

Given these dilemmas, what should those of us in the pro-life community do? First, we must return to constitutional principles and proclaim them proudly. We must take a principled approach that recognizes both moral and political principles, and accepts the close relationship between them. Legislatively, we should focus our efforts on building support to overturn *Roe v. Wade*. Ideally this would be done in a fashion that allows states to again ban or regulate abortion. State legislatures have always had proper jurisdiction over issues like abortion and cloning; the pro-life movement should recognize that jurisdiction and not encroach upon it. The alternative is an outright federal ban on abortion, done properly via a constitutional amendment that does no violence to our way of government.

If the next version of the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act reads like past versions in the House, I will likely support it despite the dilemmas outlined here. I cannot support, however, a bill like the proposed Senate version of the Partial Birth Abortion Ban that reaffirms *Roe v. Wade*.

For the pro-life cause to truly succeed without undermining the very freedoms that protect life, it must return to principle and uphold our Founder's vision of federalism as an essential component of the American system. Undermining federalism ultimately can only undermine the very mechanism that protects the right to life.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON
H.R. 2, JOBS AND GROWTH RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2003

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the President has said in numerous speeches that his policies are designed to "leave no child behind." He has said recently that, "My jobs and growth plan would reduce tax rates for everyone who pays income tax." White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer stated on May 29 about the new tax-cut law (which includes all of the provisions of the President's plan in full or in part), "This certainly does deliver tax relief to people who pay income taxes." Now that the bill has been signed, all of these statements have been shown to be false.

Back then, during the debate on this bill, the Republicans assured the press that the final conference bill retained a Senate provision that, while it did not extend any tax relief to millions of low-income working families with children, did at least accelerate the 15 percent partial refundability. The Republicans also claimed that the marriage penalty relief was accelerated for couples. These claims have been proven false as well.

The American people were sold a false bill of goods by the Administration and the Congressional Republicans. In the middle of the night, the Republicans passed a bill that over and over again puts the interests of the wealthiest people in the country ahead of those of the ordinary American family.

You will hear all sorts of excuses from the Republicans as to why this occurred. The

spokeswoman for Chairman Bill Thomas of the House Committee on Ways and Means told *The New York Times* that the blame lay with the members of the other body of Congress "(W)hen we had to squeeze it all to \$350 billion, they weren't talking about the child credits." She concluded, "(W)hatever we do is not going to be enough for some segments of the population."

The "segments" of the population we are talking about are those people who the President and Congressional Republicans say that he wants to help. We are talking about 11.9 million children (in 6.5 million families) who would benefit from accelerating the increase in the refundability of the child tax credit. These are parents who work hard at low wages and pay high payroll taxes to the Federal government. Another "segment" we are talking about is working couples who qualify for the Earned Income Tax Credit. These are working poor families who are often struggling to stay together given the financial pressures on them. A couple with two children where each parent earns about \$10,000 has about a \$1,000 marriage penalty next year. And yet, the Republicans decided that marriage penalty relief should not include them.

The Republicans also left out 8.1 million taxpayers who receive no benefits from the new tax law and yet pay income taxes. This group consists mainly of low-income single individuals and moderate-income single parents whose children are over 16.

Not only are these "segments" made up of men and women who work and pay Federal taxes, many of the people that are left out of tax relief are the same men and women who just fought for this country in Iraq. The society they sacrificed for has decided to raid the Social Security and Medicare trust fund to give billions of dollars in tax relief to wealthy investors, but has not seen fit to give a tax cut to our soldiers.

Make no mistake about it. Nobody forgot to put benefits in because they were sleepy in the middle of the night. This was not necessary because the bill had to cost only \$350 billion and it was simply impossible to do anything for these working Americans in the bill. The Republicans in Congress, with the tacit approval of the White House, deliberately skimmed and trimmed on the few provisions under consideration to help millions of middle- and low-income working families. Meanwhile, they enhanced provisions for the wealthy and for special interests. They made sure that the average millionaire would receive a \$93,500 tax break. They made sure that luxury SUV owners would get a generous tax break if they can figure out a way to make their vehicle a "business expense." They even made sure that the tax cuts for dividends, the so-called elimination of "double taxation," applied to dividends from companies that use sham headquarters in tax havens to get out of paying any tax. These companies that put profits over patriotism get benefits from the tax bill the President signed, but the parents of 12 million children do not.

