

Flight 100 maintains the guaranteed funding provisions enacted in AIR-21 that will ensure that the revenues paid into the Aviation Trust Fund by users of the aviation system are invested in that system. These guarantees ensure stable and predictable funding for technology modernization and airport capital development.

Accordingly, I urge the House to approve this motion to instruct conferees to insist upon the higher levels of FAA funding in Flight 100, as passed by the House. We must continue to make the needed investments in our nation's airports and air traffic control system. The American traveling public deserves no less.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. YOUNG of Alaska, MICA, EHLERS, HAYES, REHBERG, ISAKSON, OBERSTAR, DEFAZIO, BOSWELL and HOLDEN.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of section 521 of the House bill and section 508 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. TAUZIN, BARTON of Texas and DINGELL.

From the Committee on Government Reform, for consideration of sections 404 and 438 of the House bill and section 108 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, SHAYS and WAXMAN.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of sections 106, 301, 405, 505 and 507 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, COBLE and CONYERS.

From the Committee on Resources, for consideration of sections 204 and 409 of the House bill and section 201 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. POMBO, GIBBONS and RAHALL, provided that Mr. RENZI is appointed in lieu of Mr. POMBO for consideration of section 409 of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference.

From the Committee on Science, for consideration of section 102 of the House bill and sections 102, 104, 621, 622, 641, 642, 661, 662, 663, 667, and 669 of the

Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. BOEHLERT, ROHRBACHER and COSTELLO.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of title VI of the House bill and title VII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. THOMAS, CAMP and RANGEL.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1308, JOBS AND GROWTH TAX RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2003

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. DELAURO moves that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1308 be instructed as follows:

1. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides immediate payments to taxpayers receiving an additional credit by reason of the bill in the same manner as other taxpayers were entitled to immediate payments under the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

2. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides families of military personnel serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other combat zones a child credit based on the earnings of the individuals serving in the combat zone.

3. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report all of the other provisions of the Senate amendment and shall not report back a conference report that includes additional tax benefits not offset by other provisions.

4. To the maximum extent possible within the scope of conference, the House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report other tax benefits for military personnel and the families of the astronauts who died in the Columbia disaster.

The House conferees shall, as soon as practicable after the adoption of this motion, meet in open session with the Senate conferees and the House conferees shall file a conference report consistent with the preceding provisions of this instruction, not later than Friday, July 18, 2003.

□ 1845

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Under clause 7(b) of rule XXII, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it has now been 47 days, nearly 7 weeks, since President Bush signed into law tax legislation that denied the extension of a \$1,000 child tax credit to the families of 12 million chil-

dren. In 10 days' time, 25 million other families will begin receiving their checks in the mail but not the 6.5 million families who need it the most, hard-working, tax-paying families who earn between \$10,500 and \$26,625 a year.

Who will not receive this child tax credit? The families of nearly every child enrolled in Head Start, 912,000; families of incomes at or below the poverty line and are struggling to stay afloat in this economy.

Forty-two thousand Head Start teachers will not qualify for this tax credit either. Why? Because they earn less than \$26,625 per year. Even though these dedicated, committed, educated give their all every day, they pass up other more lucrative professional opportunities so that they can help our children get a good start in life, their own families are left out of this tax credit.

One million children of military and veterans families, men and women who have served this country with honor, will also go without in this tax cut. One only need to open the paper to realize that many of these men and women are still fighting a war, risking their lives and dying in Iraq and Afghanistan. Yet this bill does nothing for them or their families.

On average, these families would have had an additional \$151 per child had the tax credit been extended to them. It may not sound like a lot of money to some, but it is the difference between a child going to school with or without new school supplies. It helps families of the 9 million children in this country without health insurance pay for the healthcare services that they need.

What is particularly egregious is that while decent, hard-working Americans are being denied their rightfully earned tax relief, companies are still permitted to go overseas to avoid paying U.S. taxes, taking American jobs with them, and I might add that that is about \$70 billion out of the revenue stream of this country because these folks have gone offshore not to pay their taxes. It is not right that every last one of these families pays more taxes than Enron did for the 4 out of the last 5 years.

Think about that for a moment. Every minimum-wage-earning family in America paid more taxes than a multibillion corporation. What kind of a message does this send to our families and our children? What kind of values does this represent?

All of these families work hard every day to put food on the table, clothes on their children's back; and, contrary to the claims by some on the other side of the aisle, they do pay taxes, payroll taxes, sales taxes, excise taxes, property taxes. They have done nothing to deserve being held hostage by this majority. This Republican majority would only extend the credit to these families on the condition that wealthy taxpayers get yet more tax cuts.

Less than 2 weeks after passing a bill that gave every millionaire a \$93,000

tax cut, that made sure that every corporation had the right to avoid paying taxes by relocating overseas and taking American jobs with it, this majority could not put partisan politics aside. They could not simply restore to these families the tax relief that they rightfully earned.

This body passed a motion identical to the one that we are debating tonight that instructed conferees to provide those 6.5 million families with the same tax credit entitled to other families. It would have extended that tax credit to families of military personnel serving in Iraq and Afghanistan; and it would have paid for that tax cut so as not to add further to our ballooning deficit which, by the way, today the White House announced a record \$455 billion.

I might also add that Chairman Greenspan today in the Committee on Financial Services said, yes, indeed, we should do something about the child tax credit because it would, in fact, help to stimulate the economy.

The motion passed in this body, I might add, on June 12 on a bipartisan basis by a vote of 205 to 201. More than a month has passed, and yet the conferees have not taken action to resolve this issue, and I will tell the Members why. The majority leader said that helping those families was not important to them. The majority whip said he did not know if the House would act after the body's bill. Then, after the House was dragged kicking and screaming to address this issue, the Committee on Ways and Means chairman and the majority leader said that Medicare reform was on the table until the July 4 recess and that, in any case, they did not know when they could even begin to conference on the child tax credit, in essence, stonewalling this evident.

