



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 9, 2002

No. 91

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

Washington, DC, July 9, 2002.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) for 5 minutes.

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to briefly address the House on an issue, I believe, of importance to 36 million married working couples. This past year the House of Representatives and President Bush had a great accomplishment, that was, that we cut taxes across the board, benefiting every taxpaying American. In fact, over 100 million households have seen their Federal taxes lowered as a result of what we call the Bush tax cut; 3.9 million American families with children no longer

pay Federal income taxes as a result of the Bush tax cut. We eliminate the marriage tax penalty; we wipe out the death tax; we make it easier to save for retirement as well as for education. Unfortunately, because of a quirk or an arcane rule over in the other body, the Bush tax cut ended up being a temporary measure. That means if we fail to make permanent the Bush tax cut, taxes will go back up for over 100 million American taxpaying households.

I want to draw attention to one of the provisions, a provision which many of us have worked on over the last several years that is a fundamental issue of fairness and something we call the marriage tax penalty. Unfortunately, prior to the Bush tax cut being signed into law, 36 million married working couples paid higher taxes just because they are married. They paid higher taxes because when both husband and wife are in the workforce and you combine your income and you file jointly, it pushes you into a higher tax bracket and that creates the marriage tax penalty. If we allow the Bush tax cut to expire, 36 million married couples will pay about \$1,700 more in higher taxes as a result of the marriage penalty being restored. That is a \$42 billion tax increase.

Let me introduce a couple from the district that I represent in the south suburbs of Chicago, from Joliet, Illinois, Jose and Magdalena Castillo, their son Eduardo, their daughter Carolina. They live in Joliet, Illinois, they are hard-working Americans, and they suffered the marriage tax penalty prior to the Bush tax cut being signed into law. The marriage tax penalty for Jose and Magdalena Castillo was about \$1,150. There are some people here in Washington who think that we should allow the marriage tax penalty provision to expire because they want to spend that money here in Washington. For the, \$1,150 is chump change here in Washington; but for a couple such as

Jose and Magdalena Castillo of Joliet, Illinois, a hard-working couple that benefits from the marriage tax relief in the Bush tax cut, \$1,150, that is several months' worth of child care for Eduardo and Carolina while they are at work. That is several months' worth of car payments. It is a significant amount of money they could set aside in their IRA or their education savings account for retirement or for their children's education.

We need to make permanent the marriage tax penalty relief that this House passed this past year and was signed into law by President Bush. I am proud to say that just a few weeks ago the House of Representatives passed overwhelmingly, every House Republican voted "yes" and I also want to note that 60 Democrats broke with their leadership and joined with the Republicans in voting to make permanent the marriage tax relief provisions that we passed and were signed into law this past year. As a result of making it permanent, we will see protection for Jose and Magdalena Castillo. We will also see that Jose and Magdalena Castillo and 36 million couples like them will no longer pay the marriage tax penalty ever. That is why we need to make it permanent.

Again, during this year as we debate whether or not to make permanent the elimination of the marriage tax penalty, there will be those on the other side who argue they need to spend the money here in Washington, that \$1,150 for Jose and Magdalena Castillo does not really matter because it is really not a lot of money. The bottom line is it is a fairness issue. Is it right or is it wrong that under our Tax Code that a couple who choose to get married should suffer higher taxes? I think it is wrong that we would want to punish society's most basic institution.

The bottom line is, this House of Representatives has voted overwhelmingly to make permanent the elimination of the marriage tax penalty. My

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H4353

hope is that the Senate and the House will join together, that we will have bipartisan support in both the House and Senate, and that we will send to the President this year legislation to permanently eliminate the marriage tax penalty. Because if we do not, couples such as Jose and Magdalena Castillo of Joliet, Illinois, will see a \$1,150 tax increase just because they are married if we fail to make permanent the elimination of the marriage tax penalty. And if you add up all the couples across America who benefit from the elimination of the marriage tax penalty, 36 million married working couples, it would be a \$42 billion tax increase overall.

Let us protect Jose and Magdalena Castillo. Let us permanently eliminate the marriage tax penalty. Let us work together and let us get it done this year.

CORPORATE FRAUD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, later today President Bush is scheduled to give a major speech, it is billed, on corporate responsibility. His advisers have told us he is going to get tough on corporate wrongdoers. He is even calling for jail time for those who defraud shareholders and who violate Federal law. In addition, the President's advisers let slip recently he is reading a biography of Theodore Roosevelt who had a well-deserved reputation for battling corporate greed. All of this must mean that the President is very serious about ending this season of executive greed and corporate misgovernance in America.

