

Pryce (OH)	Shaw	Taylor (NC)
Quinn	Shays	Thomas
Radanovich	Sherman	Thompson
Rahall	Shimkus	Thornberry
Ramstad	Shuster	Thurman
Rangel	Sisisky	Tiahrt
Redmond	Skaggs	Tierney
Regula	Skeen	Towns
Reyes	Skelton	Trafficant
Riggs	Slaughter	Turner
Riley	Smith (MI)	Upton
Rivers	Smith (NJ)	Velazquez
Rodriguez	Smith (OR)	Vento
Roemer	Smith (TX)	Visclosky
Rogan	Smith, Adam	Walsh
Rogers	Smith, Linda	Waters
Ros-Lehtinen	Snowbarger	Watkins
Roybal-Allard	Snyder	Watt (NC)
Royce	Solomon	Watts (OK)
Rush	Souder	Waxman
Ryun	Spence	Weldon (FL)
Sabo	Spratt	Weldon (PA)
Sanchez	Stabenow	Weller
Sanders	Stark	Wexler
Sandlin	Stearns	Weygand
Sanford	Stenholm	White
Saxton	Strickland	Whitfield
Scarborough	Stump	Wicker
Schaefer, Dan	Stupak	Wise
Schaffer, Bob	Sununu	Wolf
Schumer	Talent	Woolsey
Scott	Tanner	Wynn
Sensenbrenner	Tauscher	Yates
Serrano	Tauzin	Young (AK)
Sessions	Taylor (MS)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—42

Armey	Gibbons	Neal
Blagojevich	Gonzalez	Obey
Bono	Harman	Porter
Boucher	Hayworth	Poshard
Burton	Hostettler	Rohrabacher
Clyburn	Inglis	Rothman
Cox	Kolbe	Roukema
Crane	LaFalce	Salmon
DeLay	Lee	Sawyer
Diaz-Balart	Martinez	Shadegg
Dickey	McInnis	Stokes
Doolittle	Meehan	Thune
Forbes	Mica	Torres
Furse	Moakley	Wamp

□ 1738

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9719 Candelaria Road NE, in Albuquerque, New Mexico, as the 'Steve Schiff Post Office'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, had I been present for the vote on H.R. 3630, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 195, I was unavoidably detained with committee business. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to simply note that on the last three votes in some buildings on Capitol Hill the bells are simply not working, and so a number of us have apparently missed three votes in a row because the bells were malfunctioning. I just wanted the RECORD to show that.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BONO. Madam Speaker, as I was unavoidably detained, I wish to announce my support and that I would have voted "yea" on the following business of today: Roll Call Vote #193—Approving the Journal; Roll Call Vote #194—H.R. 3808 Designating the Carl D. Pursell Post Office Building; Roll Call Vote #195—H.R. 3630 Designating the Steven Schiff Post Office Building.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 716

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 716.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HON. DAVE CAMP, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Hon. Dave Camp, Member of Congress:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 27, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that I have been served with a subpoena duces tecum issued by the 6th Judicial Circuit for the State of Michigan, in the case of *Ann Marie Reynolds v. Resource Solutions Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 97-002709-CZ.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that the subpoena relates to my official duties, and that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Member of Congress.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Madam Speaker, last week on rollcall No. 192, I was reported as voting "aye." That was the transportation bill.

I recall voting "no" and would ask that the RECORD reflect immediately following that vote that I opposed rollcall vote 192, the transportation bill, as I did from the beginning of the process.

□ 1745

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1150, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION REFORM ACT OF 1998

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time to consider the conference report to accompany the Senate bill (S. 1150) to ensure that federally funded agricultural research, ex-

tension, and education address high-priority concerns with national or multistate significance, to reform, extend, and eliminate certain agricultural research programs, and for other purposes; and, Madam Speaker, that all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration be waived, except those arising under section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which is the unfunded mandate point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

UNFAIRNESS IN TAX CODE: MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and includes extraneous material.)

Mr. WELLER. Madam Speaker, there is a big, important question that needs to be asked. That is, why it is so important that we pass the Marriage Tax Penalty Elimination Act?

