordon Pelosi
 Johnson (CT) Reynolds

□ 1059

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

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 72]

AYES—354

Abercrombie Barrett
 Ackerman Bartlett
 Aderholt Barton
 Akin Bass
 Allen Becerra
 Andrews Bentsen
 Arney Bereuter
 Baca Berkley
 Bachus Berman
 Baker Berry
 Ballenger Biggert
 Barcia Bilirakis
 Barr Bishop

Blagojevich
 Blumenauer
 Boehlert
 Boehner
 Bonilla
 Bono
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boyd
 Brady (TX)
 Brown (OH)
 Brown (SC)
 Bryant

Burr
 Burton
 Buyer
 Callahan
 Chalvert
 Camp
 Cannon
 Cantor
 Capito
 Capps
 Cardin
 Carson (IN)
 Carson (OK)
 Castle
 Chabot
 Chambliss
 Clay
 Clayton
 Clement
 Coble
 Collins
 Combust
 Condit
 Conyers
 Cooksey
 Cox
 Coyne
 Cramer
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cubin
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Cunningham
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (FL)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis, Jo Ann
 Davis, Tom
 Deal
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 DeLay
 DeMint
 Deutsch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Dooley
 Doolittle
 Doyle
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Dunn
 Edwards
 Ehlers
 Ehrlich
 Emerson
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Evans
 Everett
 Farr
 Fattah
 Ferguson
 Flake
 Fletcher
 Foley
 Ford
 Fossella
 Frank
 Frelinghuysen
 Frost
 Gallegly
 Ganske
 Gekas
 Gephardt
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Gilman
 Gonzalez
 Goode
 Goodlatte
 Goss
 Graham
 Granger
 Graves
 Green (TX)
 Green (WI)
 Greenwood
 Grucci
 Hall (OH)
 Hall (TX)
 Hansen
 Harman
 Hart

Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hayworth
 Herger
 Hill
 Hinojosa
 Hobson
 Hoeft
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Honda
 Horn
 Hostettler
 Houghton
 Hoyer
 Hulshof
 Hunter
 Hutchinson
 Hyde
 Inslee
 Isakson
 Israel
 Issa
 Istook
 Jackson (IL)
 Jenkins
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Kaptur
 Keller
 Kelly
 Kennedy (RI)
 Kerns
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 Kind (WI)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Kleczka
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 LaHood
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Largent
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 Lofgren
 Lowey
 Lucas (KY)
 Lucas (OK)
 Luther
 Maloney (CT)
 Maloney (NY)
 Manzullo
 Markey
 Simmons
 Simpson
 Skee
 Skelton
 Matsui
 McCarthy (MO)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 McCrery
 McHugh
 McInnis
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinney
 Meehan
 Meeks (NY)
 Mica
 Millender-
 McDonald
 Miller (FL)
 Miller, Gary
 Mink
 Moakley
 Molohan
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Morella
 Murtha
 Myrick
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nethercutt
 Ney
 Northup

Norwood
 Oliver
 Ortiz
 Osborne
 Ose
 Otter
 Owens
 Oxley
 Pascarelli
 Pastor
 Paul
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Pence
 Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA)
 Petri
 Phelps
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Platts
 Pombo
 Portman
 Price (NC)
 Pryce (OH)
 Putnam
 Quinn
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Regula
 Rehberg
 Reyes
 Riley
 Rivers
 Rodriguez
 Roemer
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Ross
 Roukema
 Roybal-Allard
 Rush
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryun (KS)
 Sanchez
 Sanders
 Sandlin
 Sawyer
 Saxton
 Scarborough
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrock
 Scott
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Shays
 Sherman
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Shows
 Simmons
 Simpson
 Skee
 Skelton
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Solis
 Souder
 Spence
 Spratt
 Stearns
 Strickland
 Stump
 Sununu
 Sweeney
 Tancredo
 Tauscher
 Tauzin
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thornberry
 Thune
 Thurman
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Toomey
 Towns
 Traficant
 Upton

Velazquez
 Vitter
 Walden
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Watkins
 Watts (OK)
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Wexler
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wynn
 Young (FL)

NOES—62

Baird
 Baldacci
 Bonior
 Borski
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL)
 Capuano
 Clyburn
 Costello
 Crane
 DeFazio
 English
 Filner
 Gibbons
 Gutierrez
 Gutknecht
 Hefley
 Hilleary
 Hilliard
 Hinchey
 Holt
 Hooley
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jefferson
 John
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones (OH)
 Kanjorski
 Kennedy (MN)
 Kucinich
 LaFalce
 Lee
 Lewis (GA)
 LoBiondo
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNulty
 Menendez
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Pallone
 Pomeroy
 Ramstad
 Sabo
 Schaffer
 Slaughter
 Stark
 Stenholm
 Stupak
 Tanner
 Taylor (MS)
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Turner
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Visclosky
 Waters
 Watt (NC)
 Wu

NOT VOTING—16

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

□ 1109

So the Journal was approved.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MARRIAGE PENALTY AND FAMILY TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2001

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

H.R. 6

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(4) by striking subparagraph (D).

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

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

(2) Paragraph (4) of section 63(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

“The preceding sentence shall not apply to the amount referred to in paragraph (2)(A).”.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

to inflation adjustments) is amended to read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

H.R. 6

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, ETC.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(4) by striking subparagraph (D).

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

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

(2) Paragraph (4) of section 63(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

“The preceding sentence shall not apply to the amount referred to in paragraph (2)(A).”.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

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

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

(e) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 5. MODIFICATIONS TO CHILD TAX CREDIT.

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

“(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—

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

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

“In the case of any taxable year beginning in—

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

(b) CREDIT ALLOWED AGAINST ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.—

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

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

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

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

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

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

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

SEC. 6. PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1115

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1130

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Washington, DC, March 29, 2001.

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

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

PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1145

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. I do not have the time.

Mr. RANGEL. I cannot see the photo.

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

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

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

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you very much.

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

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Thank you very much.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I say vote for the Democratic alternative.

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

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

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

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

The list is endless. This is completely reckless!

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1200

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1215

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge a yes vote.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The concerns that I have about this legislation are threefold.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

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

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

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

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

SEC. 101. INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATE REDUCTIONS.

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

“(i) 12 PERCENT RATE BRACKET.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“(3) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

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

“(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

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

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

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

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

“(2) the sum of—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 102. MODIFICATIONS TO EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT.

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

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

“(b) PERCENTAGES AND AMOUNTS.—

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

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

“(2) AMOUNTS.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(4) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

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

“(j) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

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

“(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

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

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

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

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

“(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR TABLES.—

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

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

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

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

(c) EARNED INCOME TO INCLUDE ONLY AMOUNTS INCLUDIBLE IN GROSS INCOME.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 32(c)(2)(A)(i) (defining earned income) is amended by inserting “, but only if such amounts are includible in gross income for the taxable year” after “other employee compensation”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 32(c)(2)(B) is amended by striking “and” at the end of clause (iv), by striking the period at the end of clause (v) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(vi) the requirement under subparagraph (A)(i) that an amount be includible in gross income shall not apply if such amount is exempt from tax under section 7873 or is derived directly from restricted and allotted land under the Act of February 8, 1887 (commonly known as the Indian General Allotment Act) (25 U.S.C. 331 et seq.) or from land held under Acts or treaties containing an exception provision similar to the Indian General Allotment Act.”

(d) MODIFICATION OF JOINT RETURN REQUIREMENT.—Subsection (d) of section 32 is amended to read as follows:

“(d) MARRIED INDIVIDUALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the taxpayer is married at the close of the taxable year, the credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) only if the taxpayer and his spouse file a joint return for the taxable year.

“(2) MARITAL STATUS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), an individual legally separated from his spouse under a decree of divorce or of separate maintenance shall not be considered as married.

“(3) CERTAIN MARRIED INDIVIDUALS LIVING APART.—For purposes of paragraph (1), if—

“(A) an individual—

“(i) is married and files a separate return, and

“(ii) has a qualifying child who is a son, daughter, stepson, or stepdaughter of such individual, and

“(B) during the last 6 months of such taxable year, such individual and such individual’s spouse do not have the same principal place of abode,

such individual shall not be considered as married.”

(e) EXPANSION OF MATHEMATICAL ERROR AUTHORITY.—Paragraph (2) of section 6213(g) is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (K), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (L) and inserting “, and”, and by inserting after subparagraph (L) the following new subparagraph:

“(M) the entry on the return claiming the credit under section 32 with respect to a child if, according to the Federal Case Registry of Child Support Orders established under section 453(h) of the Social Security

Act, the taxpayer is a noncustodial parent of such child.”