So, quite frankly, what we want to do is to call on the President of the United States. We asked the President to please use his moral authority to move this conference, to break the logjam, to provide this child tax credit to these 12 million children; and today we offered the same motion that was offered in July because enough is enough. The time for action is now. Six and a half million families have waited long enough. The other body has proven long ago that it can be done simply without increasing the deficit. The time has come for conferees to report out a bill that extends the full \$1,000 tax credit to these families.

Let us do right by every family who works hard day in and day out to give their children the opportunities for success. Parents define themselves in their children. They want to see their children succeed. That is what this tax credit is all about. We urge again the President to break this logjam, and I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentlewoman is correct. This is exactly the motion that was offered some time ago. She focuses on the fact that it passed 205 to 201. If they are to take some credence in a vote on a motion which is nonbinding, perhaps we will provide her with a different vote this time so the argument that it passed would not be available to her.

People who may be watching and do not understand this process need to understand that the motion in front of us has no standing in terms of influencing a conference. It is a motion to instruct, not a motion to bind, not a motion to carry out required language in a bill, for example; and so it has, in essence, no enforcement power.

The argument that there are people who are needful and should be provided with resources is, I think, a statement that we ought to examine. The legislation that we voted on was an attempt to make a change in the Internal Revenue Code which deals with income taxes.

Her argument that there are some who perhaps do not pay income taxes but who nevertheless pay some kind of tax would lead us to additional motions to instruct of not only dealing with a payroll tax or an HI Medicare tax or perhaps a sales tax or a property tax or an excise tax or some tax that someone pays who should therefore share in the redistribution of wealth under the Internal Revenue Code. I think when we begin examining that argument on its face, it begins to fall apart.

If the Members really want to know what this is all about, I would urge someone to review the debate that took place on the floor of the Senate, or the other body, in which someone who is up for reelection in November of 2004 was pleading to provide this relief between now and, do not be surprised, December 31, 2004, i.e., between the period of now and when they stand for reelection. This plea to assist these folk in receiving a \$1,000 child tax credit is only of interest between now and the election.

What the House did was examine that proposal offered by the Senate, and what we said was, gee, if in fact we did that and this particular individual was elected to the other body's 6-year term, how would that person vote in 2005, in 2006, in 2007, in 2008, in 2009? Chances are they would vote no. Why? Because they got what they wanted, coverage until the election.

We thought that perhaps, instead of the politics of using children and families, we ought to deal with the policy of helping children and families. And what we did, we said we ought to take care of the valley created by the legislation to make sure that every year, not just the time between now and the next election, but for the rest of the decade, if we committed to providing \$1,000 per child, we ought to provide it for the whole decade. That is policy, not politics.

We debated that on the floor of the House. We passed it. We sent it to the

other body. We also included the military assistance, a measure which, by the way, we passed twice in the year 2002; and the Senate neglected it. We felt that by combining it with this additional policy for those in need, as outlined by the gentlewoman from Connecticut, would perhaps induce the other body to do the right thing on a piece of legislation they have refused to move for now more than a year.

We have moved substantive legislation to address the problem. The Senate has refused to take up the House legislation. We will meet in conference. The two committees assigned to reconcile the difference between the other body's political bill and the House's policy bill are exactly the two same committees that just today convened a conference on Medicare. We will move forward in an attempt to get the other body to understand that if it is good between now and the election, it ought to be good between now and the rest of the decade.

That will be our goal. We believe we will be successful. The folks you are concerned about we believe will be taken care of, not just between now and the next election but for the rest of the decade. I am wondering why you are not willing to join us in ensuring that the Senate adopt sound policy instead of short-term politics.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The chairman is right. The views of the majority are often ignored in this House by the majority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

She is certainly to be commended for the leadership that she has shown on this issue, having originally raised this entire matter before the Committee on the Budget back in February and for bringing up the matter quite eloquently and appropriately tonight.

But I would have to say in all fairness the stronger arguments for the motion have been made by the gentleman from California. He has presented compelling arguments in favor of this motion by making clear that the conference committee has not even met during the time that it has been here and by indicating that he considers any nonbinding expression by this body, no matter how many Members there might be who voice their concerns, to be of little interest to him and the members on the conference committee and by suggesting that he thinks that providing the tax credit to working families out there, some of whom are paying a quarter or a half of their income in taxes to Federal, State, and local governments through payroll and other taxes, that they do not deserve any relief.

□ 1900

All of those suggest the reason why we should not let a single day go by

without raising this issue to the American people. Because at the end of this month, as the gentleman told us a little while before, in an election year, thank God we do not let election year politics get involved in any other tax policy. Everybody else in the country is going to get their tax credit relief, unless they are among the 6 million working poor families in this country, and they will be left out. But thank God the Republicans are only concerned about election politics for other Americans, not for those people who are struggling to make ends meet.

The military tax fairness bill has been sitting at this desk, I believe, for 2 months; and among the families that will be hurt by failing to follow the motion to instruct that the gentleman from Connecticut is proposing are our military servicemembers who are fighting on behalf of this country right now in a combat zone in Iraq. Those individuals will not get the full benefits of the child tax credit unless this motion is not only adopted tonight, but implemented by the conference committee.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as we indicated earlier, the motion to instruct is not binding in any way. It does, however, afford our colleagues on the other side of the aisle an opportunity to talk about how someone who pays Federal taxes or State taxes or local taxes or dog license taxes, should be privileged to have part of the redistribution of the income taxes. We understand their position.

But I look only to the language in the motion to instruct to determine whether or not they are really serious about what they want. And all one has to do is look at the last paragraph which, after delineating what must be done under the conditions in which they say it must be done; remember, these are the people who lost on the formal real legislation, all of the requirements that have to be met, and then the last paragraph says, the House conferees shall, as soon as practicable, after the adoption of this motion, meet in open session with the Senate conferees and the House conferees, shall file a conference report consistent with the preceding provisions of this instruction, not later than Friday, July 18, 2003. Three days to complete this assignment.

I understand they believe that it is overdue in being completed, but when we put that kind of a time line on these specific instructions, I do believe it is fairly evident to anyone who understands what is going on that this would otherwise be known as the political hour.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this

time, and I will just make a couple of comments.

