

which does not just talk about the Bill of Rights, we live it.

For generations now we have understood, not just in our heads but in our hearts, in our bones, the very essence of the Bill of Rights, which is that it protects minorities against the will of the majority. We have understood it not just because it was handed down to us from the cultural heritage of our indigenous peoples, the native Hawaiians, but because in Hawaii we are all minorities. Ethnically, no race is a majority. My own Caucasian race, no more than 25 percent. Americans of Asian descent, no more than 40 percent. Native Hawaiians, little over 10 percent. None of us is in the majority. We have to take care of each other, and similarly with the religions we have in Hawaii.

Our predominant Christian tradition in the rest of our country, no more than a third of the people in Hawaii, perhaps another third practicing religions that come primarily from Asia, Buddhist, Shinto, Hindu, and the rest of them an assortment of religions.

So in my Hawaii tolerance of diversity is not a matter just of civility. It is a matter of basic necessity.

In this tradition I am especially proud that my Hawaii State legislature has become the first legislative body in our country to officially call upon this Congress to alter those portions of the so-called PATRIOT Act and related Bush administration executive orders which run counter to this foundation rock of our democracy and rather than summarize what my legislature did, let me just read Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 passed just a few days ago by overwhelming majorities and reaffirming our commitment in Hawaii to civil liberties in the Bill of Rights.

"Whereas, the Hawaii State legislature is committed to upholding the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights, and the Hawaii State Constitution and our Bill of Rights; and

"Whereas, the State of Hawaii has a distinguished history of safeguarding the freedoms of its residents; and

"Whereas, the State of Hawaii is comprised of a diverse and multi-ethnic population, and has experienced firsthand the value of immigration to the American way of life; and

"Whereas, the residents of Hawaii during World War II experienced firsthand the dangers of unbalanced pursuit of security without appropriate checks and balances for the protection of basic liberties; and

"Whereas, the recent adoption of the U.S. PATRIOT Act and several executive orders may unconstitutionally authorize the Federal Government to infringe upon fundamental liberties in violation of due process, the right to privacy, the right to counsel, protection against unreasonable searches and seizures, and basic first amendment freedoms, all of which are guaranteed by the Constitutions of Hawaii and the United States; and

"Whereas, the citizens of Hawaii are concerned that the actions of the At-

torney General of the United States and the United States Justice Department pose significant threats to Constitutional protections; now, therefore,

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Senate" and House of the State of Hawaii "that the State of Hawaii urges its Congressional delegation to work to repeal any sections of the USA PATRIOT Act or recent executive orders that limit or violate fundamental rights and liberties protected by the Constitutions of Hawaii and the United States; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that to the extent legally possible, no State resources, including law enforcement funds and educational administrative resources, may be used for unconstitutional activities, including but not limited to the following under the USA PATRIOT Act:

"Monitoring political and religious gatherings exercising their first amendment rights;

"Obtaining library records, bookstore records and website activities without proper authorization and without notification;

"Issuing subpoenas through the United States Attorney's Office without a court's approval or knowledge;

"Requesting nonconsensual releases of student and faculty records from public schools and institutions of higher learning; and

"Eavesdropping on confidential communications between lawyers and their clients.

"Be it further resolved that this resolution be forwarded to this U.S. Congress."

Mr. Speaker, powerful words from my State legislature, and I have heard it said that those who oppose any provision of the PATRIOT Act are not patriotic. For my State and myself personally, I categorically reject that view. We in Hawaii give nothing away to any other part of our great country and our patriotism. We are proud of our country and our place in it. We are proud of the military service of our own sons and daughters in defense of this country, and we are proud that we in Hawaii are the center of our Nation's defense efforts in half of our world stretching from the mainland United States to the coasts of Africa.

To quote my State legislature in passing this resolution, our United States can be both safe and free. We must revisit the PATRIOT Act and accomplish the basic protection of our Bill of Rights.

□ 1845

#### PASS MEANINGFUL TAX RELIEF

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am going to get right to the point, we have an economy today that is flat on its back. The national unemployment

rate has hit an 8-year low at 6 percent. Manufacturing has dipped to historic lows, causing inventories to decline. While worker productivity may be on the rise, more and more employees are logging in 3 hours less every day. In the past 2 years, the Nasdaq has fallen over 60 percent.