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

TITLE II—MARRIAGE PENALTY RELIEF**SEC. 201. MARRIAGE PENALTY RELIEF.**

(a) STANDARD DEDUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 63(c) (relating to standard deduction) is amended—

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

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

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

(D) by striking subparagraph (D).

(2) INCREASE ALLOWED AS DEDUCTION IN DETERMINING MINIMUM TAX.—Subparagraph (E) of section 56(b)(1) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The preceding sentence shall not apply to so much of the standard deduction under subparagraph (A) of section 63(c)(2) as exceeds the amount which would be such deduction but for the amendment made by section 201(a)(1) of the Tax Reduction Act of 2001.

(3) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

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

(B) Paragraph (4) of section 63(c) is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

“The preceding sentence shall not apply to the amount referred to in paragraph (2)(A).”.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 104, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious time in our Nation’s economic history, because for the first time in many, many years, we expect to have a surplus; but we do not know the exact amount that surplus is going to be. Unfortunately, the Republicans have decided that they are going to have tax reductions in the budget based on the fact they expect \$5.6 trillion. We all know from the Congressional Budget Office that these figures that we are relying on, 50 percent of the time they are wrong, and the question is, what happens if they are wrong this time? We hope that they will not be.

It seems as though, if this tax cut is locked into place and the surplus is not there, then the funds will not be there for Social Security, for Medicare, for prescription drugs relief, for education where the President wants to leave no child behind; and we were hoping that if we could find some kind of a trigger mechanism or some way to have a tax cut that we know that we can afford this year, or maybe for the next 5 years

and then after that, take a look and see where we are in terms of our economy, where are we in terms of the programs, then not just Democrats, but even this compassionate Republican President would want to see supported.

□ 1230

So it just seems to me that if we are concerned about education and making certain our kids are going to be productive, concerned about our old folks getting decent health care, concerned about our men and women in the military, improving the quality of their lives, the question has to be: Where will the money come from?

Of course, if we find out that we do not have the funds, there are only two things that we can do: ask for another substantial tax increase, or cut out the programs, the funding for the programs.

We do know that there are many people on the other side of the aisle that believe the Social Security System never should have been created, that Medicare is not working, that the best that we should do for education is to give them a voucher.

We know that health care to some people, they believe that there should not be a Patients' Bill of Rights. But by the same token, most Americans disagree with that theory, and we should not use reduction of taxes and an increase in spending for defense as an excuse to wipe out domestic spending.

So, Mr. Speaker, it might be that the best thing that we should be thinking about doing is instructing the Congress or the conferees to recommit this bill, and to have them come back to see whether we can do something right now to spur the economy; whether we can get \$60 billion out there in the taxpayers' hands; whether we can really stimulate the economy now, instead of just letting the rich get richer 5 years from now.

We know that this tax cut has nothing to do with the stimulation of the economy, because the President thought about it in the good years. Mr. Clinton and Mr. Gore had a great economy going. Now that we are bad-mouthing the economy, now that it is sputtering, now that it is looking like it needs a shot in the arm, maybe what we ought to do, not as Republicans and as Democrats, but as Members of the House of Representatives, is to set aside this bill and tell the conferees, let us get something out to the taxpayers this year. Let us get it to the hard-working low-income people, the moderate-income people, and make certain that there is a vehicle out there that we can use.

I am certain that staff will have prepared at the end of this debate a vehicle that we can join together and use to get that money out there, stimulate the economy now, and then we can take a deep breath and take a look and see what an equitable tax cut might be.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Does the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) seek the time in opposition?

Mr. THOMAS. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, I guess I am just a little confused. My understanding is that the substitute that has been offered to this particular bill, H.R. 6, is identical to the substitute that was offered to the bill on marginal rate reductions, H.R. 3, just a short time ago.

But in listening carefully to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and his arguments, it sounded to me as if he really wanted a tax package; not the one offered as a substitute, but one that was, in fact, a stimulus for the economy.

It seems to me that if he would turn into paper the words that he offered, he would not have presented exactly the same substitute that had been presented 1½ weeks and 2 weeks ago; that, in fact, if he does want something that he professes, all he needs to do is offer a substitute that, in fact, does that.

At some point we begin to wonder whether that argument is rhetoric, just as the Lexus muffler is no longer in front of us. It seems as though it is an argument of the day, but we would think that if it is the argument of the day, they would offer a substitute to the motion in front of us that at least conformed to the argument of the day. But, in fact, we have in front of us that same old substitute, that same old substitute that is less generous.

The Democrats have talked about the various pieces that we have been passing. In fact, if we add them up, it is pretty obvious that the tax package that is contained in the budget that was passed yesterday is clearly more generous than what the Democrats are offering. In fact, in this substitute there really is not even any child credit, which is a major portion of the bill we are discussing and supports the President's proposal of doubling it from \$500 to \$1,000. And we make retroactive in this bill the first \$100 increase, from \$500 to \$600, to occur in this year, the 2001 tax year.

Some of our friends on the other side are continuing to argue that we do not have a budget in place. We, in fact, passed a budget. All the pieces fit. That argument is no longer relevant, unless, of course, they want to argue that it is not a budget yet until the House and Senate sit down and agree. Then Members may want to move to the argument that the ink on the paper of the agreement is not yet dry. Then they may want to offer another argument.

The fact of the matter is they will offer argument after argument. That budget that was passed yesterday addresses the President's concerns about Social Security, talks about modern-

izing Medicare, provides dollars for modernizing Medicare with prescription drugs. And, please, President Bush has already established himself as the education President. His bold and far-reaching proposals of placing more dollars in the hands of teachers and parents to make sure that no child will be left behind clearly indicates that education is on the front burner of this Presidency.

So I guess if we are going to argue against what is offered here today, a final adjustment on the marriage penalty contained in the Tax Code and a doubling of the credit available to hard-working taxpayers with children, that at the very least, if we are going to make arguments against the bill and offer substitutes, what we ought to do is have the arguments and the substitutes match.

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

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

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman has talked quite a bit about details and very little about how this all would fit together. The main reason is this: The \$1.6 trillion Bush administration tax package was a risky proposition in the first place, that including debt service was going to use up 75 percent, 75 percent of the non-Social Security and Medicare surplus.

Now, with the dip in the stock market, that proposal becomes even more risky. So the decision seemed clever at first to break it up into pieces, but the public can add. When we add it all together, it is a very, very risky proposition. It is not fiscally responsible.

Now we have a second piece in front of us today, the marriage penalty provision, plus. It is much larger than Mr. Bush proposed before he became President. Half of the so-called marriage penalty provision goes to people who do not have a marriage penalty provision in their income tax returns.

Why are we doing this? I do not know. Maybe we have kind of a Pied Piper syndrome here. I am not sure who always is calling the tune, but I think if it succeeds, it would lead those following it over the cliff. The trouble is it would lead this Nation's economy over the cliff.

There has been some talk about bipartisanship. Whatever the vote is on this or any other piece, when we put them all together, there is not bipartisan support. The bipartisan support is almost zero. Indeed, it is a partisan effort.

There has been some reference to stimulus. We are going to have a stimulus provision on the motion to recommit. What is the impact of this majority proposal here this year? It is an asterisk, which means close to zero. Talk

about a stimulus, there is not any real stimulus. If there is any tax proposal that can stimulate the Nation's economy, this is not it, nor is it the entire package.

So in a word, I suggest this: Add it all together, I say to the citizens of this country, and when we do, we will come to the conclusion that this proposal is one that puts the Nation's economy at risk.

We fought hard for a decade for fiscal discipline. It led to lower interest rates. Let us not put that in jeopardy. Vote yes on the substitute and no on the basic bill.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, of course I would note that this bipartisan bill, combined with the rate reduction that we already passed out of this House of Representatives, put almost \$600 in the pockets of the average family of four this year, if we include the child tax credit, which is retroactive, plus the rate reduction.

This is a bipartisan bill. My good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), has been a partner in this effort to eliminate the tax penalty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, for yielding time to me, and I rise in support of the bipartisan bill, the underlying bill reported out by the committee.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I believe very strongly that an increased tax should not be Uncle Sam's wedding present to a newly married couple. We need to value the institution of marriage. We need to value the children. We need to recognize that doubling the tax credit for children in this country really also is sensitive to the fact of how difficult it is today in America to raise our children and to get them to schools and in braces, to make sure that we afford to raise them the proper way.