To my colleague from Texas who said if we want to get this done and help these families, we need to follow these instructions, we do not. We need to go ahead and pass the legislation that came out of the House and the conference committee with the Senate and take it to the President and have the President sign the law. That would provide the relief not only to those people who have no income tax liability, but it would also provide relief to those who do have income tax liability. Does that not make sense?

Under our legislation, yes, we raise the cap from \$110,000 to \$150,000; but anybody making over \$150,000 as a family, a couple, gets no benefit from this, so this talk about tax cuts for the rich, I do not know where that comes from. It is for middle-income families, working families, all families who pay income taxes, plus for those families who do not have any income tax liability. If you follow the motion to instruct, if you follow the thinking of my friend from Texas, what you would do is make permanent out until 10 years, which is as permanent as we can make it, all of the income tax cuts for those who do not have any income tax liability, but you would not provide the same relief for people who have income tax liability, because guess what? That ends in 2005. So we would sunset in 2005 the tax cuts to people who have income tax liability, who are working every day, trying to make ends meet who, yes, make up to \$150,000 and make \$50,000, \$60,000, \$70,000 a year, two people working; we do not give them the 10-year relief, but we give it to folks who do not have income tax liability.

Many people do not have payroll tax liability either. Now, we can argue about State taxes or property taxes, but I just think that is unfair, and that would be the result. You would be taking from people who do have income tax liability, and you would be giving it to people who do not. That is it. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) laughs, but it is true. Look at the language. Look at the legislation. That would be the result.

Second, is this politics? Gee, I wonder. This went through the Committee on Ways and Means where I sit, it went through the House of Representatives where I vote, it went through the chairman's mark of the committee over in the Senate without a change in the refundability of the child credit. We kept current law, which is what? That people who make over \$10,000 a year, instead of having 10 percent of that money be subject to a refundable child credit, it would go up to 15 percent. That is current law. It happens in 2005, it goes to 15 percent.

That is all we are talking about here, remember. Under current law, those who do not have income tax liability get a refundable tax credit up to 10 percent now, and it goes up to 15 percent in 2005. The motion would say it should

go to 15 percent now. Why was that not raised in the Committee on Ways and Means? Why was that not raised on the floor when we debated this issue? Why was it not in the chairman's mark in the Finance Committee in the Senate? It only came up in the Finance Committee deliberation when one Senator said, I am not going to vote for this bill unless you immediately increase it from 10 to 15 percent, even though, again, for those who do pay taxes and have income tax liability, it ends in 2005.

So guess what? The Senate said, we have to have two votes. We will go ahead and add the 15 percent right now. Then what happened? That Senator did not vote for the bill. She decided for other reasons she was not going to vote for the bill anyway. Suddenly, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said, you have left people out, which is what they are saying tonight. We have somehow in the middle of the night as Republicans said we are going to hurt a certain group of people who do not have income tax liability. That is not how it happened, folks; and my colleagues know that is not how it happened. And for those colleagues on the other side who are on the Committee on Ways and Means, why was it not raised there? Why was it not raised on the floor? I think there is a little bit of politics here.

I would just say two things: One, let us provide, as the House did, the immediate 15 percent; let us go ahead and do that and provide some stimulus. We said we were willing to do that. But let us not leave out the people who you are leaving out, and that is the people who work hard every day who do have income tax liability; folks in my district and yours who make \$60,000 \$70,000 a year, maybe a school teacher and a firefighter. We are saying to them, in 2005, yours will sunset; but for those folks who do not have income tax liability, we are going to go ahead and give them an additional amount of taxpayer money coming from those who do pay income taxes because, well, I guess it is the political season.

The second point to be made is, is this politics? The way this thing happened, the way it has been described, I have to say I see a little bit of politics in it. My colleagues had the chance on the floor. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) did not raise it on the floor. We had the chance in committee. My colleagues did not raise it in committee. Suddenly, again, in the Senate, because it was added for someone who in the end did not vote for the bill, and therefore, it was removed because she was not voting for the bill, suddenly it is something that somehow nefariously it got left out.

We did not leave anybody out. We left everybody in. Then the House came back and passed it and said, yes, let us help those in the military and those who make up to \$150,000 a year. I think that is fair. I think the motion to instruct conferees is the wrong way to

go. Let us go with regular order. Let us get the House-passed legislation to the President, he would sign it, it could become law, and all of these folks could benefit immediately from the tax relief.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman, I am more than willing to be generous with the time to my colleague, but I believe the gentleman from Maryland is going to be recognized on their time to make his points.

Mr. HOYER. Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have asked the gentleman if he would yield. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is now using the time that he yielded to me.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, who has the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) controls the time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, quite obviously he is using the time that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) could use, so you may not yield.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, and then I will yield back the time unless he says something so persuasive that I need to respond.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is a good friend of mine. I have great respect for him. He is also a Member of this House that is closest to the President of the United States, perhaps. The President of the United States said that we ought to do what the gentlewoman from Connecticut is asking us to do; and, as I recall, he said we ought to do it right away. Is that not correct?

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would say that what the President would like to do is he would like to get this issue off the table and to provide this relief, both to working families who do pay income taxes, which is provided in our bill, but also to those folks who do not have income tax liability.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would tell my friend that I interpret the answer to that question to be yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say, the gentleman's question was: Did the President support what the gentlewoman from Connecticut is advocating, a motion to instruct, a multipart motion to instruct with a drop-dead date? The President in no way intended to support what the gentlewoman from Connecticut is now advocating. The answer simply is no.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of rhetoric that goes on in this Chamber and in this town when it comes to different issues, and I know the intent of a lot of people is different from the intent of others. And I know that there are those who would like to see this child tax credit given to a lot of people. In fact, the bill that we voted on here, this some—\$80 billion tax relief would do what a lot of people would like to see done, and that is the child tax credit spread around more.

But as I go back to the district at home, and not just in my district, but traveling throughout Georgia, I have the question asked of me: How in the world, Mac, can you give a tax credit or a refund to people who actually did not have a tax liability? And that is a difficult question to answer, because the Tax code is supposed to be set up in a way and in a fashion that people pay based upon their income; and if they do not have the income to pay the tax, then they have no tax liability. So, therefore, there is some concern with people who do as to why we should give a tax credit, a refundable tax credit to those who do not.

