Rosemary passed away on February 2, 2002 surrounded by her loving family. She was preceded in death by her brother Ramon Holguin Colunga, and is survived by brother William Holguin Colunga, and sisters Elvira Colunga Hernandez, and Olivia Colunga Gonzalez. She also leaves behind nine nieces and nephews, as well as seventeen great-nieces and nephews. Her family, innumerable friends and the entire community will miss her greatly.

And so Mr. Speaker, I submit this loving memorial to be included in the archives of the history of this great nation. For women like Rosemary Holguin Colunga are what make this nation great. Women like Rosemary leave a legacy of lives filled with dedication to the people of their community. She is the fabric from which our nation was created.

BIOENERGY INVESTMENT AND OPPORTUNITY (BIO) ACT

HON. JOHN R. THUNE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 2002

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, recently, I hosted two value-added agriculture round-table discussions in South Dakota to hear about the progress and concerns that farmers are having with value-added agriculture. A program that was brought to my attention that has been very helpful to ethanol and biodiesel plants is the Bioenergy Program. In South Dakota, the Bioenergy Program is currently used by Dakota Ethanol of Wentworth, Heartland Grain Fuels of Aberdeen, Broin Enterprises of Scotland and JPJ Enterprises of Humboldt.

The program is important because it stimulates industrial consumption of agricultural commodities by promoting their use in bioenergy production. Bioenergy producers that increase their consumption of eligible commodities receive payments to offset part of the cost of buying the additional commodities. According to USDA, the Bioenergy Program for FY 2001 resulted in a production increase of 141.3 million gallons of ethanol and 6.4 million gallons of biodiesel.

Today I have introduced the Bioenergy Investment and Opportunity (BIO) Act. The bill would authorize and expand the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Bioenergy Program through FY 2011.

By authorizing the Bioenergy Program we will promote value-added agriculture and increase production of bioenergy, such as ethanol and biodiesel, expanding industrial consumption of agricultural commodities. The program was initiated by an Executive Order of President Clinton and has been continued by President Bush, but it expires at the end of FY 2002.

Under the current program, USDA makes up to $150 million in payments annually. The BIO Act expands the payments to $200 million annually. The Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) makes cash payments to bioenergy producers by compensating them for a portion of their increased commodity purchases made to expand existing production of bioenergy and to encourage the construction of new production capacity.

Mr. Speaker, increased bioenergy production helps strengthen the income of soybean, corn, and other producers and lessens U.S. dependence on traditional energy sources. As I introduce the BIO Act today, I ask for the support of the other Members of this House and the Administration in continuing and expanding this important program.

PRESIDENT BUSH INSISTS ON MORE TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHY EVEN AS ECONOMISTS SHOW THAT THE RICH ARE GETTING RICHER AND PAYING LESS IN TAXES

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 2002

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would encourage Members of the House and all Americans to pay attention to two very disturbing stories this week that illustrate the tremendous burdens on working families that this Congress continues to fail to address.

Yesterday, the House voted a symbolic and politically motivated resolution upholding the grossly unfair and deficit-producing tax windfall for wealthy Americans that President Bush pushed through Congress last year. Over the course of that year, the economy has faltered, millions have lost their jobs or significant parts of their income, and we have rearranged our spending priorities because of the need to combat terrorism. Despite all of this, however, Washington still will not reconsider whether we should spend a trillion and a half dollars in tax cuts mainly aimed at the wealthiest Americans.

That Bush tax law has exacerbated the growing inequality of incomes in America that has become en emblem of the Enron decade of the '90s. According to economist Edward N. Wolff of New York University, wealth in America is more highly concentrated today than at any time since 1929.

While the number of Americans earning over a million dollars more than doubled in the last half of the '90s, the percentage of their income that the wealthiest paid in federal income taxes actually fell by 11 percent, thanks to tax changes.

Meanwhile, those who earned less paid more in taxes, according to the Internal Revenue Service.

And now President Bush wants even more permanent tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans.

Yet, while this House has time for legislation to expand tax cuts for the wealthiest, it has failed to pass legislation to benefit the millions or workers who have lost their jobs and exhausted their unemployment benefits. The Center for Budget and Policy Priorities has just released a report showing that two million working men and women will lost their unemployment benefits in the first half of this year alone, adding to hundreds of thousands who lost unemployment insurance benefits last year and tens of thousands more who were denied any benefits. As a result, the number of exhaustees who have been denied any additional weeks of benefits in the first quarter of this year is higher than in any other first quarter since the early 1970s. That is a crisis that the federal government can and should respond to but has as of now failed to do so.

Mr. Speaker, these are very, very disturbing trends: more wealth for the wealthiest, and more tax cuts for wealthiest; growing income disparity and higher taxes for the middle class working family; no extended benefits for the unemployed and no coverage for millions of workers who paid into unemployment insurance but got no benefits when they lost their jobs.

The federal government spend tens of millions of dollars trying to instruct people overseas how to build democracy in their countries, and one of the basic lessons we teach them is that you cannot build political democracy without economic justice. Frankly, the policies of this Congress are so inconsistent with any concept of economic justice that we should be concerned about the effect on our own democracy.

Attached is an article from today's New York Times.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 7, 2002]

MORE GET RICH AND PAY LESS IN TAXES

(By David Cay Johnston)

The number of Americans with million-dollar incomes more doubled from 1995 through 1999, as their salaries and their profits from stocks soared, government figures to be published today show. The percentage of their income that went to federal income taxes, however, fell by 11 percent. The incomes of Americans who made less grew as well, though by far less, and the share of their income that went to taxes rose slightly, according to Internal Revenue Service income tax data for the five years through 1999, the latest year available. The wealthiest Americans paid a smaller share of their income in taxes because in 1997 Congress reduced taxes on capital gains, which account for a significant share of their income.

Congress also cut taxes for the middle class, but only one in five taxpayers qualified for those cuts, which involved new tax credits for children and education expenses. So, as a group, the portion of their income going to taxes rose. For those with million-dollar incomes, the share of their income that went to taxes fell to 27.9 percent in 1999, from 31.4 percent in 1995. For those Americans who did not make a million dollars, the portion of their income going to taxes edged up in those years, to 12.8 percent from 12.5 percent. About 205,000 taxpayers made $1 million or more in 1999, up from less than 87,000 in 1995. The average income of those who made $1 million or more rose by $568,000 to $3.2 million.

Critics of the latest Bush administration economic stimulus and tax cut plan, announced this week, regarded the latest figures as evidence that the wealthy have received too many breaks.

''Congress cut taxes on rich people in 1997,'' Robert McIntyre, director of Citizens for Tax Justice, a nonprofit Washington organization with labor union backing, said. ''The rate that they pay fell by quite a bit, while they didn't do much for everyone else and their taxes went up a little. The law did what Congress intended. Their intent was to make sure the wealthier people paid less in taxes and they weren't worried about the rest of the people.''

President Bush, who won a major tax cut from Congress last year, and his supporters argue that permanent cuts in tax rates encourage investment, which results in more jobs and economic growth.

''We need to pass a bill that will help workers and help stimulate the economy,'' Mr. Bush told reporters on Tuesday.

The president's new tax cut plan appeared to die on Tuesday when Senator Tom