women and their families. And that particular provision passed this House and has been sitting over in the Senate for a very, very long time. It is a provision that had huge support in this House. And along with giving working families their $1,000 per child tax credit and extending it to 2004, rather than what the gentleman is suggesting, allowing it to go away in 2005, giving the working families that you have such concern for only 2 years of benefits, we think they ought to get the benefits permanently, but if we cannot get it permanently, we would like those benefits to be until 2010.

So if we just take up the Senate bill, they may enjoy it for 1 or 2 years, but then it goes away in 2005. We think they ought to be able to count on it until 2010, and we think military families ought to have the tax relief they deserve.

Mr. HOYER. I will tell you, Mr. Leader, very seriously that these 6½ million families, these 12 million children will, frankly, not understand that the perfect of what you just spoke was the enemy of the extraordinarily good, which is included in the Senate bill. And I will tell the gentleman further, during the Senate bill, unlike the bill that we passed in the House, the men and women in combat who fall within the income constraints which were covered in the Senate bill were not covered in the House bill. And while we certainly agree with you on helping all of the military who qualify, we certainly believe that the folks in combat whose combat pay is now counted against them for qualifications under this bill, would be helped by the Senate bill. So I think we could help the men and women in combat first.

And I will tell you also, Mr. Leader, we are prepared to offer unanimous consent for a companion know bill as we pass the Senate bill to fix the problem or address the problem of which you have spoken with reference to the military. But we ought not to, Mr. Leader, with all due sincerity, if we are excited, if we believe this is an important thing to do, if you wanted to make it permanent, you could have done so, of course, you did not make it permanent. You did it 5 more years than we did it. We were in the constraints of the Senate bill.

We would like to make it permanent as well. However, what we would not like to do is have July come and there be no relief for these families which is going to happen if the perfect, if the objective of doing everything defeats us in doing something.

Mr. DELAY. I just cannot let the gentleman get away by scaring working families in this country by saying they will get no relief. That is entirely untrue.

In the bill that we passed and signed by the President in 2001, it gave these working families refundable tax credits. It just did not, what we are discussing is accelerating 2 years up to this year and giving them an additional $400 from this, in addition to the $600 that they are already receiving. So to say that they get no relief, I think, is just untrue. And to say that the military families are not covered by the bill passed by this House is also untrue, because military families are covered by the bill passed by this House and is presently in conference.

Mr. HOYER. Well, the bill passed, I think we disagree on some of the information, Mr. Leader, that you have just said. I do not think you are accurate on some of that information, but be that as it may.

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield, I am not accurate that since 2001 working families have been receiving refundable tax credit?

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman is accurate on that. As you know, in the Senate bill, we increased from 10 to 15 percent the credit that would be available to them. That was dropped, as you know, in the conference.

Mr. DELAY. Were they not to receive that 15 percent starting in 2005?

Mr. HOYER. That is correct.

Mr. DELAY. And we were talking about accelerating the 15 percent to 2003?

Mr. HOYER. That is correct.

Mr. DELAY. Which is in the House bill sitting in conference right now.

Mr. HOYER. The House bill has not been taken up, Mr. Leader. It is very nice to say and, reclaiming my time, that it is in the House bill. It is permanent in the House bill. We do a lot of things in the House bill. On our side, we did not believe the House bill was going to be taken up, and we said that, which is why we said we ought to take up the Senate bill and pass it and do something, even though we were not doing everything, and we still maintain that position. And as I am reminded, and I would remind the leader, this House voted to instruct the conferees to take the Senate bill.

So we are simply giving unanimous consent to do what the House has already voted on that same day last Thursday to do, and that is, pass the Senate bill. That is what we instructed the conferees to do. So it is not as if we are asking for something that the House has not voted on to do and to accelerate the passage of this legislation so we can help these families.

Mr. DELAY. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman is correct. The motion instructed the House to accept the Senate bill in a small margin in doing that. Unfortunately, the Senate does not agree with our motion to instruct. And as the gentleman knows, it is not binding anyway. The Senate decided to go to conference. They could have and they decided to work out the differences between the House and the Senate, and those conferees will be meeting hopefully next week and produce a bill that will give much needed relief to families in this country.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Leader, I hope we are not going to give people the impression that a body that passed a bill 94 to 2 would not agree to us passing their bill because, frankly, I do not think that is the case.

I understand what you are saying, and I understand that they have been told you are not going to take the Senate bill; and, therefore, they need to go to conference. So they are bowing to practicality. What I am saying is we ought to bow to needs and to practicality and pass the bill. And I am saying to you that we can give you and will give you unanimous consent to do exactly that so that these folks can get that which they will not get, and that is, the additional payment which was provided for in the conference but not reported out of the conference, and, therefore, we are going to leave 200,000 armed services personnel not advantaged as others were in the bill.

We are going to leave 6½ million families with 12 million children not advantaged, as was the intent of the Senate, and I think most of the House.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 23, 2003

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Resources:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 19, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign from the Committee on Resources.

I appreciate the opportunity to serve you and Chairman POMBO.

Sincerely,

ADAM H. PUTNAM,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.