

a single parent without a support system and with very little money and very little self-esteem. She had just completed a recovery program and was seeking to put her life back together. It was the first time in years that she felt needed, comfortable, and good about herself and her life.

Cori went on to volunteer for Head Start. She then completed an AA degree in early childhood development because she wanted to give back to the program that got her on her feet. Now Cori has been a Head Start employee for the past 3 years, with the goal of getting a Bachelor of Arts degree.

Mr. Speaker, why should Cori be denied the child tax credit, while those making more than \$1 million a year received overall tax cuts totalling \$93,500 each? What definition of compassionate are we using here?

This attack on our working families must end. But sadly, the attack on working families does not stop with denying the child tax credit to Cori. Sometime soon we will debate a Republican bill to deny workers the benefits of overtime pay, the heart of the very Fair Labor Standards Act.

If the poorly named "Family Time Flexibility Act" passes, the Republican leadership will take a step to undermine protection of the 40-hour work week, so employers can avoid paying their workers like Cori overtime. This is not only poor economics for struggling families who count on overtime, it is just plain bad public policy.

It is time that we restore the balance for families so they can earn a living and meet family demands at the same time. We must pass H.R. 2286, which will expand the child tax credit and marriage penalty relief for lower-income families like Cori and her two children. Passing the legislation can be the first step in reversing the wrong done to these hard workers.

In the coming year, I plan to introduce legislation called the Balancing Act, which will improve the lives of working families and their children. That would mean providing paid family leave after the birth of a child, increasing the funding for child care, granting school breakfasts for all students, and helping with the care of aging parents. I urge my colleagues to join me in that effort.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to restore compassion for our Nation's working families, rather than our Nation's millionaires. Our families need to know that we have not forgotten them.

THE HAND OF HOPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is often repeated that a picture is worth a thousand words. A very powerful picture exemplifying that statement began circulating across America this last November. I would cite the commentary that accompanied it.

It should be the picture of the year, or perhaps the picture of the decade, but it will not be. In fact, unless Members obtain a copy of the U.S. paper in which it was published, they probably never saw it.

The picture was that of a 21-week-old unborn baby boy named Samuel Alexander Armas. He was being operated on by a surgeon by the name of Dr. Joseph Bruner. The baby was diagnosed with spina bifida, and would not have survived if removed from his mother's womb. But little Samuel's mother, Julie Armas, was an obstetrics nurse in Atlanta and she knew of Dr. Bruner's remarkable surgical procedure. Practicing at Vanderbilt University Medical Center in Nashville, he performs these special operations while the baby is still in the womb.

During the procedure, the doctor removes the uterus via the C-section, and makes a small incision to operate on the baby. As Dr. Bruner completed the surgery on Samuel, this amazing little baby reached out his tiny but fully developed hand through the incision and firmly grasped the surgeon's finger. Dr. Bruner was reported as saying that when his finger was grasped, it was the most emotional moment of his life, and that for an instant during the procedure he was completely frozen and completely immobile.

The photograph captures this amazing event with perfect clarity. The editors title the picture "hand of hope." They said that this tiny little hand seemed to emerge to grasp the finger of Dr. Joseph Bruner, as if thanking him for the gift of life. Little Samuel's mother said they wept for days when they saw the picture. She said the photo reminds us that pregnancy is not about disability or an illness, it is about a little person. The operation was 100 percent successful, and little Samuel was born in perfect health.

Mr. Speaker, abortion on demand has taken the lives of 43 million little Americans. That is 10,000 times as many innocent lives as were taken in the tragedy of 9-11. Before the sun sets in America today, 4,000 more will have died, nameless and alone.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for those of us on both sides of this aisle to begin to ask ourselves the real question, and the real question simply is this: does abortion take the life of a child? If it does not, then it is a nonissue. But if abortion really does kill a baby, then those of us in the seat of freedom standing here, given the charge to protect the innocent, are living in the midst of the greatest human holocaust in the history of humanity.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, if we lose the courage to protect the innocent in this place we will never find the will or the courage to protect any kind of liberty for anyone.

Mr. Speaker, today we were asked to protect a very small number of those children who were already partially born and only moments away from taking their very first breath. It beggars

human imagination that voting to support such basic compassionate humanity is even debatable, and that it got 100 votes to the contrary is a disgrace beyond expression.

Mr. Speaker, the tiny hand of hope reaches out to all of us today and asks only for mercy. God help us all to hear that little voice in our own hearts.

CHILD TAX CREDIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to address the way that the Republicans have devastated the child tax credit for low-income families.

When the child tax credit was created in 1975, it was for the purpose of helping families, not hurting them; and it was not meant to create divisions within parents and families, it was intended to include and benefit all families.

Initially, it seemed that the Republicans and President Bush's \$400 per child increase in the child tax credit was meant for all families. At least, that is what we were told. According to the Bush plan, families would receive the checks for this credit in either July or August as a way to jumpstart the economy that, of course, this administration has crippled, losing more than \$2.7 million jobs since the beginning of the Bush presidency.

Somehow, though, the attempt to help families did not extend to low-income families. The same people who were already left out of the President's tax cut on dividends, which President Bush, of course, offered the wealthiest of Americans, are the same individuals, the same families that the budget cuts are hitting the hardest.

When Republican negotiators went behind closed doors without any Democratic conferees, suddenly the families of approximately 12 million children were excluded from the child tax credit. Nationwide, this means that one out of every six American children were excluded.

What the Republicans did here is really revealing on two different levels. First, it says that their credibility really is an issue. Second, even worse, it says that they think that the priorities of the country should focus on fattening the wallets of the wealthy, not helping those who need help the most.