□ 1915

But you know what is interesting about all of this conversation and all of this rhetoric about the different tax provisions, whether it be the payroll tax or whether it be the income tax, whether it be the corporate income tax or whatever it may be, it just fuels the fire at home. And I like this fire. I like to see it fueled, and I appreciate some of my colleagues bringing it up and doing so. But it just accelerates and fuels the fire of those who would like to see a total tax reformation here in Washington of the Tax Codes. As Mr. Archer used to say, just pull it up by the roots and do away with it and put in place a different type of system.

I am often asked by my constituency at home and other parts of the State about a representative from Georgia who has introduced such a measure that is called the Fair Tax introduced by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER). That is the reason I am a co-sponsor of it, because of the complexity and the cost of complying with this type of system and how it treats people who pay tax far differently than it does those who do not pay tax. I am a strong supporter of the gentleman from Georgia's (Mr. LINDER) Fair Tax.

I have asked the chairman of the committee to let us hold some hearings on the Fair Tax. Let us see just exactly how it would be implemented and how it would change the makeup of the tax system in the United States and how that makeup today is far different from other nations and how, if we changed it, it would make us a lot more competitive in the world marketplace, which we need to be.

Just in the last couple of years we have lost over 2 million manufacturing jobs from this country to offshore, many of those U.S. companies who

have moved offshore. I believe if we were to reform this tax system we would see a lot of those companies maybe change their mind and relocate back here or at least change the mind of some of those who want to relocate offshore.

I kind of like the idea that they bring all of this rhetoric to the floor of the House of Representatives and expose the fact that we have a very complicated, complex tax system that treats people who actually get out and work every day and take a risk and invest and try hard to provide for their families, but yet some of their funds are taken from them and transferred to people who do not have a tax liability because some of them do not have enough income or they have a far larger family than the income requirements for the tax liability.

So I appreciate the fact that they will bring this type of information to the floor and this type of rhetoric. It just fuels the fire of the gentleman from Georgia's (Mr. LINDER) Fair Tax bill that I am a strong supporter of and would like to see the House Committee on Ways and Means address it with hearings.

I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding me time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to quote what the President's spokesman said about what the President wanted.

He, the President, wants to sign that legislation and hopes that the Congress will get it to him quickly. He believes what the Senate has done is the right thing to do, a good thing to do, and he wants to sign it.

He said that on June 9. Now, that is what the effect of this motion is, and that is what the President wants.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this and look forward to once again passing this motion to instruct.

We actually on this side of the aisle take these motions to instruct very seriously. We think they do have some meaning or at least should have some meaning to the conferees, and I am disappointed to hear that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means thinks that you can just throw away this kind of vote. It does not matter that the majority of people on this floor voted for it.

I brought a picture of the Johnston family. I have introduced the Johnstons to this Chamber before, but I think a lot of people have forgotten about them. Particularly the Republican majority has forgotten about them. This is a family that would benefit from the full thousand dollar child credit but will not be getting any check on July 25 when those checks go out, the same day, by the way, that we are scheduled to recesses for our August break.

I would suggest that the child tax credit is something we should not go home without. We should not go home without it. We have just a few days. And, again, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means suggests that we are just not serious, that the July 18 date that we have in here could not be done, and all of us know that we could do it instantly. We could do it tonight. We could do it tomorrow. We could do it in a few minutes, just the way the Senate did.

I think we ought to do a little look back at the real history of what happened here.

The Senate had the child tax credit in their Jobs and Growth Bill, a \$350 billion tax relief bill, most of which went to the wealthiest. No, it is true the House did not. But when the negotiation came on this big tax break mostly for millionaires, how, when that negotiation took place, it looked like, uh-oh, we have exceeded the \$350 billion mark. Somebody is going to have to be thrown over the side.

The Vice President of the United States, who, by the way benefitted to the tune of about \$116,000 in tax relief in one year from that bill, this family would have to work approximately over 5 years to just meet what the tax cut was for the Vice President, he said, somebody has to go. We cannot provide all of this tax relief.

And guess who went? Twelve million children, including this adorable baby, over a million children of veterans and other people in the military who are not going to get their full thousand dollar child tax credit, 6.5 million working families who earn a huge sum of money, between \$10,500 and \$26,625 per year, not nearly what the Vice President will make in just his tax break.

We say in this Chamber all the time how much we value work. This is a working family. The working families we talked about, health aides, teacher aides, security guards, they take care of our parents and our children. Those are the families who are not going to get it.

This is a very simple matter. You do not have to be a rocket scientist or an actuary or know math to figure out this is the kind of family who would benefit who is not going to because the Republican majority said no.

But we value work. Somehow, though, the kind of work we value most is cutting open envelopes and taking out dividend checks, not the kind of work that people do 40 hours a week taking care of children, taking care of seniors, serving in our military, putting their lives on the line. We should vote and mean it for this motion to instruct.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMONS). The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) has 18 minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from Connecticut for bringing this motion to instruct conferees.

I speak as a new Member of the House of Representatives. I know that all of us take the oath of office to represent and do our due diligence of representing our districts. Yet the Republican tax plans to me are devastating to people working in my district. Every city in my district in California, every city has lost jobs since President Bush took office. Believe it or not, the number of unemployed has increased more than 30 percent in 2 years in most of my cities; and in one city alone, the city of South El Monte, the unemployment rate is 10.8 percent. It started out 2 years ago at about 9. Now it is at 10.8. And the Republicans call cutting taxes for rich trickle-down economics?

The only thing trickling down to my community is a headache and budget cuts. The \$450 billion deficit that has accumulated since the President took office is trickling down to States and communities like mine, and it all adds up to a lot of bad news for working class people. Local taxes have increased, job losses, cuts to school budgets, cuts in health and first responder services and an inability to deal with our environmental issues and problems like the quality of air and water.

The burden of these cuts are hitting hard working-class families like those in my district, and it is shameful that the main beneficiaries of the Republican tax cuts are the millionaire friends of the folks on that aisle. Republicans found \$90 billion to give to 200,000 millionaire families. They got \$93,500 in tax breaks. Yet 47 percent of Californians, that is almost half, will get a total cut of less than \$100; and 28 percent in California will get absolutely nothing. Nada.