The bill we introduce tonight is designed to serve those people with children that the Republicans talk about but somehow never do anything for. This includes many of our service men and women who are or have been stationed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Korea. These

men and women have risked their lives and done their duty at such low wages that the President's tax cut which he claims helps "working families" has left them out.

The bill would include an expansion of the refundable child credit that was included in the Democratic economic stimulus proposal. It would expand the refundable child credit for the families of military serving in Iraq and other combat zones. It also would include the provision of the Democratic stimulus plan that accelerated the marriage penalty relief in the earned income tax credit that was provided in the 2001 tax bill.

The President's bill gave big tax cuts to the wealthiest citizens and funded these tax cuts through borrowing. While we want every child in America to benefit from tax cuts, we do not want to pass the cost of what we do to our children and grandchildren in the form of more national debt. The cost of the bill would be offset by a combination of the corporate tax shelter and Enron-specific provisions that passed the Senate and Mr. NEAL's bill stopping corporate expatriation.

The legislation we propose has two key sections:

LIBERALIZATION OF REFUNDABLE FAMILY CREDIT

Under current law, the per-child tax credit is partially refundable (i.e., paid even if the family has no income tax liability). The amount of partial refundability is 10 percent of taxable wages above \$10,000. Under the 2001 tax act, the amount of refundability is increased to 15 percent of taxable wages over \$10,000 effective in 2005 and thereafter.

This legislation accelerates the 15 percent partial refundability and lowers the threshold for partial refundability from \$10,000 to \$7,500. It would increase the number of families eligible for partial refundability.

The military serving in combat zones receive an exclusion for their pay while serving in the zone. As a result, many in the military will not be eligible for the partial refundable family credit because they do not have taxable wages. The legislation solves this problem by disregarding the combat pay exclusion when computing the size of the partially refundable family credit.

MARRIAGE PENALTY RELIEF IN EARNED INCOME CREDIT

The 2001 tax act provided three types of marriage penalty relief, an increase in standard deduction, an expanded 15 percent rate bracket, and an increase in the dollar amount at which the earned income credit begins to be phased out. The recently enacted tax cut accelerates the first two types of marriage penalty relief, but does not accelerate the relief in the earned income tax credit.

This legislation will accelerate the marriage penalty relief in the earned income tax credit.

When the Republicans brought their final tax cut bill up in the House in the middle of the night, I argued on the House floor that the bill did almost nothing for working people while rewarding the wealthiest people in our society who have lots of unearned income. The Republicans accuse me of engaging in "class warfare" and expect me to back down. But I agree that it is class warfare. The Republicans have declared war against those who earn their living through work, even when those individuals are serving their nation in the armed service. This legislation shows that in this

class warfare, we are on the side of working men and women.

RECOGNIZING THE IMAGEN
FOUNDATION

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the outstanding achievements of the Imagen Foundation. Since its establishment sixteen years ago through the leadership of Helen Hernandez, the Imagen Foundation has led the fight to increase career opportunities for Latinos and Latinas in the entertainment industry and transcend the stereotyped media roles Latinos have been pigeonholed into.

The Imagen Foundation has helped to positively influence the role of Latinos in the media. It is critical for our community to be accurately portrayed because of the influential power the media holds in forming public opinion. Unfortunately, our community is underrepresented and misrepresented throughout all major media networks. Reports show that only 4 percent of people on prime time TV are Latinos, and Latinos who hold more permanent roles only make up 2 percent of actors. It is important to expose the world to the reality that Latinos are also doctors, lawyers, business executives and Members of Congress, and refute the stereotypes perpetuated by the entertainment industry.

Through various tools such as education, mentorship opportunities and workshops, the Imagen Foundation has created openings for Latinos in the entertainment industry. I have had the privilege of attending several workshops and I have seen the incredible talent that exists in the Latino community. The Imagen Foundation has been an amazing force working to develop, showcase and honor the talent in our community. It is my privilege to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Imagen Foundation.

Through groups such as the Imagen Foundation and people like Helen Hernandez, more doors are beginning to open for Latinos in the entertainment industry. While much has been accomplished, we cannot stop here. There is still much to be done and we need to continue to work together. Hispanics are a fundamental part of this nation's history, a significant part of our present, and will play a vital role in the future success of this country's collective prosperity. I know that this is just the beginning, but with institutions such as the Imagen Foundation, who are committed to fighting prejudices and are concerned with bringing truth and a cultural sensitivity to television and society, I look forward to the accomplishments that are yet to come.