This is a value that I voted for when the Democratic President vetoed it, and I will vote for it again today. I will vote for it as the father of four children. I will vote for it because, from my farmers' market to my supermarkets, this is one of the most important tax breaks that my constituents in Indiana talk to me about all the time, the marriage penalty and helping with the tax credit to raise their children.

This bill is not perfect. It needs reform. It needs refinement. It needs

modification. It needs all of this because it is higher than even what President Bush has proposed. I have said that reducing the national debt is important. I do not think we can dig a big hole and get back into the fiscally irresponsible days that we had 5 and 6 years ago there.

Excuse the pun, but we should also marry this bill up to estate tax reform; not straight-out repeal, but reform of the estate taxes. We should also help with an AMT fix, with the marriage penalty and child tax credits, which all together would not threaten our economy, which would help us pull down the debt. That would fit in about a \$1 trillion tax cut.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the 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?

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. We are debating yet another tax bill proposed by the Republicans that is seriously flawed.

The Republican proposal provides the most benefits to those who need them least. It gives short shrift to those who need relief the most. And as predicted,

the Republican leadership is attempting to go well beyond the already huge tax cut proposed by President Bush with more tax cuts on the way.

Again, Democrats strongly support marriage tax penalty relief and tax benefits for families with children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic alternative.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would note to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), my good friend, who spoke on behalf of the partisan Democratic alternative, that by voting for the partisan Democratic alternative against the bipartisan H.R. 6 that she would vote to deny 54,000 kids in the eighth district in California increased child tax credit relief.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), a leader on behalf of families.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. What this bill does very clearly, first, is double the child tax credit from \$500 to \$1,000, increases standard deductions for married folks, joint filers, twice that of single filers; expands the 15 percent tax bracket for married joint filers to twice that of single filers; and increases the earned income tax credit; protects child tax credit from the alternative minimum tax.

What is this bill really about? I say it is truly about family values. I know that expression has been abused over the years, but it is about the value of the institution of marriage; something that transcends faith and transcends culture.

We are saying let us not tax that institution because there are enough pressures on that institution already. Let us make it fair. Let us give them the opportunities.

One of the leading causes of a breakdown of the family is financial pressure, and we want to relieve that. That is what this bill does.

We had from the far left a welfare system that did not recognize the value of the family and said, Dad, you are not welcome here.

We truly need to recognize the value of the institution of marriage. Because why? It is about children. It is about their future, making sure that we can do everything to recognize the importance of its institution and its impact on children. That is the reason I recommend that you oppose this partisan bill and support the bipartisan bill H.R. 6.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for his leadership. I thank the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the debate is so limited that we are not able to express our concerns for the American people in longer debate. Today I will announce that I am going to vote for a marriage penalty tax relief.

Frankly, the kind of relief that if Americans were given the information that the media holds back from you, you would understand that we are trying to work in a manner that responds to the needs of working families.

In fact, I am also supportive of a \$60 billion tax cut right now, this year, that keeps us in line with the fact that we cannot guarantee that we will have a \$5 trillion surplus over the next 10 years.

I want you to have tax relief now, and so what we are supporting is to ensure that in my State of Texas, if you will, that we will not have 769,000 numbers of families with children who will get no tax cut.

Unlike the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), my good friend, he is voting for a tax cut where 362,000 of his constituents in Illinois will not get a tax cut.

We want a marriage penalty that responds to the needs of the American people. One that creates a 12 percent rate bracket for the first 20,000 of taxable income, equivalent to 41,000 of total income for a couple with two children.

We want to simplify the earned income tax credit and increase it for working families. We want the dollars to go in your pocket, unlike the \$128 billion tax cut that I am told we received in the State of Texas 2 years ago.

When I go throughout any district and I ask my constituents, did they receive a tax cut, did they get a refund, no one can document receiving any fungible dollars that they could utilize to support their family. Some people say that they thought they got a tax credit on their property taxes, which really does not show up.

So what the Democrats are saying with the alternative is it could actually get reported in the newspapers today SHEILA JACKSON-LEE will vote for a marriage penalty tax relief bill. I believe in this bill because it is fiscally responsible, and it answers the concerns of the American people and working families.

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

Mr. Speaker, just in quick response to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), my good friend, I would say that not only will the bipartisan bill which she spoke against provide 5 million low-income working Americans receiving the earned income tax credit, significantly more relief, in fact, \$400 a year, but that the proposal which the gentlewoman is in support of, the partisan Democratic substitute, that proposal would actually deny tax relief to millions of children throughout America, including her own district.

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

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, for his leadership on this issue.

I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 6. As the cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, I begin by saying that I am not opposed to providing true marriage penalty relief for all Americans. I support responsible tax cuts for all taxpayers.

As the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and many of my Democratic colleagues of mine who have stated so forcefully today, the Democratic alternative is the only bill on the floor that provides true relief. Americans need a tax cut, and I am in favor of that. But we must have a tax cut that is responsible, a targeted tax cut that really will provide true tax relief during these difficult economic times.

As with the bills that my Republican colleagues brought before the 105th and 106th Congress and now in the 107th Congress, H.R. 6 is poorly targeted, too broad and too expensive.

This bill will result in spending of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds and a cut in domestic spending. This plan reverses the course that we have been on for several years and does not leave adequate money to continue paying down the national debt.

H.R. 6 is a bill tilted towards the wealthy people of this country and threatens all the priorities important to hard-working families.

It raids Medicare trust funds, and it is too back-loaded that it does nothing to help our economy today.

This bill will crowd out the priorities vital to millions of seniors, military families, women and children. It cuts services like COPS on the beat and after-school programs that are so vital for the public schools and for safety of our children.

This bill provides, Mr. Speaker, no benefits to American families who need help with child care and housing. I support the Democratic alternative, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill that gives true marriage penalty relief.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that we have a bipartisan bill before us today that is being offered as an amendment, a partisan Democratic substitute for the bipartisan bill. I would note that the bipartisan bill will benefit 25 million married working couples who pay higher taxes just because they are married.

In fact, the bipartisan bill which received the support of every House Republican last year and 51 Democrats who broke with their leadership to support real marriage tax relief will help eliminate almost the entire marriage tax penalty for almost everyone that suffers it. That is pretty fair.

I would also note that the partisan Democratic substitute fails to help

children. In fact, they fail to address the need to increase the child tax credit. And we work with the President and his proposal to double the child tax credit, doubling it to \$1,000. It is currently \$500. It will provide immediate relief this year, an additional \$100, so it will be an additional \$600 tax credit this year.

I would point out in combination with the rate reduction, as well as the child tax credit this will put an additional \$600 in the average family's pockets this year.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that if there are any Members who believe that President Bush had this marriage penalty tax solution correct last year during his campaign, they need to vote against this proposal, because this bill rejects the Bush solution to this marriage penalty problem.

Indeed, the only witness that the Republicans brought forward on this issue said President Bush's approach was worse than doing nothing. Now after I said that earlier in the debate, a piece of paper was advanced that the Administration has endorsed today's proposal. I have not seen that yet, but certainly this would not be the first campaign promise that the President has chosen to reverse himself on this year.

Mr. Speaker, I would just emphasize that the better approach is not to place an additional penalty on single individuals, whether a widow, a single mom or simply some person that chooses to live as a single individual. Our tax system ought to be based on equity and be designed so as not to discriminate based on marital status. This particular Republican proposal discriminates instead of following the approach that President Bush recommended last year.

One of the issues that has not gotten as much attention in this debate as I think it needs is the question of what stimulus, if any, comes out of this tax package.

Members will recall that the Bush tax proposal was not developed during hard times, at least not economic hard times, they were developed during campaign hard times, when he feared Steve Forbes' challenge in the Republican primary.

The economy was doing well. His campaign was faltering a little bit. So he tried to come up with an approach that would stimulate the financial statements of the wealthiest people in our society and to out-Steve Forbes, Steve Forbes. I think that that is what his overall tax proposal was designed to do last year.

Now we face more challenging economic times, and it would seem to me that we ought to focus tax relief in ways that might help with our economic slowdown.

We do not know how long or how deep this Bush economic slowdown will be, since he began talking down the economy, but we can be certain that there is no economic stimulus to turn the economy around found in today's piece of legislation.

Like their estate tax proposal, this tax package has a better chance of resurrecting the dead than of resurrecting the economy.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 14½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) has 20 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, one might think the only thing before us today is the marriage penalty and the child credit. I think to legislators we can take a look and clearly we would see that the Democratic substitute that is before us today is more equitable. It is fairer, and it takes care of the problems that we have been talking about.