Tax breaks for millionaires will not make it in my district because I do not even have a millionaire that lives in my district. They all make below \$200,000 a year.

To add insult to injury, the last-minute changes made by the Republicans will also prevent families in the area of \$10,500 to \$26,625 who have 11.9 million children from receiving child tax credits.

Democrats did offer an economic stimulus plan with an immediate increase in the child tax credit, marriage penalty relief for all, and the expansion of the 10 percent tax bracket. Democrats tried to put money in the pockets of people who earn it; and, as usual, we were stifled.

We demand to see this restored tax credit for our families, and I would urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, apparently it is necessary to repeat once again the House

has acted. We are on record to send a check out to these people, not just between now and the next election but every year this decade, every year this decade. Someone may wonder why we are saying that this also should go out to people who make \$150,000 a year. That was in the Senate measure that they are asking us to support. Of course, if you read the fine print it turns out it only goes out to families making \$150,000 in 2010. So when you combine sending it out to families who make \$150,000 in one year, 2010, and you provide \$1,000 only between now and the next election, you realize exactly what is going on.

What we did in this House was say to those people who we think are entitled to a check should have a check every year for the rest of this decade. And if it is worthy of giving someone \$150,000 in 2010, it is worthy to do it this year and every year. After all, \$150,000, if you are an elementary school teacher in New York and your husband is a fireman who responded on 9-11, \$150,000 is about what they earn. It is not the rich.

You will hear repeated over and over again, we built a tax program for the rich. An elementary school teacher in New York City and a fireman in New York City, ask them if they are rich. Ask them if offering the \$150,000 only in the last year, 2010, and offering the child credit only between now and the next election is not politics. Let them decide who is offering policy.

Our position, every year for the rest of the decade; \$150,000 for the rest of the decade; \$150,000 in 2010; the thousand dollar child credit between now and the next election. I think that family will sit around the kitchen table and say, we know who is playing politics.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) for purposes of control.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from California (Chairman Thomas) laid this out very accurately. Tonight is all about politics. I remember when I was elected in the class of 1994 I campaigned on creating the child tax credit which was a centerpiece of what was called the Contract with America at the time. And I remember many of those that are now somehow laying claim to the child tax credit were the same ones in 1995 who criticized the child tax credit somehow as a tax break for the rich.

□ 1930

So it is the same well-worn-out, tired, partisan rhetoric that we hear from the other side.

One of the things I hear from my colleagues is they always like to somehow make everyone a victim. They always

say that someone's going to get hurt. Let us think about who gets hurt if the Democrats prevail: poor people who have their child tax credit raised from \$600 to \$1,000, who right now qualify for the earned income tax credit. If Democrats have their way, it is only there for 1 year. Then they take it away at the end of 2004; and if the Democrats have their way, married couples, for example, who suffer from a marriage tax penalty in the child tax credit will suffer as well.

As the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) pointed out, we eliminated the marriage tax penalty in the child tax credit in the legislation we passed out of the House. The version they support, we do it in not 10 years, but we eliminate the marriage tax penalty. We want to eliminate it for the decade so it is in effect right now and stays there rather than waiting a decade for, as the Democrats would want to do, to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. Again, by eliminating the marriage tax penalty, we say if a person makes \$75,000, they qualify, as they would today, for the \$1,000 tax credit; and if they make twice what a single person makes, which is \$150,000, and that is a good income, but as the chairman pointed out, that is what a schoolteacher in New York City and a fireman in New York City who are married, a combined income, make, and they are denied the child tax credit under what the Democrats would like to do. We want to eliminate the marriage tax penalty right now.

We also, under our legislation, make the child tax credit available for the entire decade. I mentioned that earlier, and one other group that I think it is important for us to note is that if the Democrats have their way, our military men and women who would benefit from the House-passed tax relief targeted to our military families, many of whom have loved ones engaged somewhere in the Middle East, in Afghanistan, Iraq or elsewhere, the Senate, as my colleagues know, has not yet passed that legislation. We feel it should have been done not yesterday but months ago that we should have passed that legislation. That was coupled with the bill that passed the House of Representatives. Again, if the Democrats had their way, our military men and women who would benefit from the package of targeted tax relief to help our military men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan would be hurt, to use a Democrat's term.

So those are some of the victims out there. The victims, of course, are low-income families who have the child tax credit increased from \$600 to \$1,000 but immediately so, but it would only be there for 1 year. So it would be taken away from them.

Second, under the Democrat plan, we would not eliminate the marriage tax penalty for those who could benefit from the child tax credit. We want to do it immediately. They want to do it essentially 10 years from now.

In particular, we are also trying to help our military men and women, those in Iraq and Afghanistan and elsewhere, who are risking their lives today by ensuring that they get the tax relief, the help that we promised them months ago, unfortunately which other body has not yet passed. We think that needs to be done as well.

One thing we want to make clear. In this House, we Republicans want to ensure that all children who should qualify benefit from the child tax credit. As my colleagues recall, the Bush tax credit, the same children who they claim to be trying to help right now were already provided \$1,000 tax credit. It was phased in. We agree that it needs to be increased. We want to increase it for the entire decade. We want to eliminate the marriage tax penalty for the child tax credit, and we also want to help our Armed Forces currently in Iraq and Afghanistan with tax relief they should have received months ago; but unfortunately, for whatever reason, it has not yet been passed by Members of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

The gentleman's premise, and we have heard the chairman also say, gee, we want to do this, we want to help these children, we want to help these 12 million children, we want to help these 6.5 million families. Gee, we cannot do it unless we do it all, and the Senate will not pass our bill.

What precludes my colleagues from doing it all and doing it now as well? I suggest to the gentleman, nothing. The President of the United States, President Bush, asked my colleagues to do the Senate bill, do it now so we can get money into the hands of these families now, not at some theoretical future date.

