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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 354, nays 50, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

YEAS—354

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weygand
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (FL)

NAYS—50

Aderholt
Baird
Bilbray
Bonior
Borski
Brady (PA)
Capuano
Clay
Crane
DeFazio
Deutsch
English
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Holt
Hulshof
Kucinich
LoBiondo
McDermott
Moore
Oberstar
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Ramstad
Rogan
Sabo
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Weller
Wexler
Wu

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—29

Ackerman
Archer
Baker
Barton
Bateman
Campbell
Carson
Chenoweth-Hage
Costello
Forbes
Frost
Johnson, Sam
Knollenberg
Leach
McNulty
Obey
Owens
Oxley
Paul
Sessions
Sisisky
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Souder
Vento
Whitfield
Wise
Wynn
Young (AK)

□ 1052

Mr. HILLIARD changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ISRAEL CANCELS SALE OF AWAC SYSTEM TO CHINA

(Mr. CALLAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been quite a bit of interest in the last couple of months about the Israeli sale of an AWAC system to China. It was going to be a major discussion on the floor of the House today. I know many Members were concerned about that issue.

I wanted to tell them that I just received a call from the ambassador telling me that Mr. Barak has canceled the AWAC sale to China.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4810, MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2000

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 545 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 545

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4810) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Rangel or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 545 is a modified closed rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4810, the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Reconciliation Act of 2000. For those Members who think they are experiencing deja vu, let me clear up any confusion. It is true that the House has already voted to provide relief from the marriage tax penalty. In fact, on February 10 of this very year, the House passed legislation that is identical to H.R. 4810 by a bipartisan vote of 268–158. Prior to that, the House twice passed marriage tax relief as part of a larger tax bill which the President unfortunately vetoed. So this is actually the fourth time that the 106th Congress will debate and vote to provide tax fairness to married couples.

It probably baffles the American people that it takes this much effort to

correct such a blatant inequity in the tax code, but rest assured the Republican majority is determined to keep at it and give the President another chance to sign this bill into law. Today, we will consider the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Act under a reconciliation process which we hope will speed this legislation's path to the President's desk.

Under the rule, the House will proceed with 1 hour of general debate on the bill which will be equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. Even though the House has already thoroughly debated this issue and passed this legislation, the Committee on Rules decided to give the minority an opportunity to offer a substitute amendment which will be debated for 1 hour. The substitute amendment which is printed in the Committee on Rules report may be offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) or his designee. All points of order against consideration of the bill and the amendment are waived. Not only will the minority have the opportunity to offer a substitute but they also will have the option of offering a motion to recommit, with or without instructions. So I think we can all agree that this rule is quite fair in its generosity to the minority.

Mr. Speaker, 'tis the season for holy matrimony and as wedding bells chime across the Nation this summer, many couples will celebrate their unions without suspecting that the Government has in store for them a tax on their marriage. If these newlyweds listen to the family-friendly rhetoric in Washington, they might think the Government is toasting to them as they create their new families. But instead of sending sentiments of congratulations and best wishes, the only thing the Government plans to deliver is a bigger tax bill. So let us hope these couples do not run out and cash the wedding checks that they receive from Grandpa Joe and Cousin Jane because they still have to pay Uncle Sam.

That is right, Mr. Speaker. The Federal Government sees marriage as an opportunity to increase taxes. Newlyweds may see their taxes rise by hundreds or even thousands of dollars based solely on the fact that they have walked down the aisle and said, ''I do.'' It is hard to understand why the decision to make a solemn commitment to another individual through the institution of marriage has anything to do with the rate at which one is taxed, but we should know by now that the Government has no qualms about taking every opportunity to make a grab for more of our hard-earned money. In fact, each year 42 million working Americans pay higher taxes simply because they are married. This policy is unfair and discriminatory, not to mention the fact that it undermines one of the most fundamental institutions of our society. And it makes little sense to add to the tax burden of newlyweds, especially when marriage is often a precursor to added financial responsibilities such as owning a home or having children.

□ 1100

I think we all know that despite all of our glowing talk about a robust economy, many families find that it is hard to make ends meet. Both spouses must work. Under the current Tax Code, working couples are pushed into a higher tax bracket because the income of the second wage earner, often the wife, is tacked a much higher rate.

Because of the marriage penalty, 21 million families pay an average of $1,400 more in taxes than they would if they were single or just living together. What kind of message does that send?

The Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Act will bring fairness to the Tax Code by doubling the standard deduction for married couples, expanding the 15 percent bracket so more of a couple's income is taxed at a lower rate, and increasing the amount that low-income couples can earn and still be eligible for the earned income tax credit. This fix will mean lower taxes for 25 million American couples, and that is 59,000 couples in my district alone.

But my Democrat colleagues will claim that we are doing too much, though I am not sure there is such a thing as too much fairness, Mr. Speaker. Still, they will want to differentiate between married couples and penalize some couples for their vows, but not others.