Americans are out of work, and those with jobs are seeing their 401(k)s and retirement savings dwindle by the day. What this economy needs, Mr. Speaker, is what we would call in Ohio a Buckeye boost.

We know what the problem is, an investor-led sluggishness, that is stifling growth, new capital demand, and job creation. And we have the right solution.

That formula for success begins with the understanding that government does not earn a profit. Government just does not earn a profit. Government does not create the jobs in this economy. Government can only stand in the way of progress and prosperity.

So House Republicans have developed a common sense plan that targets the twin pillars of economic growth, consumers and small businesses. Let us talk about consumers first. It might surprise the average American to know that he or she comprises three-fourths of economic activity in this country. That is right. Consumer spending on goods and services represents 75 percent of the entire economy.

Think about that for a minute. That is why Republicans place such emphasis on returning power and income back to the hands of the individual taxpayer. Because when they have the money, they spend it on their needs and their family's needs, and that grows the economy.

So our plan accelerates income tax relief for every American who pays taxes. We give a little extra help for married couples struggling to make ends meet by eliminating the extra taxes they pay just for saying "I do." I do not know about others, but I have never seen the tax man leave a wedding gift when he confiscates the extra taxes from married couples every April 15.

Additionally, our plan expands the child tax credit for families, giving parents an extra \$1,000 to help raise their child and pay the bills. Finally, the onerous AMT continues to push more and more families into higher tax brackets. Our plan will save nearly 10 million Americans from paying more. That is real relief.

Let us talk about small businesses for a moment. Now the second and perhaps the most important part of this package is small businesses. Nine out of 10 jobs in your neighborhoods and communities were created by small businesses. That local entrepreneur who wanted to take a risk and open their own business is the reason jobs are created and this economy grows.

Republicans feel it is important to help that small business owner whenever we can. Our business expensing

provisions are just what the doctor ordered. Every business owner I talked to in Columbus, Ohio, tells me how important these expensing deductions are because when we lower costs, we free up income. That lets us businesses make investments elsewhere.

How often do we forget that over 23 million small business owners pay taxes at the personal rates, not the lower corporate tax rates. Did you ever wonder where the Democrats come up with these bogus numbers for the "super rich" and then they wage class warfare with these numbers? The dirty little secret they hope Americans do not realize is that most of these super wealthy people are actually small business owners.

Finally, the capital gains and dividends relief provisions in this package are an economist's dream come true. History is on our side. Every time this Congress has reduced the capital gains rate in this country, the economy has grown and revenues into Washington have increased. Conversely, every time we have raised the rate in order to tax businesses more and reduce the deficit, the opposite has happened. It is a simple economic truism. If you want more of something, tax it less.

So the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the Committee on Ways and Means have developed a revolutionary idea to tax both dividends and capital gains less. This provision alone is projected to produce 400,000 new jobs and boost the stock market by as much as \$550 billion. That is what I call a return on investment.

Mr. Speaker, we have failed the American taxpayer and the American worker if we do not first commit in this body to do our level best to create more and better-paying jobs, and that is what we have done. Taken together, this package will produce 1.2 million new jobs in a little more than a year.

In contrast, our opponents' plan pledges more spending and more unemployment checks, but no new jobs. There is not one guarantee for any new job under their plan because they raise taxes on individuals and businesses 1 year after they lower them.

So the next time Members hear of soaking the rich or reverse Robin Hood, just ask our opponents if their constituents would prefer 1.2 million new jobs or none with an unemployment check. The choice is clear.

This economy has one obstacle standing between historic levels of growth and a jobless recovery. That is meaningful tax relief. As Members, we can choose to do something about it, to make bold decisions for a bold recovery. Or we can sit on the sidelines, wring our hands, and hope, like the Democrats, that things get better on their own.

Mr. Speaker, the American people did not send us here to be potted plants. We came to change the course of history, to make this country a better place to live, work and raise a family, and that is what I intend to do.

