

point that out, in Sunday's New York Times there was an article by Robert Pear, and it says, and I want to quote a few sections, under the Republican proposal, "Medicare would pay subsidies to private entities to offer insurance covering the costs of prescription drugs. Such 'drug only' insurance does not exist and many private insurers doubt whether they could offer it at an affordable price."

A quote: "I am very skeptical that 'drug only' private plans would develop," said Bill Gradison, a former Congressman who was president of the Health Insurance Association of America from 1993 to 1998.

The insurance companies themselves are telling the Republican leadership that these drug-only policies will not work. They will not be offered. It is a hoax on the American people and on our seniors to suggest that somehow this Republican bill is going to provide a benefit. It will not provide a benefit. Nobody is even going to offer the benefit.

Today in the New York Times, an opinion piece by Paul Krugman, who is a regular contributor to the New York Times, says essentially the same thing. I just want to quote a couple of sections.

He says, "The theory of the Republican bill is that competition among private insurance providers would somehow lead to lower costs. In fact, the almost certain result would be an embarrassing fiasco because the subsidy would have few, if any, takers. The trouble with drug insurance from a private insurer's point of view is that some people have much higher drug expenses than the average, while others have expenses that are much lower, and both sets of people know who they are. This means that any company that tries to offer drug insurance will find that it tries to offer a plan whose premiums reflect average drug costs. The only takers will be those who have above-average drug costs."

What Krugman is saying here and what others are saying is that no insurance company is going to provide this insurance, because the only person that would take it would be someone who has extremely high drug costs, and they cannot operate an insurance system that way. I do not want to get into all the details, but the bottom line is that we are getting this uniform chorus around the country telling us that the Republican proposal to simply provide money to private insurers will not work.

What are the Republicans going to do? They know this is not going to work. They are going to try to shove it down the throats of the Congress in committee tomorrow or the next day, and bring it to the floor next week. They know it will not work, so what they are doing is use the pharmaceutical drug companies to spend millions of dollars on advertising to say it is a good proposal, and it is not.

RECOGNITION OF TEACHERS OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I hate to hear them talking about drugs this early in the morning, because the Republican plan will work. We believe in democracy and free enterprise, and that is how it is going to work.

Mr. Speaker, we have good teachers and we have great teachers, and it is an honor to bring to my colleagues' attention distinguished teachers from the Third Congressional District of Texas. I am pleased to recognize these recipients of the Teacher of the Year Award, who enable our students to understand and learn from each other and strive to achieve their goals.

Great teachers nurture our country's best hope for tomorrow: our children. Children may be a fraction of our society, but they are 100 percent of our future. The perseverance and dedication of our teachers challenge and shape students to dream, to work, to make those dreams come true.

Unfortunately, educators work with little public thanks or appreciation, even though top-notch teachers are essential to a strong future. These dedicated educators in particular go beyond the call of duty and selflessly make our children and our country a better place.

It is my distinct honor to present the teachers of the year from Garland, Texas, and Richardson, Texas:

In Garland Independent School District, the teacher of the year is Carol Clark.

In Richardson Independent School District, the teachers of the year are Betty Jackson and Kari Gilbertson.

As the highest-ranking Texan on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I know firsthand the importance of a quality education. However, it is outstanding teachers like these who strive for excellence. I thank these hometown heroes and excellent educators for all they do for Garland, for Richardson, for our children, for America, and for freedom. God bless them.

NO TAX BREAKS FOR CORPORATIONS RENOUNCING AMERICA ACT

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, September 11 really brought out the best in Americans when all of us are continuing to be asked to sacrifice some for our country, and some have sacrificed their all. Unfortunately, certain of our multinational corporations are offering less, indeed, much less.

Over the years, the United States has rightly entered into tax treaties with countries around the world to avoid taxing the same income twice for their businesses, as well as for ours. These treaties are so broadly worded, however, that some corporations can exploit them to evade taxes not just on their foreign earnings, but on what they earn right here at home.

These corporations use gaps in the tax treaties to shift U.S. earnings abroad to countries like the Barbados or Luxembourg that impose little or no tax. This income vanishing act occurs through the creation of affiliated foreign shell corporations that make high-interest loans or obtain hefty royalty fees from the American companies.

To stop this abuse, today I am introducing the "No Tax Breaks for Corporations Renouncing America Act." This abuse results from the broad way in which our tax treaties test foreign ownership and residency. Before globalization, one could assume that a company with stock listed on the stock exchange was a company from one of the countries with which it was listed, but that is no longer the case. My legislation, by narrowing the provision, ensures that tax treaties are used only for their intended beneficiaries, not for those corporations whose phony claim to foreign citizenship is based on little more than a new mailbox.

By exploiting the tax treaty loophole, companies who renounce their U.S. citizenship are reaping a windfall. Corporate freeloaders are taking treaties designed to eliminate double taxation and are using them instead to eliminate all taxation on some of their income.

These corporate "ex-patriots" are selective in waving the Star-Spangled Banner. Yes, they want to be American to enjoy the protection of our Armed Forces, the protection and reliability of our courts, and to seek business from the Federal Government; but when it comes time to pay, to pay their fair share to keep America strong, Old Glory suddenly comes down the flagpole, and they claim they are foreigners.

These fair-weather friends choose to wrap themselves in the flag when that is convenient, and renounce the flag and say they are foreigners and wrap themselves in a tax treaty when that is convenient; we have to put a stop to that. It is time to end the practice of them sending Uncle Sam a postcard that says, "Sorry, you can find me in Barbados, glad you are not here."

American executives who want to evade U.S. taxes on U.S. income by moving their mailbox to an island and hold beachside board meetings, are entitled to a tan, not a tax break.