Let no one believe that by voting for the substitute that they are not voting for not only equitable relief, but they are voting for a child credit that is going to reach the kids that come from families that make less than \$30,000, which is not true of the majority's program.

But even more importantly than that is the different pieces of the tax bill that is coming to the floor, not as a comprehensive tax program within a budget that we know what to expect, but each week that we come here, we are asked to vote on different pieces. It is this that we do not know how much can we digest since already before the next week is out they would have completed the \$1.6 trillion and start moving towards the \$2 trillion tax package that they really have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the distinguished minority leader, who is the final speaker on our side.

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

□ 1300

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask Members to vote against the Republican tax bill and for the bill sponsored by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and our ranking member on the Committee on Ways and Means.

I take this position for several reasons. First, I ask Members to consider the real differences between these two tax cut proposals. The Republican bill increases the child credit, but only for some families. Their child credit does not fully phase in until the year 2006, which means that some families will not see any relief because their chil-

dren will turn 16 before then, and they will be too old to be eligible for the tax cut.

Millions of families of all income levels will be disappointed because Republicans give people nothing in the marriage penalty relief until the year 2004, and they will not get the full tax cut that the Republicans promise until 2009.

What does all of this delay and all of these gimmicks really say to the American people? That despite all of the rhetoric about cutting taxes to help with the immediate economic downturn, I do not think my friends on the other side are serious. They are not serious about providing relief this year when it is most needed. Their tax bill does not help people for another 3 to 5 years; in some instances, 8 years. This delayed phase-in is the direct result of a larger tax plan that spends the entire available surplus that is not even there yet that may never materialize.

Well, this is not right and it is not fair. I ask Members to consider our bill, which is responsible, balanced and fair. Our bill doubles the standard deduction for married couples so they get relief this year. Our bill recognizes that we are in a period of economic uncertainty, so we give people immediate tax relief which we think will help them get through the uncertainty of the time we are in.

But the most important reason to vote against the Republican bill is that it is part of a much larger tax plan that leaves no room for the other important priorities of the American people.

After today, this House will have already passed \$1.8 trillion in tax cuts when we include the interest. If Republicans continue with their plans and put forward, as they are apparently planning, the estate tax and their other tax bills, then the additional tax breaks that they have said they will pass as part of the President's plan, which is a floor, will cost about \$3 trillion once the smoke clears.

The Republican tax cut package raids the Medicare trust fund as early as 2005. It does nothing to help the economy because it is so back-loaded. It crowds out other priorities vital to millions of seniors, military families, and women and children. It results in a budget that cuts existing services like Cops on the Beat and after-school programs to make our public schools safe for our children.

Most damaging, the Republican tax plan could bring back the high deficits, high interest rates, and slow growth that we saw at the end of the last Bush administration.

We have to keep in our mind that the goal is to keep the economy moving, to keep unemployment down, to keep growth going up. One of the best ways to do that is to keep interest rates down.

So I argue to the Members, think about the effect on the economy and what the Republican tax cut does not

do, what it crowds out our ability to do for the ordinary families in this country who pay interest costs on house payments and car payments and furniture payments every month.

Married families and children would be better off with our plan. We provide sensible tax relief for all taxpayers. We focus relief on those in the middle and those trying to get in the middle who need our help the most.

Plus, we give people a country free of debt by 2008; a Medicare prescription drug program for all seniors who want it; a Social Security and a Medicare trust fund extended to 2050 in the one case and 2040 respectively, at least 11 to 12 years added solvency of the Medicare and Social Security trust funds; more quality teachers; more Cops on the Beat; and school buildings in repair and enlarged and rehabilitated.

We give people lower interest rates. For an average family of four, 1 percent off interest rates means \$1,500 a year in savings on a car payment and on house payments. If one adds a reasonable tax cut, about \$700 a year, one is going to wind up putting more money in the pockets of a typical family than the larger tax cut that would likely keep interest rates a point higher.

So I urge Members to consider this argument when they cast their vote on these two bills. Consider the actual real-life consequences of the decision we are making on the floor today. Consider what happens if these surpluses do not materialize. Consider what happens if the projections turn out to be wrong.

What if we find ourselves in debt again, as we did in the 1980s, as far as the eye can see? We have been there. We have run this experiment. We ran it for 15 years, from 1981 to 1995. It did not work.

We should be more humble about our thoughts about economics. We should be more reticent to take this risky river boat gamble to go out into the deficits when we could keep the surpluses.

It is time to keep interest rates down, unemployment down, inflation down. This is a 20-year decision of this body. It is easy to make this decision. It is hard to correct it. It took us 15 years to 20 years to get over the last mistake. Why would we want to do that again?

I urge Members to examine their conscience, examine the facts. Vote against this Republican bill. Vote for the more sensible common sense Democratic alternative.

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

Mr. Speaker, I note that the bipartisan plan before us, H.R. 6, combined with the rate reduction we passed earlier this year, will put \$600 in the pockets of the average family of four this year. I also note in the minority leader's district that his partisan Democratic alternative would deny relief to 102,000 children in his own district, the Third District of Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS), the distinguished House Republican Conference Chairman.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois, my friend, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me set something straight at the outset. I think it is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that what we are talking about today is not the government's money, but the American people's money. One of these days, it is going to register to the 535 Members of Congress that vote on these issues that it is not Washington's money, it is the people's money.

I think it is time to put partisanship aside and enact a plan that will protect families, strengthen the economy, and secure our children's future. H.R. 6 is a common sense plan to strengthen families and secure our children's future. It stops the unfair tax that simply penalizes two people for saying "I do." I think it is wrong. I think it is unfair.

The problem that we have is, and I would make the point, families are working longer and harder than ever; yet Washington continues to take more and more. The marriage penalty requires more time at work, and that means less time at home with the family and with the kids.

Should two people pay higher taxes just because they are married? Should families spend 50 percent of their income in Federal, State and local taxes? Should families pay more in taxes than for food, clothing, and shelter combined? Should not parents be allowed to spend their own money to meet the needs of their own children?

On behalf of hard-working families, what we are doing today is asking for fairness and common sense to protect families and to secure our children's future.

The average family of four will save \$560 this year through our tax plan, H.R. 6, and the rate reduction plan that we have already passed. All Americans will benefit because giving people money back, that creates job security and a strong economy.

Nearly 25 million couples will save money from repeal of the marriage penalty, 53,000 couples in the Fourth District of Oklahoma, the district that I represent. More than 81 million children will qualify for the \$1,000 per-child tax credit; 81,000 kids in the Fourth District of Oklahoma will qualify for that.

At least 4 million African American married couples will benefit immediately from repeal of the marriage tax penalty. This means more money for college, for groceries, for house payments, for car payments, for car insurance, maybe to buy a new washer and dryer, new appliance.

It is time that we enact common sense legislation today to strengthen families and secure our children's future and stop taxing people for simply saying "I do." That is unfair. It is wrong.

I urge a yes vote on H.R. 6.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this whole idea that Democrats do not understand that what surplus we are talking about is not the government's money, but it is the people's money, we understand that. We understand even further that whatever surpluses we are talking about is the hard-working people that pay the Social Security tax and the payroll tax that give us what is the so-called surplus.

There is no surplus there. The fact that under the Clinton-Gore administration we have been able to get a better cash flow does not mean that there is a surplus. We owe \$3.4 trillion. We pay debt service on that money.

It is safe to say that, when we work together and try to reduce our national debt, that that is the true way to say that we are giving back their money by reducing the national debt.

In addition to that, it is abundantly clear that many on the other side do not believe we should have a Social Security system. I cannot argue with you if that is what you believe. You do not believe in Medicare. You do not believe in providing for affordable prescription drugs.

What we are saying is that, yes, those are the people's programs. We are here as Democrats; and hopefully we can convince some Republicans to work together and not just say it is the people's money. It is the people's country. It is the people's debt. It is the people's Social Security program. It is the people's Medicare program. It is the people's children that need education to make them productive. All of these things belong to the people.

We should not take a river boat gamble on what is going to happen 6, 7 years from now and put people in jeopardy for their kids and those people today that will soon become eligible for Social Security and Medicare benefits.

We have to agree that you are coming our way as it relates to child credits and things like that, but you are giving us a little piece at a time. Already we are up to a trillion dollars, and we have to stop you before you hurt somebody. Because we know that piece by piece you will never be able to get this off of the ground.