Mr. Speaker, at 6:39 tonight it was 33 days exactly since the House appointed conferees to the House-Senate conference committee on legislation to increase the child tax credit for those 6.5 million families and those 200,000 servicemen and -women that the Republicans say they want to help, but only if we help them for 10 years. Nothing precludes them from helping now and helping later.

Thirty-three days, Mr. Speaker, and still no movement by Republicans on the fundamental issue of fairness that the President asked them to respond to. The President, not Democrats, President George Bush, the President of the United States, said pass the Senate bill; but the majority party has turned a deaf ear to the President on this issue. Selective hearing.

In fact, on June 12 when this House GOP passed a fiscally irresponsible \$82 billion bill that will cost \$800 billion in the years after 2013 that included the

child tax credit, rather than accept the Senate version costing \$3.5 billion, now they really do not care about deficits, they have blown a hole in the surplus they inherited, the largest surplus in the history of our country and have turned it into the historically highest deficit in the history of our country in less than 30 months. That is one heck of an accomplishment, a bad one.

They hoped to kill this bill. That is why they did not pass the Senate bill. They said, oh, we want to do it all, knowing full well that they could not do it because, as the gentlewoman said, the reason they cut out these families was because they could not afford it; but yet they think they can afford \$82 billion. They cut out 3.5 billion. Great math on that side.

Thirty-three days, Mr. Speaker, and still America waits for the GOP to summon a sense of fairness for these 12 million children who were deliberately and consciously and specifically left out in the cold by conferees on the Republican tax bill because their parents have low income. The clock is still ticking, but there is still time to do what is right for these families.

The gentleman from Illinois said we could do it tonight. Our side of the aisle will give unanimous consent for my colleagues to take the Senate bill, pass it tonight, pass it tonight without change and send it to the President, and the President can sign it tomorrow morning so that on July 25, those working families, the families that are having the toughest time in America, will have some help.

I had some school supplies in my office the other day. We took it off the Internet, matter of fact today off the Internet, the suggested school supplies for going back to school in September, \$220. This tax cut, if we paid it on July 25, could take care of those school supplies for those families.

Pass it, pass it now. Do not dissemble; do not delay.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) has 4 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the right to close, being in the majority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) has the right to close.

Mr. WELLER. She has the right to close, pardon me. I reserve the balance of my time to allow her to use up some more of her time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as of February this year, I too serve on the Committee on Ways and Means; and I am so happy to have the opportunity to sit there, and tonight I rise in support of the motion to instruct conferees to take action on the child tax credit by this Friday, as my colleague from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) has urged.

I heard the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means say, have it happen by Friday, how could that be? Contemplate that almost every piece of significant legislation that has come before this Congress in the last few months gets to the Democratic Party on the morning that the legislation is debated, hundreds of pages. We are required to go through hundreds of pages. Surely this Congress could go forward and take care of this issue by Friday.

The other thing that was so amazing to me was the discussion about politics. Give me a break. The politics of everything we have done in the last few months looms large.

The reason we dealt with the prescription drug benefit before July 4 was because the President instructed them to do that, and it was political because he needed to have that done.

The reason we dealt with a tax cut was on the President's instruction, and it was political because he needed to pay back all the people who supported his campaign.

The reason that the children, in this instance, were left out was political because there was only \$400 million set aside for the tax cut; and the poor, the poor folks in this country were put aside in the name of the rich in this country.

It is just a shame that we would have to sit here and talk about an issue and call the most important issue for many working families in this country rhetoric and that this motion has no significance; but the motion was significant enough to bring the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the motion was significant enough to bring the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), who has a relationship with the President, the motion was significant enough to bring the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) down here to debate against us. It is significant and they know it, and that is why they are down here on the floor debating us.

I say that it would be wonderful if on July 26 when those checks went out that the checks would go out to families who need it the most. In my State, the State of Ohio, 147,000 people have lost their jobs since 2001. Surely those working folks would like to be able to say I paid income tax in 2001 and 2002, give me a job, I would pay income tax. Unfortunately, as a result of the proposed 2001 tax cut that did not boost the economy, 147,000 people in the State of Ohio have lost their jobs.

I could go on and on about this issue, but I have colleagues here in the audience who would like to say something about the issue. Give me a break. It is

political, it is political, but we are being political on behalf of working folks. I seek opportunity to yield back my time to give some other Members of this House an opportunity to be heard on the issue. Before I do that, let me say one more thing.

It is significant that many of the minority children in this country will not be given an opportunity to get dollars, 2.4 million African American children, 4.1 million Latino children. Overall, it is almost one in six children that will not get a benefit because this Republican Party has delayed, delayed, delayed.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), the chairman of the Hispanic Caucus.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight because some of my colleagues have stood here on the House floor and stated they believe that working families who earn less than \$26,000 do not deserve a tax relief. Shame on them.

I stand before my colleagues today to speak to those people who are blocking the efforts to extend this child tax credit for low-income working families throughout this country, to let them know that their actions are affecting some of the hardest-working mothers and fathers in our Nation.

The Bush tax cut left behind thousands of hardworking south Texans and Americans. Many jobs, good jobs, just do not qualify my constituents for tax relief.

Let me look at some of these examples. We have child care workers who make roughly \$13,000 starting salaries, fast-food cook workers who make \$13,000, waitresses who make \$14,000, food preparers and servicers who make \$14,000, preschool teachers who start at \$13,000.

□ 1945

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) has 4 minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), for yielding me this time and for taking the leadership on this issue.

A number of folks on the other side of the aisle mentioned people who did not pay taxes. I agree with them. It is very important that people pay taxes. That is why I am struck by the lack of compassion for the fact that Enron, for 4 out of 5 years with record profits, never paid a single corporate income tax, yet was the recipient of \$250 million worth of export-import loans, or corporate welfare. I do not see anybody shedding any moral indignation about

Enron not paying corporate taxes for 4 out of 5 years.

WorldCom, which recently declared bankruptcy and defrauded many of its shareholders, recorded \$12.5 billion in profits, and yet 2 out of 3 years never paid any corporate taxes. Yet on this side not a voice is raised out of concern for the fact that corporations who have not paid taxes get many tax credits and benefits. They pay no incomes taxes, and yet they continue to receive taxpayer-funded government contracts, whether that be MCI or Enron.