I think that question is best answered with a series of questions. Do Americans feel that it is fair that an average working married couple pays more in taxes just because they are married? Do Americans feel that it is fair that 21 million married working couples pay on the average of \$1,400 more in taxes just because they are married, \$1,400 more than an identical couple with identical incomes that live outside of marriage?

Of course not. Americans recognize that the marriage tax penalty is not only unfair, it is wrong. It is morally wrong that we tax our society's most basic institution, 21 million married working couples, \$1,400 more.

That is one year's tuition at Joliet Junior College in the district I represent. That is 3 months of day care at a local child care center, real money for real people. Let us make elimination of the marriage tax penalty a bipartisan priority. Let us make elimination of the marriage tax penalty our number one priority this year.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight what is arguably the most unfair provision in the U.S. Tax Code: the marriage tax penalty. I want to thank you for your long term interest in bringing parity to the tax burden imposed on working married couples compared to a couple living together outside of marriage.

In January, President Clinton gave his State of the Union Address outlining many of the things he wants to do with the budget surplus. A surplus provided by the bipartisan budget agreement which: cut waste, put America's fiscal house in order, and held Washington's feet to the fire to balance the budget.

While President Clinton paraded a long list of new spending totaling at least \$46-\$48 billion in new programs—we believe that a top priority should be returning the budget surplus to America's families as additional middle-class tax relief.

This Congress has given more tax relief to the middle class and working poor than any Congress of the last half century.

I think the issue of the marriage penalty can best be framed by asking these questions: Do Americans feel its fair that our tax code imposes a higher tax penalty on marriage? Do Americans feel its fair that the average married working couple pays almost \$1,400 more in taxes than a couple with almost identical income living together outside of marriage? Is it right that our tax code provides an incentive to get divorced?

In fact, today the only form one can file to avoid the marriage tax penalty is paperwork for divorce. And that is just wrong!

Since 1969, our tax laws have punished married couples when both spouses work. For no other reason than the decision to be joined in holy matrimony, more than 21 million couples a year are penalized. They pay more in taxes than they would if they were single. Not only is the marriage penalty unfair, it's wrong that our tax code punishes society's most basic institution. The marriage tax penalty exacts a disproportionate toll on working women and lower income couples with children. In many cases it is a working women's issue.

Let me give you an example of how the marriage tax penalty unfairly affects middle class married working couples.

For example, a machinist, at a Caterpillar manufacturing plant in my home district of Joliet, makes \$30,500 a year in salary. His wife is a tenured elementary school teacher, also bringing home \$30,500 a year in salary. If they would both file their taxes as singles, as individuals, they would pay 15 percent.

MARRIAGE PENALTY EXAMPLE IN THE SOUTH SUBURBS

	Machinist	School Teacher	Couple	Weller/McIntosh II
Adjusted Gross Income	\$30,500	\$30,500	\$61,000	\$61,000
Less Personal Exemption and Standard Deduction	\$6,550	\$6,550	\$11,800	\$13,100 ^(1 2)
Taxable Income	\$23,950	\$23,950	\$49,200	\$47,900
Tax Liability	(\$15)	(\$15)	(\$28)	(\$15)
Marriage Penalty	\$3592.5	\$3592.5	\$8563	\$7,185
Weller-McIntosh II Eliminates the Marriage Tax Penalty			\$1378	\$1378 ³

¹ Singles.
² Partial.
³ Relief.

But if they chose to live their lives in holy matrimony, and now file jointly, their combined income of \$61,000 pushes them into a higher tax bracket of 28 percent, producing a tax penalty of \$1400 in higher taxes.

On average, America's married working couples pay \$1,400 more a year in taxes than individuals with the same incomes. That's serious money. Millions of married couples are still stinging from April 15th's tax bite and more married couples are realizing that they are suffering the marriage tax penalty.

Particularly if you think of it in terms of: a down payment on a house or a car, one year's tuition at a local community college, or several months' worth of quality child care at a local day care center.

To that end, Congressman DAVID MCINTOSH and I have authored the Marriage Tax Penalty Elimination Act.