Even the President is against the things that you are going to come up with. Well, how do I know? Well, first of all, it is because I go over and I talk with the President from time to time. He is a very likable chap. He likes Democrats. He likes Republicans.

He told us, which I assume he shared with you, that he does not want the tax cut lower than \$1.6 trillion, like Democrats want it, nor does he want it higher than \$1.6 trillion like some Republicans want it. He wants it just like this. He thinks that this just fits.

I am telling the President, get your troops in order and try to get some of that compassion or conservatism on

the other side of the aisle; because, Mr. President, this just does not fit.

Already we have got \$950 billion that has already passed the House, \$399 billion we are trying to defeat today, \$267 billion they say is going to come up next week. We have health related, education related. We have got research and development, which is going to cost us \$50 billion. We have the alternative minimum tax fix, \$292 billion.

When we get finished with all of this and add debt service to it, \$556 billion, Mr. President, the Republicans will be giving you a \$3 trillion tax burden which you say is too big.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, let the Democrats join in and say we are going to stop this majority in the House. We have a substitute that is more in line with what you are thinking about, Mr. President, and the people will have an opportunity, including Republicans, to work in a bipartisan way to vote for the substitute and to stop the majority's bill.

Mr. Speaker, then what can we do? Then we can really come together, sit down as Republicans and Democrats, and see whether we can agree to a bill that does not pass on the partisan vote, but a total bill taking in consideration all of the things.

Mr. President, in order to make it easier, we Democrats have come up with a bill that we really believe Republicans should consider. It is H.R. 1264, and it would allow for us to look at the entire budget that we have and to divide it into one-third for the tax cut, one-third in order to reduce the debt, and one-third for the programs that the American people and even the President of the United States support.

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, we have one remaining speaker on behalf of our legislation. Has the minority concluded?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has no time remaining. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) has 16½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have a bipartisan bill, H.R. 6, before us that eliminates the marriage tax penalty, as well as doubles the child tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the House majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Committee on Ways and Means and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) in particular for his fine work on this legislation. I also want to personally thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for speaking one more time on

this bill, because his having done so punctuates a fact that we oftentimes try to disguise in this body, and the gentleman from New York has made that fact profoundly clear to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, this is a partisan debate. Mr. Speaker, that is as it should be, because, indeed, this body is almost wholly divided between two very distinct and two very separate political parties, parties that do, in fact, congregate around different visions of America, and to a large extent what you see in this debate today is a conflict of visions.

My colleagues who congregate on my side of the aisle have a vision of America that is based on our profound belief that America is made great and America is built, its economy is built, by real people at home in America earning and spending their own money on behalf of their own best interests and on behalf of their families.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party on the other side of the aisle tend to congregate around the belief that America is built great by big government. This is not a new debate. We have it every time we put a tax bill on the floor; and the foundation issue is do we give people part of their money back and hold taxes down so that the greatness of America can continue to be built at home by people who actually earn the money themselves, or are we going to keep it here in town so that people in Washington can spend it on their behalf and build programs.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is we have seen demonstrated time and time again that whenever Washington has the good grace to leave people more of their own money in what we call take-home pay, America does well with that.

I was a young economics student in 1961 and 1962, and this lesson was brought home to me by President Kennedy, and the Democrats do not like us to mention this fact, but he taught us this lesson in economics in the early 1960s. When President Kennedy faced an economic recession, he said, cut taxes and let America grow the economy back with their own money. And bless our hearts, we did; and he was right.

Mr. Speaker, the animosity towards growing America at home through your own money is so heartfelt on the other side of the aisle that today they even resent us citing this great lesson from this great President, because indeed the idea is bigger than the man, and this idea is not the idea around which they congregate.

And so we come again to the early 1980s, Mr. Speaker, and Ronald Reagan did the same thing, and America did grow. It is a fact that revenue to the United States Government doubled in the 1980s after the American economy began to grow again in consequence to the Reagan tax cuts.

The deficits that we experienced in the 1980s were not because the American people were not doing their part;

we did our part. We sent Washington twice as much money by the end of that decade. The problem is that Washington did not do its part. It did not control its gluttony. Washington has had an addiction that we are trying to cure, and that is an addiction for other people's money. Throughout the entire decade of the 1980s, spending in this town grew by \$1.56 for every \$1 that we sent this town.

If you want to stop the deficits, that is where you stop it. You stop that spending growing out of control, and that is what we did when we took over in 1994, and that is why we have the surpluses we have today; because we stopped the spending gluttony of this town.

Mr. Speaker, now we come to another time where America is once again concerned about their economic stability, their future. The American people are saying that we need relief. We need encouragement in a Tax Code. Give us some more of our own money back. Take a little less away. We have good things that we want to do with it. And this bill that we bring to the floor today speaks to the heart of the American dream. The idea that we will say to our young men and women in this country, Go ahead, fall in love, get married, and you will not be penalized for it should never be an idea that is resisted by anybody.

Now, I do not have a reputation for being much of a romantic fellow around here, but I have enough romance in my soul to realize this: If young people fall in love and get married, the Federal Government should applaud them, not tax them. And once you are married, and once you retain some take-home pay that is commensurate with what you did before you were married, go ahead and have those precious babies and spend on them. I hope you spend a lot on them.

On behalf of my grandson, for example, I happen to be a big fan of Blues Clues toys. I think every baby ought to be able to play with Blues Clues toys. There are many things we can do for our babies, and we ought to have a little more take-home pay, so we increase the child tax credit so those families can enjoy those things. That should be applauded in this Chamber, especially by those of us that are at the age of myself and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), who have the great joy of grandchildren in our lives. Far better for them than it was for our kids. And we should applaud this.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important move. This is an important change in the Tax Code. Not only does it have the ability to encourage the American family to work harder, do more, but it allows them to take a larger share of their own paycheck home and do the most important thing they will ever do in their life, raise their children.

Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been throughout this entire discussion, from the inception going back to the campaign, on shift-

ing sand. First it was no tax reductions. We cannot afford that. I always laugh when I hear the government cannot afford that. How much will it cost the government to give tax reductions?

Then it was you have the wrong kind of tax reductions. But they continued to move on this matter. Then it was it is not your tax cuts we want, it is our tax cuts that we want. And then finally, you have got to do this on a bipartisan fashion. You cannot do it on a bipartisan fashion if one party wants no tax cut and the other party wants a tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, but even then we try to accommodate. What can be more bipartisan than a bill that was passed just a year ago with more than 50 votes from the other side of the aisle? That looks like a generous bipartisan effort.

This is an important thing that we do, and we are working hard for it. We can talk about the growth of the American economy through the efforts of the American family, and we can talk about the prosperity and happiness of the American family by having more of their own pay as take-home pay, and we can talk about resolving fundamental inequities and inanities in the Tax Code.

Mr. Speaker, I must say we should be embarrassed to have a Tax Code on our books that says to our sons and daughters, if you should fall in love, and if you should wed, we will punish you. Again, let me applaud the gentleman from Illinois and the Committee on Ways and Means. It is time to put an end to that, and we will do that with this vote.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 104, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 196, nays 231, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—196

Abercrombie	Barrett	Blumenauer
Ackerman	Becerra	Bonior
Allen	Bentsen	Borski
Andrews	Berkley	Boswell
Baca	Berman	Boucher
Baird	Bishop	Boyd
Baldacci	Blagojevich	Brady (PA)