Exxon Mobile recently reported, if I am not mistaken, \$12.3 billion in their quarterly income, yet received a \$25 billion tax credit. To do what? Drill for oil. I thought that was what their business was. I thought that was what they were supposed to do. I did not know taxpayers are supposed to subsidize what they are supposed to do for business. That is in their business plan and in their own quarterly reports of what they do, yet they reported quarterly profits. But this Congress provides them a tax cut.

So is there politics? My colleague is right. There are politics. Do people not pay taxes and yet get corporate benefits and get government benefits? Yes, they do, and the taxpayers pay for them all the time.

In The New York Times about 3 weeks ago I noticed that the taxpayers of the United States were paying Iraqi citizens \$20 a day to not show up for work. Now, I come from Chicago, and my good friend from Illinois comes from the suburbs of Chicago, but we both know something about no-show jobs. In Chicago, we think we wrote the book on no-show jobs. But \$20 a day for a no-show for an Iraqi citizen, well, the taxpayers of the United States are paying those people \$20 who do not show up for work. That can make a ward committeeman in Chicago a little jealous.

That is over \$1,000 in the last 3 months since the war ended. That Iraqi gets \$1,000, yet American citizens, 12 million children, do not get a child tax credit. Their parents cannot buy their school supplies as they get ready to go back to school.

So I think there is a great deal of irony, and, if I may say, a great deal of policy that my colleagues would provide Iraqis \$20 a day for not showing up for work, yet the men and women who are over there in uniform, making us proud, their children will not get the full tax credit. I do not know if that is policy or politics. I do not know what to call that, except that it is shameful.

So as we begin to think about what we are going to do here, the motion to instruct here would provide us the opportunity to move on this.

And I would like to remind people of one other point today. In front of the Committee on Financial Services, Chairman Greenspan spoke, and he talked about one of the reasons he thought the economy was taking off the second half of this year. One of two

reasons he provided was that we had a child tax credit that would put money in the pockets of middle-class families, and he lauded the child credit. He saw it as a good thing. We asked him if he thought it would be helpful to the economy if working middle-class families got it. He said he did.

Now, I know that periodically we selectively use Chairman Greenspan's words around here, but he lauded the child tax credit, and he lauded its ability to stimulate the economy. We would hope that since President Bush has asked us to get this done and Chairman Greenspan has talked about the value of this to working families and since our colleagues have decided to provide \$20 a day to Iraqis, I would hope that we would give that same consideration to American taxpayers who do show up to work.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct a factual point that my good friend from Illinois made, and that is the original voice behind the \$500 per child tax credit was the Gore-Downey legislation. And the President of the United States who signed the \$500 per child tax credit into law was President Clinton in 1997 in the Balanced Budget Agreement. Now, there was a piece of that in the Contract With America, but the first child tax credit idea was the Gore-Downey \$500 tax credit. It became law in 1997 and was part of President Clinton's budget.

I would not want that to get in the way, and it might have been in the Contract With America, and I am glad he ran on it, and there should be bipartisan agreement on that rather than disagreement on that. I would hope that we could do that. We are willing to give our colleagues the right to get it done right now, to adopt the Senate provision. We would like to be the voice for those 12 million children who do not get the tax credit as other children would. I hope my colleagues will see the economic benefits of that and see that it gets accomplished.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy my good friend from Illinois, the former member of the Clinton administration, but I would point out again that it was a Republican Congress that passed the \$500 per child tax credit. He is right. President Clinton did sign it in the Balanced Budget Agreement that was passed by a Republican Congress, but I would note that it was the centerpiece of the Contract With America, the child tax credit; and many of my friends on the other side of the aisle again called the child tax credit a tax cut for the rich because they would rather spend the money here in Washington.

We have heard a lot of rhetoric tonight, and it has all been political. That is what this exercise is all about, rhetoric and name calling. But so much of it is not true.

It is often asked, who benefitted from the Bush tax relief package? Who benefitted from the jobs and economic

growth package? Well, in my State of Illinois, the average tax-paying family will see lower taxes, or what we like to call higher take-home pay of about \$1,000. And if they are married couples, they see an elimination of the marriage tax penalty.

Three million Illinois children are already benefitting from the doubling of the child tax credit to \$1,000. It will be a big help to millions of Illinois families. Again, if you pay income Federal income taxes, you benefit, and millions of low-income taxpayers are no longer on the tax rolls thanks to this package.

One other example of someone who benefits from the package that was just signed into law by President Bush is Jose and Magdalena Castillo of Joliet, Illinois, a couple of construction workers. They work hard in Joliet. They have two children, Eduardo and little Carolina, and they suffered from the marriage tax penalty. Under the provision that eliminated the marriage tax penalty for couples like Jose and Magdalena, they see about \$1,400 in benefit. Think about that. That is a couple of semesters worth of tuition at Joliet Junior College. It is several months worth of day care at a local day care center. It is several months worth of car payments. It is probably 2 months worth of house payments for Jose and Magdalena. They benefit.

They also benefit from the legislation we passed out of this House because they benefit from the child tax credit. Under the legislation the House passed, we extend the child tax credit for Jose and Magdalena Castillo through the end of the decade.

The Democrats, of course, want to take that away at the end of 2004, once the election is over with. Well, we want to honor our commitment and keep our commitment, and many of us believe that we should make the elimination of the marriage tax penalty and the doubling of the child tax credit permanent forever. That is a separate debate, but the House-passed bill, which my Democratic friends oppose, extend it at least to the end of the decade so families can make plans.

If the Democrats had their way, Magdalena and Jose Castillo, for each of their two children, would lose that \$1,000 tax credit. In that case, it would cost that family \$800 in higher taxes for Jose and Magdalena Castillo, if my Democratic friends had their way. That is why it is so important to oppose what the Democrats are proposing today and that is to take away the tax credit from Jose and Magdalena Castillo.

That is why I strongly support what the House passed with bipartisan support, legislation to extend it through the end of the decade so families like Jose and Magdalena Castillo can make plans.