The Marriage Tax Penalty Elimination Act will increase the tax brackets (currently at 15 percent for the first \$24,650 for singles, whereas married couples filing jointly pay 15

percent on the first \$41,200 of their taxable income) to twice that enjoyed by singles; the Weller-McIntosh proposal would extend a married couple's 15 percent tax bracket to \$49,300. Thus, married couples would enjoy an additional \$8,100 in taxable income subject to the low 15 percent tax rate as opposed to the current 28 percent tax rate and would result in up to \$1,053 in tax relief.

Additionally the bill will increase the standard deduction for married couples (currently \$6,900) to twice that of singles (currently at \$4,150). Under the Weller-McIntosh legislation the standard deduction for married couples filing jointly would be increased to \$8,300.

Our new legislation builds on the momentum of their popular H.R. 2456 which enjoyed the support of 238 cosponsors and numerous family, women and tax advocacy organizations. Current law punishes many married couples who file jointly by pushing them into higher tax brackets. It taxes the income of the families' second wage earner—often the woman's salary—at a much higher rate than if that salary was taxed only as an individual. Our bill already has broad bipartisan cosponsorship by Members of the House and a similar bill in the Senate also enjoys widespread support.

It isn't enough for President Clinton to suggest tax breaks for child care. The President's child care proposal would help a working couple afford, on average, three weeks of day care. Elimination of the marriage tax penalty would give the same couple the choice of paying for three months of child care—or addressing other family priorities. After all, parents know better than Washington what their family needs.

We fondly remember the 1996 State of the Union address when the President declared emphatically that, quote "the era of big government is over."

We must stick to our guns, and stay the course.

There never was an American appetite for big government.

But there certainly is for reforming the existing way government does business.

And what better way to show the American people that our government will continue along the path to reform and prosperity than by eliminating the marriage tax penalty.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we are on the verge of running a surplus. It's basic math.

It means Americans are already paying more than is needed for government to do the job we expect of it.

What better way to give back than to begin with mom and dad and the American family—the backbone of our society.

We ask that President Clinton join with Congress and make elimination of the marriage tax penalty—a bipartisan priority.

Of all the challenges married couples face in providing home and hearth to America's children, the U.S. tax code should not be one of them.

Lets eliminate The Marriage Tax Penalty and do it now!

IN OPPOSITION TO RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AMENDMENT

(Mr. EDWARDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, tomorrow in this House I will vote to oppose the Istook amendment which would amend our cherished Bill of Rights for the first time in our Nation's history. Numerous religious organizations support this position. Yet incredibly and sadly the Christian Coalition has sent out a mailing in my district which I would like to submit for the RECORD accusing me of, quote, religious bigotry because I oppose the Istook amendment.

They say this about me: "His attitudes have no place in Texas or anywhere in America."

Madam Speaker, I never thought that my position in defending the first amendment of the Bill of Rights would be the basis for someone accusing me of being anti-American. Such a claim is outrageous. If I am a religious bigot for believing in the first amendment, the first 16 words of the Bill of Rights, then I shall say I will be in good company with James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, and our Founding Fathers.

Perhaps the author of this hate mail should be reminded of the ninth commandment which says, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

STOP THE BIGOTRY!

Your congressman, Rep. Chet Edwards, is trying to stop Christians and other people of faith from exercising two of their First Amendment rights: the freedom of religion and the freedom of expression. Rep. Edwards is the leading opponent of the Religious Freedom Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

This Amendment would allow all Americans the freedom of religious expression in public places and would ensure that school children are not punished for creating a Valentine to Jesus, or for reading a Bible during free time.

The Edwards bigotry directed at Christians and other people of faith is outrageous and must be stopped! His attitudes have no place in Texas or anywhere in America.

People of faith cannot sit silently and allow this bigotry to be used as a tool to stop the Religious Freedom Amendment. We must stand for our right to express our religious beliefs.

Call Rep. Edwards now and (1) ask him to stop trying to silence people of faith and (2) encourage him to support the Religious Freedom Amendment.

CALL TO ACTION—PRAYER MONITORS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL HALLS!

Blatant disregard for the rights of people of faith are becoming more and more commonplace as our judges and politicians turn their backs on religious freedom.

WE NEED A RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AMENDMENT

Call your congressman at the numbers listed on this postcard today!

COMMENDING HONORABLE TONY HALL FOR SUDAN VISIT

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I rise to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for traveling to Sudan to see firsthand what is taking place. He saw starvation, devastation, basically