Brown (FL)	Inslee	Owens	Kerns	Oxley	Skeen
Brown (OH)	Israel	Pallone	King (NY)	Paul	Smith (MI)
Capps	Jackson (IL)	Pascarell	Kingston	Pence	Smith (NJ)
Cardin	Jackson-Lee	Pastor	Kirk	Peterson (PA)	Smith (TX)
Carson (IN)	(TX)	Payne	Knollenberg	Petri	Souder
Carson (OK)	Jefferson	Pelosi	Kolbe	Pickering	Spence
Clay	John	Peterson (MN)	LaHood	Pitts	Stearns
Clayton	Johnson, E. B.	Phelps	Largent	Platts	Stump
Clement	Jones (OH)	Pomeroy	Latham	Pombo	Sununu
Clyburn	Kaptur	Price (NC)	LaTourette	Portman	Sweeney
Condit	Kennedy (RI)	Rahall	Leach	Pryce (OH)	Tancredo
Conyers	Kildee	Rangel	Lewis (CA)	Putnam	Tauzin
Costello	Kilpatrick	Reyes	Lewis (KY)	Quinn	Taylor (MS)
Coyne	Kind (WI)	Rivers	Linder	Radanovich	Taylor (NC)
Cramer	Klecza	Rodriguez	Lipinski	Ramstad	Terry
Crowley	Kucinich	Roemer	LoBiondo	Regula	Thomas
Cummings	LaFalce	Ross	Lucas (KY)	Rehberg	Thornberry
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Roybal-Allard	Lucas (OK)	Reynolds	Thune
Davis (FL)	Lantos	Rush	Manzullo	Riley	Tiahrt
Davis (IL)	Larsen (WA)	Sabo	Matheson	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Sanchez	McCrery	Rogers (MI)	Toomey
DeGette	Lee	Sanders	McHugh	Rohrabacher	Trafigant
Delahunt	Levin	Sandlin	McInnis	Roukema	Upton
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Sawyer	McKeon	Royce	Visclosky
Deutsch	Lofgren	Schakowsky	Mica	Ryan (WI)	Vitter
Dicks	Lowey	Schiff	Miller (FL)	Ryun (KS)	Walden
Dingell	Luther	Scott	Miller, Gary	Saxton	Walsh
Dooley	Maloney (CT)	Serrano	Moran (KS)	Scarborough	Wamp
Doyle	Maloney (NY)	Sherman	Morella	Schaffer	Watkins
Edwards	Markey	Shows	Murtha	Schrock	Watts (OK)
Engel	Mascara	Skelton	Myrick	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (FL)
Eshoo	Matsui	Slaughter	Nethercutt	Sessions	Weldon (PA)
Etheridge	McCarthy (MO)	Smith (WA)	Ney	Shadegg	Weller
Evans	McCarthy (NY)	Snyder	Northup	Shaw	Whitfield
Farr	McCollum	Solis	Norwood	Shays	Wicker
Fattah	McDermott	Spratt	Nussle	Sherwood	Wilson
Filner	McGovern	Stark	Osborne	Shimkus	Wolf
Ford	McIntyre	Stenholm	Ose	Simmons	Young (AK)
Frank	McKinney	Strickland	Otter	Simpson	Young (FL)
Frost	McNulty	Stupak			
Gephardt	Meehan	Tanner			
Gonzalez	Meek (FL)	Tauscher	Baldwin	Ros-Lehtinen	Sisisky
Gordon	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (CA)	Lampson	Rothman	
Green (TX)	Menendez	Thompson (MS)			
Gutierrez	Millender	Thurman			
Hall (OH)	McDonald	Tierney			
Hall (TX)	Miller, George	Towns			
Harman	Mink	Turner			
Hastings (FL)	Moakley	Udall (CO)			
Hill	Mollohan	Udall (NM)			
Hilliard	Moore	Velazquez			
Hinches	Moran (VA)	Waters			
Hinojosa	Nadler	Watt (NC)			
Hoeffel	Napolitano	Waxman			
Holden	Neal	Weiner			
Holt	Oberstar	Wexler			
Honda	Obey	Woolsey			
Hooley	Olver	Wu			
Hoyer	Ortiz	Wynn			

NOT VOTING—5

□ 1349

Messrs. CALVERT, BERRY, COOKSEY and KANJORSKI changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. SHOWS and Mrs. THURMAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(Mr. BOUCHER asked and was given permission to speak out of order for 1 minute.)

EXPRESSION OF SYMPATHY AT THE PASSING OF NORMAN SISISKY, MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty of reporting to the House the passing this morning of our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY).

For 18 years, NORMAN represented Virginia's 4th Congressional District with distinction in a manner that was highly effective for the interests of his constituents, for our State of Virginia, and for the Nation. His wit and his charm and his gracious manner endeared him to the Members of the House and to the Virginians who have been well served by his representations, first as a member of the Virginia House of Delegates and more recently as a Member of this body. His many legislative contributions on matters ranging from national security policy to economic advancements to educational improvements have made his State and our Nation a better place.

I have personally known NORMAN for many years and have been glad to name him among my personal friends. We began our public service together in

the Virginia General Assembly and were elected for the first time to this House in the same year.

I wish to express my deepest sympathy to his family and to his many friends. In the passing of NORMAN SISISKY, we have lost a dear friend; and this Nation has lost a valuable public servant.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer sympathy to NORMAN's family. Everyone was NORMAN's friend on both sides of the aisle. There will be a resolution that we will offer from both sides of the aisle after the last vote for an hour, and anyone who would like to speak at that time will have the opportunity immediately after the last vote. But our hearts and prayers go out to NORMAN's family, his staff, and his friends.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RANGEL. Yes, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANGEL moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Stike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. REFUND OF 2000 INDIVIDUAL INCOMES TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter B of chapter 65 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to rules of special application) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 6428. REFUND OF 2000 INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, each individual shall be treated as having made a payment against the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such individual's first taxable year beginning in 2000 in an amount equal to 100 percent of the amount of such individual's net Federal tax liability for such taxable year.

“(b) MAXIMUM PAYMENT.—The amount treated as paid by reason of this section shall not exceed \$300 (\$600 in the case of a married couple filing a joint return).

“(c) NET FEDERAL TAX LIABILITY.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘net Federal tax liability’ means the amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

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

“(B) the sum of the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A (other than the credits allowable subpart C thereof, relating to refundable credits).

“(2) FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN.—In the case of a taxpayer with 1 or more qualifying children (as defined in section 32) for the taxpayer's first taxable year beginning in 2000,

NAYS—231

Aderholt	Combest	Goodlatte
Akin	Cooksey	Goss
Armey	Cox	Graham
Bachus	Crane	Granger
Baker	Crenshaw	Graves
Ballenger	Cubin	Green (WI)
Barcia	Culberson	Greenwood
Barr	Cunningham	Grucci
Bartlett	Davis, Jo Ann	Gutknecht
Barton	Davis, Tom	Hansen
Bass	Deal	Hart
Bereuter	DeLay	Hastings (WA)
Berry	DeMint	Hayes
Biggart	Diaz-Balart	Hayworth
Billirakis	Doggett	Hefley
Blunt	Doolittle	Herger
Boehrlert	Dreier	Hilleary
Boehner	Duncan	Hobson
Bonilla	Dunn	Hoekstra
Bono	Ehlers	Horn
Brady (TX)	Ehrlich	Hostettler
Brown (SC)	Emerson	Houghton
Bryant	English	Hulshof
Burr	Everett	Hunter
Burton	Ferguson	Hutchinson
Buyer	Flake	Hyde
Callahan	Fletcher	Isakson
Calvert	Foley	Issa
Camp	Fossella	Istook
Cannon	Frelinghuysen	Jenkins
Cantor	Gallegly	Johnson (CT)
Capito	Ganske	Johnson (IL)
Capuano	Gekas	Johnson, Sam
Castle	Gibbons	Jones (NC)
Chabot	Gilchrest	Kanjorski
Chambliss	Gillmor	Keller
Coble	Gilman	Kelly
Collins	Goode	Kennedy (MN)

such taxpayer's net Federal tax liability for such year shall be the amount determined under paragraph (1) increased by 7.65 percent of the taxpayer's taxable earned income for such year. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'taxable earned income' means earned income as defined in section 32 but only to the extent includible in gross income.

“(d) DATE PAYMENT DEEMED MADE.—The payment provided by this section shall be deemed made on the later of—

“(1) the date prescribed by law (determined without extensions) for filing the return of tax imposed by chapter 1 for the taxable year, or

“(2) the date on which the taxpayer files his return of tax imposed by chapter 1 for the taxable year.

“(e) CERTAIN PERSONS NOT ELIGIBLE.—This section shall not apply to—

“(1) any estate or trust, and

“(2) any nonresident alien individual.

“(f) WITHHOLDING CREDIT CERTIFICATES IN LIEU OF PAYMENTS IN CERTAIN CASES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that the amount treated as paid under this section would (but for this subsection) exceed the taxpayer's net income tax liability for the taxable year—

“(A) the amount of such excess shall not be treated as paid under this section, and

“(B) the Secretary shall issue to the taxpayer a withholding credit certificate in the amount of such excess.

“(2) UTILIZATION OF WITHHOLDING CREDIT CERTIFICATE.—A withholding credit certificate issued under paragraph (1) may be furnished by the individual to such individual's employer.

“(3) FURNISHED TO EMPLOYER.—If a withholding credit certificate issued under paragraph (1) is furnished by an individual to such individual's employer, the amount of the certificate shall operate as a reduction in the liability for employment taxes that would otherwise be withheld from the individual's wages.