Take companies like Cooper Industries and Stanley Tools. They make tools, shovels, and the like; but we might think that when Stanley says it is making something great, it had in mind beach tools like this from its new

residency. The way that they are operating inspired one of my neighbors down in Austin to note that Stanley Works ought to be called "Stanley Flees," because it has fled Old Glory and America.

A vote for the bill that I am introducing today will send the executives a message: They can play all they want on the beach to avoid taxes, but Congress will not put its head in the sand. They can have fun in the sun, but Congress refuses to let the rest of us, Americans who are working hard to pay our taxes, get burned by having to pay their taxes also. It is the American taxpayer who gets hammered when Stanley Works or one of these other companies heads off to foreign shores and does not pay its fair share for our increased national security needs.

And remember, allowing a few unpatriotic corporations to exploit this loophole gives them a competitive advantage over the many American corporations that stay and pay their fair share and are competitors with those who leave our shores.

□ 1045

Freedom is not free. Corporate free loaders, Uncle Sam wants you, wants you to pay your fair share to support America.

I encourage my colleagues to join with me in supporting the "No Tax Breaks for Corporations that Renounce America," act so we can really ensure equity and fairness in our tax system and put an end to those who are abandoning us through reliance on provisions in these tax treaties that were never intended for the purpose for which they are now being exploited.

ELIMINATION OF MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, often over the last several years, many of us have asked a very fundamental question, that is, is it right, is it fair, that under our Tax Code that millions of married working couples pay on average about \$1,700 in higher taxes just because they are married.

Over the last several years, we in the House Republican majority have been working to eliminate what we call the marriage tax penalty where under our Tax Code, married working couples who are husband and wife are both in the workforce, pay higher taxes, and the way the marriage tax penalty works is when someone is married, husband and wife are both in the workforce, they combine their income, they file jointly. That has always pushed married working couples into a higher tax bracket. Really, it is a financial disadvantage. A couple is punished if they get married and essentially re-

warded if they break up the marriage and are living as two single people.

We in the House Republican majority felt all along that was wrong. It is wrong under our Tax Code that we punish marriage. While President Clinton was in office, we passed legislation out of the House and Senate, sent a stand-alone bill to the President, President Clinton; and unfortunately, he vetoed our effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. Fortunately, this past year, we had a President come into office, George W. Bush, who agreed that it is time to stop punishing society's most basic institution, and this past year President Bush signed into law part of what we call the Bush tax cut legislation, which wipes out the marriage tax penalty; and it is estimated that 43 million married working couples will receive marriage tax relief as a result of the legislation that was signed into law last year.

Unfortunately, because of an archaic rule over in the other body, that provision had to be temporary, which means it expires in a few years; and unless the House and Senate do something, the marriage tax penalty will come back. I am proud to say that this past week the House of Representatives passed overwhelmingly, with the vote of every House Republican plus 60 Democrats, we passed overwhelmingly with a strong bipartisan vote an effort which wipes out the marriage tax penalty permanently.

My hope is the other body will take that up and that the House and Senate will quickly move that legislation through, get it on the President's desk, and permanently eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

It has been noted to me, according to the Congressional Budget Office, that unless we permanently eliminate the marriage tax penalty that when this temporary provision expires, that 36 million married working couples on average will see a total tax increase of almost \$42 billion. Think about that. Unless we make permanent our legislation to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, we will see a \$42 billion increase of taxes on marriage, and that is wrong.

I think a couple back in the district I represent in the south suburbs, Jose and Magdalena Castillo, a young couple, they work hard. They have two children, Eduardo and Carolina. They suffered, prior to the Bush tax cut being signed into law, \$1,150 marriage tax penalty; and thanks to the efforts of this House, to the House Republican majority, to President Bush, we eliminated their marriage tax penalty. For Jose and Magdalena Castillo, \$1,150 is several months of car payments, several months of day care for Eduardo and Carolina, a significant portion of tuition at Joliet Junior College. It is a down payment on a car. It is a big chunk of savings for their children's college education; \$1,150 is real money.

There are some here that say we should let that legislation expire. We

should let the marriage tax penalty come back because we can spend that money here in Washington on something else. Well, \$1,150 in Washington is a drop in the bucket; but for Jose and Magdalena Castillo, the marriage tax penalty, \$1,150, is real money, just like it is for 36 million married working couples all over America.

The House has passed legislation now to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. My hope is that Republicans and Democrats in the House and Senate will come together and make this a priority to permanently eliminate the marriage tax penalty. We have done it here in the House. My hope is the entire Congress can do it together in a bipartisan way and we can get on President Bush's desk this fall legislation to permanently eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

BUMFIGHTS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most troubling problems for our communities facing the struggle for liability deals with our homeless population. The problem of homelessness, if not worse today, is certainly more complex. As a result of deinstitutionalization, many of these people now live on the streets; and one of the most serious consequences is violence against the homeless.

Stories of the abuse of homeless and the mentally ill are appearing with stark and frightening regularity, setting a homeless woman on fire, random beatings, even murders. We know last year there were 18 murders and dozens of assaults on the homeless.

These are the stories that were reported to the authorities and found their way into the media. Because of the hidden, often forgotten, world these people inhabit, we know that incidents are underreported and that the known violence is just the tip of the iceberg.

I have been appalled at the people who would not just avoid helping but actually are seeking to exploit the homeless, and the worst example I have seen is a recent video entitled "Bumfights" that films the abuse and violence against the homeless. "Bumfights," the brain child of two recent graduates of the University of California and USC film schools, sets a new standard for the cruel exploitation of damaged human beings. In less than a month, these people have sold 10,000 copies of a video depicting homeless men assaulting each other on the streets of Las Vegas.

A vagrant struggles to escape the punishing punches, kicks and body slams of his attacker. Another scene with a man standing in a dark alley,