The second thing is that we eliminate the marriage tax penalty. I thought the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) laid it out very well, because he pointed out that, under the

House-passed bill, which my Democratic friends stand in opposition to, we eliminate the marriage tax penalty under the child tax credit. Right now, if you are a single person with a child, a single mom making up to \$75,000, you can get the thousand dollar tax credit. However, if you are a married couple, you can only make up to \$115,000. Who gets hurt?

Mr. Speaker, I, of course, urge my colleagues to vote in bipartisan opposition to the Democrats wanting to take away the child tax credit and also their efforts to oppose our efforts to eliminate the marriage tax penalty and the child tax credit.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This body did pass a motion identical to the one that we are debating tonight. It instructed the conferees to provide the 6.5 million families with the same tax credit given to other families, extending that tax credit to families of military personnel serving in Iraq. It was an overwhelming vote, a bipartisan vote, 205 to 201. But I guess what the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means said is right, the Republican majority does not care about the will of the majority of this House and what we are talking about.

The House GOP bill contains bad news for the children of 200,000 men and women who currently serve in Iraq and other combat zones. What we would do with this motion to instruct tonight is to help these military families, while what they had passed originally does not help those families.

Want to talk about playing politics? They passed what they did here because they knew there were no votes in the Senate and they would try to kill this piece of legislation, that they would not want to do something for those 12 million children who are not going to get the benefit of the child tax credit. That is playing politics.

When they say that in fact they will do nothing, that we do not have time for a conference, well, we could call that conference, as has been said here earlier tonight, in a heartbeat. We could vote on it tomorrow. We could do what the President of the United States has said we ought to do. We could do what the Senate has done and what he believes is the right thing to do, a good thing to do. And he wants to sign it.

I ask the President of the United States to please call on his leadership in the House of Representatives and in the United States Senate to come together in a conference. He should use his moral authority, use the bully pulpit to do something for 12 million children whose families work hard every single day to allow for their success.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

UNITED STATES-SINGAPORE FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-100)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit legislation and supporting documents to implement the United States-Singapore Free Trade Agreement (FTA). The Agreement will further open Singapore's markets and increase competition and consumer choice. This is America's first FTA with an Asian-Pacific nation, and we hope it will serve as a benchmark for future free trade agreements with other nations in the region. The Agreement will enhance prosperity in the United States and Singapore, serve the interest of expanding U.S. commerce, and advance our overall national interest.

My Administration is strongly committed to securing a level playing field for America's workers, farmers, and businesses. The Congress helped advance that policy by passing Trade Promotion Authority in the Trade Act of 2002 (the "Trade Act"). The Congress can help us take another important step by approving this Agreement and the implementing legislation. Without this Agreement, U.S. workers and businesses could be placed at a competitive disadvantage, because Singapore has signed or is currently working on free trade agreements with Japan, Canada, Australia, Mexico, and India.

In negotiating this FTA, my Administration was guided by the negotiating objectives set out in the Trade Act. The Agreement locks in tariff-free access for all U.S. goods, including textile and agriculture products, and addresses other barriers to trade. It opens opportunities for our services businesses, which now account for nearly 65 percent of our gross domestic product and more than 80 percent of employment in the United States. Through this FTA, Singapore will grant substantial additional market access to U.S. firms across a broad spectrum of services, including banking, insurance, securities and related financial services, express delivery services, professional services, and telecommunications. The Agreement also incor-

porates commitments on regulatory transparency that will be of special help to services business.

This Agreement provides state-of-the-art intellectual property protection, including significant commitments on trade in digital products. It ensures that electronic commerce will stay free of duties and discriminatory rules. In addition, Singapore will accede to international treaties dealing with copyright and access issues for the Internet.

United State citizens and businesses that invest in Singapore will have significant increased protections. This Agreement enhances transparency and openness in order to foster a more secure environment for trade and investment. Furthermore, Singapore will provide U.S. investors with important substantive protections that Singaporean investors already enjoy in the United States.

Singapore and the United States have also agreed to cooperate on the environment and labor issues and to establish mechanisms to support those efforts. The FTA obligates each country to enforce its own labor and environmental laws and makes clear that domestic labor or environmental protections may not be reduced in order to encourage trade or investment. The Agreement also preserves our right to pursue other legitimate domestic objectives, including the protection of health and safety, consumer interests, and national security.

Trade and openness contribute to development, the rule of law, economic growth, and international cooperation. Singapore is a close partner of the United States, and this Agreement will strengthen those ties.

With the approval of this Agreement and passage of the implementing legislation by the Congress, we will advance U.S. economic, security, and political interests, while encouraging others to work with us to expand free trade around the world.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 15, 2003.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2691, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (during the DeLauro Motion to Instruct conferees on H.R. 1308), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-209) on the resolution (H. Res. 319) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2691) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2122, PROJECT BIOSHIELD ACT OF 2003

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (during the DeLauro Motion to Instruct conferees on H.R. 1308). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House H.R. 2122; that the bill be considered as read for amendment; that in lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committee on Government Reform and the Select Committee on Homeland Security now printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute I have placed at the desk be considered as adopted; that all points of order against the bill, as amended, be waived; that the bill, as amended, be debatable for 90 minutes, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 15 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Reform, and 15 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage, without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Project BioShield Act of 2003".

SEC. 2. BIOMEDICAL COUNTERMEASURE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part B of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 243 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 319F the following section:

"SEC. 319F-1. AUTHORITY FOR USE OF CERTAIN PROCEDURES REGARDING QUALIFIED COUNTERMEASURE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—

"(1) AUTHORITY.—In conducting and supporting research and development activities regarding biomedical countermeasures under section 319F(h), the Secretary may conduct and support such activities in accordance with this section if the activities concern qualified countermeasures.

"(2) QUALIFIED COUNTERMEASURE.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified countermeasure' means a priority countermeasure (as defined in section 319F(h) and as determined by the Secretary in accordance with such section and consistent with sections 302(2) and 304(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002) against a chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear agent that may cause a public health emergency affecting national security.

"(3) INTERAGENCY COOPERATION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out activities under this section, the Secretary is authorized, subject to subparagraph (B), to enter into interagency agreements and other collaborative undertakings with other agencies of the United States Government.