#### VOTE FOR DEMOCRATIC SUBSTITUTE ON JOBS AND GROWTH PACKAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, what I like about the opportunity in addressing colleagues and speaking about issues in a pointed fashion, we can simply cut to the chase.

Mr. Speaker, it was in 1993 that a Democratic House and the President of the United States had to make a very difficult decision. But out of making that budgetary decision, we moved into the 1990s rebuilding our economy and generating the kind of surplus that America had not seen for 10, 15, 20, 25, 30 years. In 1997 again, when I was a Member of this body, the President of the United States, William Jefferson Clinton, and many of us, the Democratic Caucus, worked in a bipartisan manner to put forward a budget that really addressed the question of rebuilding the surplus.

So we see that out of that work we do not have to give anecdotal stories. We do not have to speak to pie in the sky. We have real proof because in January 2001 we had a \$5.6 trillion surplus built upon the sacrifices of Democrats and the willingness to invest in the American public.

As we move through the Republican presidency, President Bush and the Republican Congress, under the Republican budget we now have a minus \$2 trillion deficit as given to us by the Congressional Budget Office and the House Budget Committee, two independent sources.

Interestingly enough, we come over here to this question of jobs, and we hear that the bill on the floor of the House tomorrow is a job growth bill. We surely need jobs. I need jobs in Houston, Texas, and the State of Texas, jobs in New York and California, Mississippi and Kansas and Colorado, jobs all over the Nation. Well, from January 1993 to April 1995, the Bureau of Labor Statistics will tell us that the labor market gained 6.8 million jobs, not pie in the sky, reality.

Under President Clinton's policies and a Democratic Caucus working together from 1993 to 1995, we gained 6.8 million jobs. Then we get to January 2001, changing the administration and a Republican Congress, April 2003, we have lost 2.7 million jobs.

That is why I believe it is extremely important that we look realistically at what we need to do tomorrow. Frankly, what we need to do is to pass a real jobs growth initiative. The Democrats have the answer. We know that millions of Americans are going to lose their unemployment benefits, working men and women who do not owe us anything, we owe them because they worked and put dollars into the economy. So we want to extend Federal unemployment benefits.

We believe that we should support the States who are suffering. Texas alone has a \$12 billion deficit. Republicans are down in Texas trying to redraw lines of congressional seats that will cost the State millions and millions of dollars. It is a nonsensical plan, but we are willing to commit money to the States to help with Medicaid, education, homeland security and infrastructure.

We were just in Texas looking at the needs of the Port Authority, looking at the needs of hospitals and emergency rooms. This is a program that makes sense to put money into States and support them. Yes, we would like to make sure that we include a response to the Republican plan by creating jobs. Every single aspect of our particular proposal, the Democratic proposal, would do so.

I hope there is a substitute. But, Mr. Speaker, frankly, I hope that it is a substitute that will draw the support of all of our colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, because if Members are truly interested in job creation, we cannot do it by giving a tax cut to 1 percent of the population or individuals making over \$350,000. Those individuals making a million dollars and up getting \$17,000 in a tax cut, and as the numbers go down to working Americans, we wind up with zero.

People are hurting. The unemployment rate is increasing, but let me add another component to this. This is the month of May. I will be attending many, many graduations, young Americans looking for jobs. And I can say there are no jobs. The job numbers are down. Add to that the brave men and women from the United States military just returning from Iraq. Yes, many will maintain their service in the military, and we applaud that. But many of them will be ending their service in the military, brave men and women who were willing to offer themselves to fight for our principles, and they have no jobs, plain and simple.

I do not understand how we can put forward a tax cut of \$550 billion, ultimately \$1.7 trillion, and suggest it is job creation when if Members speak to any of the CEOs of the Fortune 500 corporations and others they question whether or not the dividend tax cut would generate any dollars. What we need is investment in our small businesses, and investment in homeland security and infrastructure. That creates jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I am about to submit to the Committee on Rules another amendment that decreases taxes, and that is for those hard-working, tax-paying employees that suffered the roller coast of corporate malfeasance and criminal activity of corporations like WorldCom, which went bankrupt, Enron went bankrupt, they gave them severance pay, and they had to pay taxes on the severance pay.

I am putting forward an amendment which will decrease taxes on these hard-working Americans who lost their