HONORING JOHN RHYMES

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, as a former teacher, I am happy to rise before you today

to recognize Mr. John Rhymes, who is retiring as Principal of Gundry Elementary School, in my hometown of Flint, Michigan.

Armed with a desire to teach, John Rhymes, a native of Hazlehurst, Mississippi, started his college career at Mississippi Valley State University, where he received his Bachelor's Degree in 1970. He later arrived in Michigan, where he earned a Master's Degree in Guidance and Counseling from Eastern Michigan University, and also studied Educational Leadership at Wayne State University in Detroit.

Moving to Flint 32 years ago with his new wife Lessie Odom Rhymes, John began his tenure with the Flint educational community as a teacher, Social Service field worker, Assistant Principal, and ultimately Principal. In addition to serving as Principal of Gundry Elementary, John is also Executive Director of the Sylvester Broome, Jr. Training Technology Center. At the Broome Center, he oversees the Amistad Academy After-School School, which offers young people classes in computers, public speaking, performing arts, and character development, among other things. To date, there have been 308 graduates of the Academy, with a long waiting list of students eager to be placed into the program.

John's commitment to education is matched only by his tremendous commitment to improving the community. He has been recognized many times for his work by such groups as the Flint Human Rights Commission, Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, and the City of Flint Youth Council, to name a few. As mentor and advisor for the Gamma Delta Kudos of Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., John helps young men enhance leadership skills as well as self-esteem, and for many, serves as a strong, positive role model.

John's professional affiliations include the Congress of Flint Administrators, Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Province Guide Right, and the National Guide Right Board. He is also a member of Metropolitan Baptist Church, where he has served as Youth Fellowship Director, Vacation Bible School Director, Sunday School Superintendent, and the church's Day Care Center's Board of Directors. Presently he is President of the Inspirational Voices Choir, Sunday School teacher and instructor, and Assistant Director of Christian Education.

Mr. Speaker, many of John Rhymes' students, as well as the various faculty members under his leadership, both past and present, have greatly benefited from his insight, as has the entire Flint community. He has always been a staunch fighter for education, for he believes that a strong educational background is the basis toward improving the quality of life. I ask my colleagues to please join me in congratulating him on his retirement, and wishing him and his family, the best in their future endeavors.

DENTAL OFFICER RETENTION ACT:
TO AMEND TITLE 37, UNITED STATES CODE, TO REMOVE THE PROHIBITION ON THE ABILITY OF QUALIFIED DENTAL OFFICERS IN THE UNIFORMED SERVICES TO RECEIVE ADDITIONAL SPECIAL PAY WHILE UNDERGOING DENTAL INTERNSHIP OR RESIDENCY TRAINING

HON. ROB SIMMONS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the Dental Office Retention Act, a bill to allow dental officers in military service to receive additional special pay while undergoing an internship or residency.

Aspiring dentists leave medical school owing hundreds of thousands of dollars, often substantially more than \$100,000. Shouldering this burden places a large financial strain on these men and women. The loss of additional special pay during their dental training program further aggravates this problem at a time when these dentists can least afford it.

Dental officers with 3–10 years of service lose \$6,000 in additional specialty pay. Dental officers with more than 10 years of service lose \$15,000. Military dentists face further incentives to leave the service. This is because they receive salaries 30–50 percent lower than their civilian counterparts. We should not be cutting compensation to our military dentists when they need it most.

There are 3,000 dentists in Connecticut and they tell me that the most pressing concern for them in pursuing a career in the military dental corps is how to repay their loans.

Dr. Mark Desrosiers, a dentist from my congressional district in eastern Connecticut, says, "Having been in the military, and a practicing dentist myself, I think this would be a great way to ensure that residents in military specialty programs not be penalized financially by losing their special pay."

Another dentist explains during an exit interview why, though he would rather have stayed in the military, his financial burden forced him to leave. "The main reason for my decision to leave the Air Force is my financial situation. I have enjoyed my time in the Air Force and believe it is one of the best ways for a young dentist to gain experience both as a dentist, leader and follower. It was a difficult decision to make because my wife and I enjoy the military way of life, but we cannot pay our debt with the salary I am paid."

Mr. Speaker, in order to keep a sufficient number of quality dentists in the dental corps, thereby ensuring the dental readiness of America's forces, it is important to eliminate this disincentive that drives officers from the dental corps. Removing the restriction that the officers not receive additional special pay (ASP) while participating in a dental internship or residency training program would help achieve that end.

I urge all my colleagues to support my legislation.