The Republicans' actions clearly represent a credibility gap, also. When the tax plan first came through the House and Senate it included the child tax credit, but apparently that credit did not fit with the numbers that they needed. It did not fit with their effort to provide tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. They needed \$3.5 billion more for the cuts for the wealthiest Americans, so they eliminated credit for all families making between \$10,500 and \$26,625. What a terrible thing to do.

The Republicans, with the blessing of the White House, clearly recognized

the possibility of a backlash, I assume. Otherwise, why did they hide their actions from public view? President Bush said that all Americans would receive tax relief, but that was not the case. This sort of double-talk is not the way to run a country, not the way to run this country.

This double-talk also reflects the misplaced priorities that the Republicans and their leadership have for this country. What they are telling us is that it is important to have a dividend tax break for people who live well, extremely well. What they are also telling us is that it is not important to help those people who are struggling to find adequate housing, enough food, or a decent job.

Of course, children, unfortunately, are hit the hardest. These children come from families where the parents work hard and play by the rules. They deserve the same tax credit that other parents will receive, and they, of course, need much more. Their families do not have the advantages that others have.

In a jobs depression like President Bush has put us in, the loss of the \$400 tax credit is really rubbing salt into their wounds. 8.1 million taxpayers will receive no relief under the Republican tax cuts, and 1.6 million of these taxpayers are Hispanic. 8.1 million represents 44 times the number of taxpayers who have incomes exceeding \$1 million, yet the President and the Republicans have gone out of their way to help the wealthy.

□ 2145

In fact, those people with incomes over \$1 million will receive an average tax cut of \$93,500 in 2003. In terms of the child tax credit, one-half of all African-American families will not get the full tax credit and one-quarter will receive no tax credit.

For Hispanic families, 40 percent will not get the full tax credit, while one-fifth of Hispanic families will receive no child tax credit at all.

What message does this send to minorities? Of course, the Republicans have a checkered history of offending minorities, so perhaps this behavior is to be expected. But interestingly enough, the Republicans' actions on the child tax credit also offend military families. According to the Washington Post, as many as 200,000 military families were excluded from the increased child tax credit by the actions of the last few weeks.

This is just downright wrong. We should move immediately to pass legislation to restore the child tax credit and we should do it now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. COLLINS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MISREPRESENTED JOBS AND GROWTH PACKAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss some of the recent misrepresentations of the Jobs and Growth Package, a package that this Congress passed before the Memorial Day recess.

Last night I had the opportunity to listen to many of our friends on the other side characterize the tax cuts as misdirected and targeted to the wrong people.

According to the Joint Economic Committee, this tax bill provides the largest percentage reductions in the income taxes of low and middle income Americans, thereby shifting the tax burden upward. The Jobs and Growth Tax Act exempts another 3 million workers entirely from Federal tax liability. And low income families in particular benefit from this economic and growth tax package relief through a number of provisions.

First, there is the acceleration of the expansion of the 10 percent rate bracket which means that workers can earn more before they get moved into the 15 and 25 percent tax brackets, elimination of the marriage penalty, and the acceleration of the President's 2001 tax cut provisions to increase the child tax credit to \$1,000.

Accelerating the expansion of the child tax credit will provide 26 million families with an average tax cut of over \$600. This could mean a great deal to a family of 4 working to make ends meet each year. Even families who do not owe taxes may benefit from the increase in the child credit to \$1,000 because of the current refundable feature of the credits.

So some ask, Who benefits from this credit? Well, what about 44 million children who will benefit?

So, Mr. Speaker, do not be fooled when certain groups do not explain the whole story. Some low income Americans are not included in this credit because their family income is low, but they qualify for other, more beneficial anti-poverty programs. And let us not forget that that group of low income taxpayers received significant benefit from the tax cuts that passed in this Congress in 2001, and they continue to benefit from that legislation today.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to punish those who work hard, take risks and are subsequently successful. We need their success for the economy to recover. The country needs the jobs their success will generate.

I remember a few weeks ago when the folks on the other side of the aisle op-

posed a tax cut of any kind during the debate on the economic stimulus bill. Well, Mr. Speaker, the time has come for them to figure out where they stand.

TAX CUT HURTS LOW INCOME CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, when the President and the Republican party made a decision that they would not extend the financial benefits of the increase in the child tax credit to all families, they essentially made a decision that they would leave out millions of young children who live in families who earn between \$10,000 and \$26,000 a year.

What they said was somehow those families and those children were not worth as much as the rest of children and families in this country. Thirty years ago we made a decision to have a child tax credit to help families with the cost of raising their children, to ease the burdens of raising their children, educating them, providing health care, and it was extended to all Americans with children.

Over time we have increased that child tax credit, and this year a decision was made that we would increase that child tax credit by \$400 for each child, and those checks would go out this summer. But, tragically, in a back room, in the late night, in negotiating the bill under the leadership of Vice President CHENEY, the Republicans made a decision that low income working families would not get that child tax credit for their children. They will not get that \$400 per child increase this summer.

Erin Doyel of Vallejo, California in the district in which I represent and her daughter, Adrienne, will not get that tax cut. Erin is going to work every day and earning \$12,675 as a financial administrative assistant. Erin is doing everything that this Federal Government told her to do: To get off of welfare, to take responsibility for her child and to get a job. And she has been doing it and she is doing it well.

But as we can see here, Erin and her daughter Adrienne, Erin is asking the question, What about my kid? Why is not my kid worth the same tax credit as the other children? Because I only make \$12,000 a year?

She needs this help for her family. She needs this benefit for her family so that she can provide the education, she can provide the wherewithal to hold her family together. She knows how much she needs it. She says they made a big mistake when they left her daughter out of the tax cut. She needs this money to help her pay the rent, to pay for her car, to pay for her job expenses.

That is what she would do with that money. She would immediately put it