But to use the bully pulpit like Teddy Roosevelt did, you have got to have credibility on the issues at hand. For many of us, the President's credibility on corporate issues has been a problem since his vast, but inexplicable, success as a businessman was revealed a number of years ago. As recently as yesterday, the President and the White House have sought to offer new explanations for why he did not report in a timely manner his 1990 sale of \$850,000 worth of stock in a Texas-based energy company just weeks before its value plummeted.

It sounds a lot like Enron. It sounds a lot like WorldCom. It sounds a lot like Adelphia. It sounds a lot like these corporate scams that we have all been so critical of. Previously, the President said he thought regulators lost the documents. He pointed at the regulators. Then last week the White House said it was a mix-up by the lawyers, the son of the President's lawyers; and then yesterday he gave the most plausible explanation. He said, "I still haven't figured it out completely how I made the \$850,000." He has not figured it out.

While there are many decent and honest corporate executives and ac-

countants in this country, those who lack integrity have only been emboldened by the permissive environment created by this administration and by those on the other side of the aisle in congressional leadership who never met a regulation that they liked. Companies like Enron and WorldCom and Arthur Andersen obviously believed they could mislead investors with impunity as long as this President, this friend of corporate America, was in office.

And why would they not? In the middle of the Enron scandal, President Bush, on behalf of his corporate friends, proposed a zero-growth budget for the Securities and Exchange Commission even though the SEC itself complained it was too short-staffed to go after these corporate abuses. President Bush supported a weak pension reform bill in the House even though thousands of employees in Texas and around the country lost their retirements because of fraud and mismanagement by the President's friends and his single major contributor and fundraiser at Enron. And the President endorsed an accounting reform bill in the House that had no teeth since it was strongly supported by his friends in the accounting industry.

Does it sound familiar? President Bush has refused to ask for reauthorization of the Superfund tax which would require corporate polluters, again friends of the President, which would require corporate polluters to pay for cleanup of the messes that they make. Instead, he wants to saddle taxpayers with those cleanup costs. The President joined the prescription drug industry, for whom they had a fundraiser raising literally \$3 million from the drug industry itself 2 weeks ago, in supporting and pushing through the House a Medicare prescription drug plan that, first of all, privatizes Medicare, and second undercuts seniors' purchasing power and enables the drug industry, the most profitable industry in America, to continue to sustain its outrageous drug prices.

The President has openly supported the idea of turning the Medicare program over to the health insurance industry, again friends and major contributors of the President, and the Social Security program over to Wall Street, again major friends and political supporters and contributors of the President.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on and on and on and on. So later today as the country listens with rapt attention to the President's plan for reversing the trend of corporate greed and misdeeds, you will understand if I view this speech with a healthy degree of skepticism.

Civil rights leaders said years ago, "Don't tell me what you believe, tell me what you do and I'll tell you what you believe."

JUVENILE DIABETES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the Chamber's attention to the serious issue of juvenile diabetes which is usually but not always diagnosed in children and remains with them for life. It has stricken over 16 million Americans, and it kills one American every 3 minutes. By the time that my brief remarks are over, two children will be diagnosed with the disease, kids like my constituent Victor Suarez. Diagnosed at age 14, Victor has to administer daily shots of insulin to keep him from falling into a diabetic coma from which there may be no recovery. Victor's friends must keep constant watch of his condition. This is no way for Victor or any child to live, but unfortunately this scene is repeated millions of times every day across our country.

Mr. Speaker, let us work toward finding more funding for research to ensure that Victor and other children will not be forced to suffer with juvenile diabetes. I congratulate the South Florida chapter of the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation International as well as its president, Sheldon Anderson, for their sincere commitment to finding a cure for diabetes and its serious complications. Founded in 1991 by a group of dedicated individuals, this south Florida chapter has already contributed over \$8 million to diabetes research. Mr. Speaker, I join 274 Members of Congress and 67 Senators who recently signed a letter requesting support for increased juvenile diabetes research funding.

I believe, as do my colleagues, that a cure for juvenile diabetes is just around the bend and that by working together, we can make it a reality.

HONORING THE LIFE OF PETE C. JARAMILLO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor and personal privilege to stand before you to pay tribute to one of our bravest and finest Americans, Pete C. Jaramillo, a loving father and grandfather, devoted son and brother, courageous soldier, loyal civil servant and great human being.

Pete C. Jaramillo of Belen, New Mexico, passed away on April 26, 2002, after a long illness. He will be remembered for his quiet strength, gentle manner, humility, deep compassion, kindness, and his dignity. He will be deeply missed by his family and friends. Mr. Jaramillo was born in Arroyo Colorado (Red Canyon), New Mexico, a small