“(5) NET INCOME TAX LIABILITY.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'net income tax liability' means net Federal tax liability determined without regard to subsection (c)(2).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 65 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 6428. Refund of 2000 individual income taxes.”

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

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

(e) COMPLIANCE WITH BUDGET RULES.—The aggregate amount of refunds and withholding credit certificates provided by this Act before October 1, 2001, shall not exceed \$15,000,000,000. The Secretary of the Treasury may implement the limitation of the preceding sentence by providing pro rata reductions or otherwise. The limitations of this subsection shall cease to apply at such time as the congressional budget resolution for fiscal year 2001 is adjusted to permit full payments authorized under this section.

Mr. THOMAS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFEL).

Mr. HOFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we need to put money in people's pockets today. We should not start next year or 5 years from now or 10 years from now. We need to pass a tax rebate that would give people now \$300 per person, \$600 per family. This would give the American economy an immediate \$47 billion stimulus this year.

We have spent the last few weeks debating and passing tax bills that give more relief than is prudent and most of which will not affect the average taxpayer for 7 to 10 years. In fact, the bill before us today provides only \$50 million in stimulus this year, \$50 million to rebate that we want to propose would establish almost \$50 billion in economic stimulus. That is almost 1,000 more economic stimulus, 1,000 times the economic power, the spending and saving power this year.

We must support a tax package that includes sensible rate reductions for everyone that will not threaten our fiscal footing and allows us to pay down all of our national debt, a tax package that will include targeted marriage penalty relief, a tax package that does not threaten Social Security and Medicare. Pass this motion to recommit. Do it today.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the early warning signs are all around us. Manufacturing has lost 230,000 jobs in the last 3 months alone. The stock market has lost about \$5 trillion in value in the last year. We must act to stimulate the economy now.

The Progressive Caucus proposed a \$300 dividend for every American this year. We must act now. According to economists, the \$300 dividend is about enough to counteract the effect of a stock market decline. This motion would pay that dividend now and stimulate the economy. The majority's bill gives people only pennies this year. It does not stimulate the economy, because it will not give more than 80 percent of the tax cut until 2005.

The choice is clear. Americans get pennies under the majority's bill or \$300 under the motion to recommit.

□ 1400

They get economic slowdown under the majority's tax bill, or a stimulus and restore prosperity under the motion to recommit.

Vote yes on the motion to recommit.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, we are not just here dealing with the child credit or removing the marriage penalty. I think that is a bipartisan issue that we all have worked on, and we could have worked on effectively had the other side seen fit to attempt to come up with something that is bipartisan.

Instead of this, they have, in a very bipartisan way, brought before this floor a \$953 billion tax cut all geared toward the top 1 percent, at least half of it, of the taxpayers.

The President, who asked for this \$1.6 trillion tax cut, he asked for this during the time that we had the prosperous Clinton and Gore years. Now, Mr. Speaker, we do not hear the President of the United States talking in such a compassionate way as he did during the campaign about leaving no child behind. We do not hear him talking about the viability of the Social Security System or Medicare. We do not hear him talking about prescription drugs. He is going around in different communities talking about the sputtering economy and how the stock market is falling, and how he needs this \$1.6 trillion to give it a jolt in the arm.

Most of us know, who write the bills, that they have not shared with the President that he will not be getting any part of this \$1.6 trillion until the next 5 years. And if he is really serious about wanting to do something now, do not depend on the high-rollers to go out and buy that refrigerator or that washing machine, but let it be to the American people who work every day and try to send their kids to school, that are struggling to pay the mortgage. Give them the money now, and they will be able to give this economy the shot in its arm to bring it back to what we did have when we had sound fiscal policy under President Clinton and under Vice President Gore.

All we are saying with this motion to recommit is do not give up on the tax cut, but take a deep breath, go back to the committee, and see whether or not we can get \$60 billion in the economy now, this year, in the pockets of the people to spend.

Then let us try to come together once again as Republicans and Democrats and try to work out something that is not as extreme as the \$1.6 billion; that does not totally repeal the estate tax for the rich, but really gets out there for the working poor, the moderate-income people, and give a fair tax break to everybody.

We have not given up on Republicans on this side, and we have not given up on our President. The motion to recommit really means let us go back and let us see whether we work out something now to stimulate this economy, and to make certain that the American people have confidence not

only in the economy, but have confidence in this Congress.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize to my friends on the other side of the aisle, because I have the unfortunate habit of actually reading their motions to recommit.

So, first of all, I would call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the motion to recommit says, "Strike all after the enacting clause." That means, number one, no marriage penalty relief and no child tax credit. But what they are offering instead is the idea that we can have an immediate stimulus.

Okay, let us talk about that trade-off. Keep reading, Mr. Speaker. By the time we get to page 5, after we go to page 4 of the motion to recommit, on which there is a kind of a homemade attempt to make this motion in order, with handwriting in the margin and the rest, but when we get through with that, we actually get to the heart of the proposal.

The gentleman from New York said we get an immediate stimulus of \$50 billion. Now, remember, with the "Strike out all after the enacting clause" we have given up the marriage penalty and the child credit.

But if we read what the motion to recommit actually does, it says, "In fiscal year 2001, no more than \$15 billion." No matter how impassioned they say now, \$35 billion comes out of next year, 2002. Fair enough. In 2001 and in 2002, we get the \$50 billion stimulus.

Hang on. This House has already passed H.R. 3, and we are going to pass H.R. 6. Let us take a look at what those two provisions do in fiscal year 2001 and 2002.

Quite ironically, when we combine H.R. 3 and H.R. 6 and look at the effect in fiscal years 2001 and 2002, we get a \$54.6 billion permanent tax reduction.

Here is the choice: Vote for the motion to recommit, and we do not get marriage penalty relief, we do not get the child credit doubling, we do not get permanent marginal relief, but we do get \$50 billion of one-time money.

If we vote against the motion to recommit, we get marriage penalty relief, we double the child tax credit, we get permanent marginal rate relief, and we get \$54.6 billion worth of relief.

I think this motion to recommit is easy. If Members vote for them, they get \$50 billion. Vote for us and Members get \$54.6 billion plus marriage penalty relief, child credit, and permanent rate reduction.

This one is easy. Vote no on the motion to recommit.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A vote on final passage, if ordered, will be a 5-minute vote.

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

[Roll No. 74]

AYES—184

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Mollohan
Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Moore
Allen	Harman	Moran (VA)
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Murtha
Baca	Hill	Nadler
Baird	Hilliard	Napolitano
Baldacci	Hinche	Neal
Barrett	Hinojosa	Oberstar
Becerra	Hoeffel	Obey
Bentsen	Holden	Oliver
Berkley	Holt	Ortiz
Berman	Honda	Owens
Berry	Hooley	Pallone
Blagojevich	Hoyer	Pascrell
Blumenauer	Inslee	Pastor
Boniior	Jackson (IL)	Payne
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi
Boyd	(TX)	Phelps
Brady (PA)	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Brown (FL)	John	Price (NC)
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E.B.	Rahall
Capps	Jones (OH)	Rangel
Capuano	Kanjorski	Reyes
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rodriguez
Carson (OK)	Kennedy (RI)	Ross
Clay	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Clayton	Kilpatrick	Rush
Clement	Kind (WI)	Sabo
Clyburn	Kleczka	Sanchez
Conyers	Kucinich	Sanders
Costello	LaFalce	Sandlin
Coyne	Langevin	Sawyer
Crowley	Lantos	Schakowsky
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Scott
Davis (FL)	Lee	Serrano
Davis (IL)	Levin	Sherman
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
DeGette	Lofgren	Slaughter
Delahunt	Lowey	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Luther	Solis
Deutsch	Maloney (CT)	Spratt
Dicks	Maloney (NY)	Stark
Dingell	Markey	Strickland
Doggett	Mascara	Thompson (CA)
Dooley	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	McCarthy (MO)	Thurman
Edwards	McCollum	Tierney
Engel	McDermott	Towns
Eshoo	McGovern	Turner
Etheridge	McIntyre	Udall (CO)
Evans	McKinney	Udall (NM)
Farr	McNulty	Velazquez
Fattah	Meehan	Visclosky
Filner	Meek (FL)	Waters
Ford	Meeks (NY)	Watt (NC)
Frank	Menendez	Waxman
Frost	Millender-McDonald	Weiner
Gephardt	Miller, George	Wexler
Gonzalez	Mink	Woolsey
Gordon	Moakley	Wu
Green (TX)		Wynn

