

stress that has hit eastern Europe as a whole since the collapse of Communism. Under Communism, governments allotted good apartments to married couples. In the post-Communist era that incentive to marriage has disappeared. Large apartments are now too expensive for many couples to afford in stressed economic times. What used to be an incentive to marriage has turned into a disincentive. Yet nothing of this sort is happening in Holland.

THE EVIDENCE IS CLEAR

So the real question raised by Badgett's comparison is why Holland should be virtually the only traditionally low out-of-wedlock birthrate country in which couples have easy access to birth control where out-of-wedlock birthrates are now "soaring"? I'm grateful to Badgett for (inadvertently) drawing this additional factor to my attention. Rather than weakening my point, it greatly strengthens it. It is clearer than ever that something very unusual is happening in the Netherlands. Demographically, we have a kind of Dutch exceptionalism—and the key difference is that the Dutch added gay marriage to their precarious balance between socially liberal attitudes and traditional family practices. Gay marriage—not restricted contraception or the collapse of Communism—upset that balance, with the result that the out-of-wedlock birthrate began to zoom.

The decline of marriage in the Netherlands in tandem with the growing success of the Dutch movement for gay marriage is the clearest example of gay marriage's impact on marital decline. Badgett does her best to evade the problem by claiming that the increase in non-marital births began before Dutch registered partnerships took effect in early 1998. That is a weak argument, since an increase of two-percentage points in the out-of-wedlock birthrate for seven consecutive years is rare. It was anything but inevitable that a two-percent increase in non-marital births in 1997 would be followed by six consecutive increases at the same level. In any case, the final vote to establish registered partnerships took place in 1997.

But the deeper point is that the meaning of traditional marriage was transformed every bit as much by the decade-long national movement for gay marriage in Holland as by eventual legal success. That's why the impact of gay marriage on declining Dutch marriage rates and rising out-of-wedlock birthrates begins well before the actual legal changes were instituted. The recent statement by five Dutch scholars takes exactly that position.

Badgett has no trouble accepting the idea that gay marriage might be an effect of an increasing cultural separation between marriage and parenthood. But how could gay marriage be a product of this cultural trend without also locking in and reinforcing that same cultural stance? I've offered abundant cultural evidence that the message conveyed by gay marriage does in fact reinforce acceptance of parental cohabitation.

The Dutch scholars are right. Many factors are in play in European marital decline, and more research is needed to separate out the relative importance of the various factors. But continued marital decline in Scandinavia and the Netherlands has already provided us with enough evidence to call the wisdom of same-sex marriage into serious doubt.

CHARLOTTE SPARROW CHIAVETTA  
MAKES HER MARK ON THE WORLD

HON. BOB ETHERIDGE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 2004

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate John Bryan and Rebekah Sparrow Chiavetta on the birth of their first child, Charlotte Sparrow Chiavetta. Charlotte was born on Thursday, October 7, 2004, and weighed 6 pounds and 13 ounces. Faye joins me in wishing John and Rebekah great happiness during this very special time in their lives.

As a father, I know the joy, pride, and excitement that parents experience upon the entrance of their child into the world. Representing hope, goodness, and innocence, a newborn allows those around her to see the world through her eyes... as a new, fresh place with unending possibilities for the future. Through a child, one is able to recognize and appreciate the full potential of the human race. I know the Chiavettas look forward to the changes and challenges that their new daughter will bring to their lives while taking pleasure in the many rewards they are sure to receive as they watch her grow.

I welcome young Charlotte into the world and wish John and Rebekah all the best as they raise her.

COCA-COLA RECOGNITION

HON. HENRY BONILLA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 2004

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the classic beverage producer, Coca-Cola Company. Coca-Cola has been involved in its community and our Nation since the founding of the company. Through involvement in programs such as "Reading is Fundamental" and the U Promise Program, they have continually served the public. This history of public service was recently recognized when the Coca-Cola Company was awarded the United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, USHCC, Corporation of the Year Award at the 25<sup>th</sup> Annual National Convention and Business Expo in Austin, TX.

As the company's promise states, "The Coca-Cola Company exists to benefit and refresh everyone it touches." Such a recognition of the Coca-Cola Company by USHCC only reinforces the commitment Coca-Cola has made to make their promise come true.

The Coca-Cola Company strives to reach out to the Hispanic community through a variety of programs. These programs primarily focus on education, which Coca-Cola believes is a "powerful force in improving the quality of life and creating opportunity for people and their families around the world." Of close to 30 programs, three—the Art of Harmony, the Coca-Cola First Generation Scholarship Program, and the Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program—stand out in exemplifying the company's determination and willingness to "benefit and refresh." Through programs such as these, Coca-Cola has encouraged students who may not have a family history of going to college, or the financial stability to succeed

once they get there, the means and motivation to excel.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize the Coca-Cola Company as the recipient of the USHCC Corporation of the Year Award and bring to light their outstanding efforts within the Hispanic community.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4520,  
AMERICAN JOBS CREATION ACT  
OF 2004

SPEECH OF

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 2004

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strident opposition to the conference report on H.R. 4520, the so-called "Jobs Creation Act." This bill does nothing to create jobs at home, and actually provides incentives for corporations to move jobs offshore. The conference report is a \$140 billion solution to a \$57 billion problem, and how the Republicans intend to pay for this solution is both a sham and a disgrace.

Repealing the extraterritorial income, ETI, regime is absolutely necessary to avoid retaliatory duties imposed by the European Union. This tax scheme was found to be illegal by the World Trade Organization because it unfairly advantaged U.S. corporations in the international arena. Given that judgment, my preferred approach was to simply repeal the tax and save \$57 billion for America's taxpayers.

That's what should have happened. But, even if one felt that the corporations shouldn't be penalized for the WTO ruling, keeping them whole after the ETI repeal would cost \$57 billion. Unfortunately my colleagues have decided to go much further. They are replacing that illegal regime with \$140 billion in unnecessary corporate tax cuts and extraneous provisions that have no business in this bill.

This bill isn't only loaded with expensive, unnecessary tax breaks, it then goes so far as to induce U.S. companies to move even more jobs overseas through its bizarre tax incentive structure. During this jobless economic recovery, we cannot afford to give corporations even more incentive to ship jobs offshore. But, I guess this is consistent with the Bush administration and Republican belief that outsourcing jobs is good for America. I disagree.

This bill also gives U.S. companies a tax break on the profits they have previously made by shipping jobs offshore. In fact, corporations are temporarily allowed to repatriate foreign profits at a rate of 5.25 percent. Why would we ever give companies a tax holiday so they can line the pockets of executives and investors? That doesn't create jobs, it just breeds more corporate greed.

The Republicans will claim that this bill is fiscally responsible because it is paid for. In reality the \$80 billion in closed loopholes and other revenue raisers are just a pipe dream. Two of the biggest revenue raisers in the bill make it much harder for individuals to take the charitable deduction for donating property to non-profit organizations. I thought this was a corporate tax bill. I guess the Republicans think it is OK to raise taxes on charitable individuals so that billion-dollar corporations can