NOES—240

Aderholt	Blunt	Camp
Akin	Boehlert	Cannon
Armey	Boehner	Cantor
Bachus	Bonilla	Capito
Baker	Bono	Cardin
Ballenger	Boswell	Castle
Barcia	Boucher	Chabot
Barr	Brady (TX)	Chambliss
Bartlett	Brown (SC)	Coble
Barton	Bryant	Collins
Bass	Burr	Combest
Bereuter	Burton	Condit
Biggert	Buyer	Cooksey
Bilirakis	Callahan	Cox
Bishop	Calvert	Cramer

Crane	Johnson (CT)	Rivers
Crenshaw	Johnson (IL)	Roemer
Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Culberson	Jones (NC)	Rogers (MI)
Cunningham	Keller	Rohrabacher
Davis, Jo Ann	Kelly	Roukema
Davis, Tom	Kennedy (MN)	Royce
Deal	Kerns	Ryan (WI)
DeLay	King (NY)	Ryun (KS)
DeMint	Kingston	Saxton
Diaz-Balart	Kirk	Scarborough
Doolittle	Knollenberg	Schaffer
Dreier	Kolbe	Schrock
Duncan	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Dunn	Largent	Sessions
Ehlers	Latham	Shadegg
Ehrlich	LaTourette	Shaw
Emerson	Leach	Shays
English	Lewis (CA)	Sherwood
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Shimkus
Ferguson	Linder	Shows
Flake	Lipinski	Simmons
Fletcher	LoBiondo	Simpson
Foley	Lucas (KY)	Skeen
Fossella	Lucas (OK)	Smith (MI)
Frelinghuysen	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Gallegly	Matheson	Smith (TX)
Ganske	McCarthy (NY)	Snyder
Gekas	McCrery	Souder
Gibbons	McHugh	Spence
Gilchrist	McInnis	Stearns
Gillmor	McKeon	Stenholm
Gilman	Mica	Stump
Goode	Miller (FL)	Sununu
Goodlatte	Miller, Gary	Sweeney
Goss	Moran (KS)	Tancred
Graham	Morella	Tanner
Granger	Myrick	Tauscher
Graves	Nethercutt	Tauzin
Green (WI)	Northup	Taylor (MS)
Greenwood	Norwood	Taylor (NC)
Grucci	Nussle	Terry
Gutknecht	Osborne	Thomas
Hall (TX)	Ose	Thornberry
Hansen	Otter	Thune
Hart	Oxley	Tiahrt
Hastings (WA)	Paul	Tiberi
Hayes	Pence	Toomey
Hayworth	Peterson (MN)	Trafficant
Hefley	Peterson (PA)	Upton
Herger	Petri	Vitter
Hilleary	Pickering	Walden
Hobson	Pitts	Walsh
Hoekstra	Platts	Wamp
Horn	Pombo	Watkins
Hostettler	Portman	Watts (OK)
Houghton	Pryce (OH)	Weldon (FL)
Hulshof	Putnam	Weldon (PA)
Hunter	Quinn	Weller
Hyde	Radanovich	Whitfield
Isakson	Ramstad	Wicker
Israel	Regula	Wilson
Issa	Rehberg	Wolf
Istook	Reynolds	Young (AK)
Jenkins	Riley	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Baldwin	Ney	Sisisky
Hutchinson	Ros-Lehtinen	Stupak
Lampson	Rothman	

□ 1425

Mr. DELAY changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. KILPATRICK and Messrs. MORAN of Virginia, GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. McNULTY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall vote No. 74, the motion to recommit, because I was stuck in elevator number 7A over in the Rayburn building.

Had I been here, I would like to inform the House I would have voted "yes" on the motion to recommit.

Stated against:

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, today I had an urgent matter to attend to. As a result I missed

rollcall vote No. 74. Please excuse my absence from this vote. If I were present, I would have voted "no".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote on passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 282, nays 144, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—282

Aderholt	Dunn	Kolbe
Akin	Edwards	LaHood
Armey	Ehlers	Langevin
Bachus	Ehrlich	Largent
Baird	Emerson	Larsen (WA)
Baker	Engel	Latham
Ballenger	English	LaTourette
Barcia	Etheridge	Leach
Barr	Everett	Lewis (CA)
Barrett	Ferguson	Lewis (KY)
Bartlett	Flake	Linder
Barton	Fletcher	Lipinski
Bass	Foley	LoBiondo
Bereuter	Ford	Lucas (KY)
Berkley	Fossella	Lucas (OK)
Berry	Frelinghuysen	Luther
Biggert	Gallely	Maloney (CT)
Bilirakis	Ganske	Manzullo
Bishop	Gekas	Mascara
Blagojevich	Gibbons	Matheson
Blunt	Gilchrest	McCarthy (NY)
Boehlert	Gillmor	McCrery
Boehner	Goode	McHugh
Bonilla	Goodlatte	McInnis
Bono	Gordon	McIntyre
Boswell	Goss	McKeon
Boucher	Graham	McKinney
Boyd	Granger	Mica
Brady (TX)	Graves	Miller (FL)
Brown (SC)	Green (WI)	Miller, Gary
Bryant	Greenwood	Moore
Burr	Grucci	Moran (KS)
Burton	Gutknecht	Morella
Buyer	Hall (TX)	Myrick
Callahan	Hansen	Nethercutt
Calvert	Harman	Ney
Camp	Hart	Northup
Cannon	Hastert	Norwood
Cantor	Hastings (WA)	Nussle
Capito	Hayes	Osborne
Capps	Hayworth	Ose
Carson (IN)	Hefley	Otter
Carson (OK)	Herger	Oxley
Castle	Hill	Paul
Chabot	Hilleary	Pence
Chambliss	Hobson	Peterson (PA)
Clay	Hoekstra	Petri
Clement	Holden	Phelps
Coble	Holt	Pickering
Collins	Hooley	Pitts
Combest	Horn	Platts
Condit	Hostettler	Pombo
Cooksey	Houghton	Portman
Costello	Hulshof	Pryce (OH)
Cox	Hunter	Putnam
Cramer	Hyde	Quinn
Crane	Isakson	Radanovich
Crenshaw	Israel	Ramstad
Cubin	Issa	Regula
Culberson	Istook	Rehberg
Cunningham	Jenkins	Reynolds
Davis (CA)	John	Riley
Davis (FL)	Johnson (CT)	Rodriguez
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson (IL)	Roemer
Davis, Tom	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Deal	Jones (NC)	Rogers (MI)
DeLay	Keller	Rohrabacher
DeMint	Kelly	Ross
Deutsch	Kennedy (MN)	Roukema
Diaz-Balart	Kerns	Royce
Doolittle	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Doyle	Kingston	Ryun (KS)
Dreier	Kirk	Sandlin
Duncan	Knollenberg	Saxton

Scarborough
Schaffer
Schiff
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)

Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Towns
Traficant

Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—144

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baldacci
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capuano
Cardin
Clayton
Clyburn
Conyers
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel

Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecza
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Sherman
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender
McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar

Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—7

□ 1438

Mr. TOWNS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Stated for:

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I was unavoidably delayed by official business during the vote on final passage for H.R. 6. Accordingly, I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 75. If I had been present I would have voted "yea".

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

"A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the marriage penalty by providing for adjustments to the standard

deduction, the 15-percent rate bracket, and the earned income credit, to increase the child credit, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on H.R. 6, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purposes of inquiring of the schedule for the day and the remainder of the week and next week.

Before I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), let me say to the gentleman from Michigan State (Mr. STUPAK), from the upper peninsula, I just wish that the Arizona Wildcats get stuck in elevator 7A and they do not make it to the ball game on Saturday.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the great home of Oscar Robertson.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan. I am from Cincinnati, Ohio; therefore, not in the Final Four.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has completed its legislative business for this week.

The House will meet next for legislative business on Tuesday, April 3, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 o'clock for legislative business. The House will consider a number of measures under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices tomorrow. On Tuesday, we expect no recorded votes before 6 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means will meet this afternoon shortly to consider H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act. It is my expectation that that bill will be ready for consideration in the House on Wednesday, April 4. That being the case, the vote on the Death Tax Elimination Act in the House next Wednesday would be our last vote for the week heading into the Spring District Work Period.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding to me.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if I could just inquire, does the gentleman from Ohio expect any other legislation to be offered on the floor other than that which he has mentioned in his statement?

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, there may be additional measures other than H.R. 8. It is my understanding that nothing else is scheduled at this point,