Under the Democrat's plan, the Government does not have to give these families as much money back, so the Government can keep and spend more. They may claim that this is a more responsible approach; but, Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleagues that the Government is experiencing a budget surplus. We have already taken the Social Security and Medicare trust funds off the table and made a commitment to paying down the debt, and we still have money left over. If we cannot afford to fix this glaring inequity in our Tax Code today, then when would my Democrat friends suggest that we do it, and how is it responsible to let this penalty on marriage continue when the Government is swimming in surplus cash?

I do not claim to understand the logic, but this rule will give the Democrats the opportunity to make their case and offer their substitute.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule that will give the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Act the momentum it needs to move through the Senate and to the President's desk, so that he has another opportunity to do the right thing and give working families this needed break. There is absolutely no reason to continue this unfair policy, no more excuses.

It is time to either defend the marriage tax or eliminate it. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Reconciliation Act.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), for yielding me the customary half hour. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we all agree the marriage tax is unfair. It punishes people for getting married just when they are thinking of starting a family, and it really needs to be abolished. The question is how to abolish it.

There is a Democratic bill; there is a Republican bill. The central difference between the two bills is who is benefited.

The Republican bill will benefit the richest 25 percent of Americans, including a lot of people who do not even pay the marriage penalty in the first place. The Democratic bill benefits working families who really need it, working families with children who are trying to save for a home, who are trying to put their children through school, who are trying to make ends meet. They should not have to pay additional taxes just because they are married; and unless they are very rich, the Republican bill just does not work for them.

The reason the Republican bill will not work, Mr. Speaker, is because it increases the standard deduction without adjusting the alternative minimum tax. That means that millions of families would see no net reduction under the marriage penalty whatsoever under the Republican bill.

In yesterday's Washington Post, in the editorial, Mr. Speaker, it said, ''The cost of the bill is high: The bulk of the benefit would go to people already quite well off, and there are better uses for the money, to shore up Medicare, for example.''

By the year 2008, the year that the Republican bill finally goes into effect, 47 percent of American families with two children would get no relief whatsoever. The tax will have a new name, but it will cost a lot. Mr. Speaker, that is not what the American families need.

Millions of low- and moderate-income families, especially those with children, need help; and the Republican bill just does not do it.

The Democratic bill will, Mr. Speaker. The Democratic bill will focus its efforts on low- and moderate-income taxpayers by increasing the standard deduction for married couples until it is twice the size of the single people's deduction. It will also reduce the marriage penalty in the Earned Income Tax Credit and change the alternative minimum tax so that all of the promised tax cuts actually do take effect. It will mean real help to working families who need it.

Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's editorial in the Washington Post, the title was ''A Phony Issue.'' It says ''Congressional Republicans scheduled a vote

this week on a sizable tax cut, mainly for the better off, which they misleadingly describe as relief from the marriage penalty. The President has rightly indicated that he will veto this bill as it is likely to be presented to him. That suits the sponsors perfectly, and that vote is mainly intended as a frame for the national,'' well, that is something else. But I think the Washington Post says it much better than anyone else.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Republican bill.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Columbus for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that my friend from south Boston, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, and we are going to do our darnedest to see that he stays right in that spot, just as my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), will remain in his very important key spot as ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means as we move into the 107th Congress.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object.

Mr. DREIER. To object? I am happy to yield, if the gentleman wants to debate the issue.

But the fact is my friend from south Boston has talked about the Democratic bill, and I am proud to talk about the bipartisan bill, because what we have done here on this marriage penalty issue is we have put together a very strong bipartisan package, and there is recognition on both sides of the aisle that this issue needs to be addressed.

Republicans and Democrats alike voted strongly for this bill when we brought it up in February, and I suspect that later today when we cast the vote on this, we once again will see strong bipartisanship. So I am happy to have the leadership on the other side talk about their Democratic bills, and we on the Republican side are proud to embrace bipartisanship, because we know that that in fact is the best way to get things done for the American people.

Even in an election year, even in a election year there are some very basic principles that the American people share, and fairness happens to be one of them. That is what this is all about, is trying to bring about a modicum of equity; and we are doing it specifically to address the concern of those who are most impacted.

If you look at the cost for women, minorities, they are penalized greatly because of this marriage tax; and if you look at the cost, it is about $1,400 on average for those who are in that middle- and lower-income area.

So it seems to me that we have got a strong effort that has been put together here by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) and others on the Committee on Ways and Means who have been championing this issue for a long period of time.

It is all about equity and fairness. And guess what, Mr. Speaker? That is exactly what this rule is about too. The rule is a very fair one. It is a very equitable one. It allows my very good friend from New York (Mr. RANGEL) to offer his substitute motion. As was the case in the beginning when we took the majority in 1994, we are going to guarantee the motion to recommit.

So my Democratic colleagues will have two bites at the apple, and we will have one bite for the bipartisan package that we are moving forward here. It seems to me it is extraordinarily fair. We have turned ourselves inside out to accommodate the minority, and I know some of my Republican colleagues may not be too ecstatic about that, but we have done that; and I believe that in this instance, it is the right thing to do.

At the end of the day, Democrats and Republicans alike will join in support of the measure, so I hope the Democrats and Republicans alike will overwhelmingly support this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I do not disagree with the chairman. This is a fair rule; it is just not a fair bill. We get two bites at the apple, but they get five bites at the money.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to my dear friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to spoil the reputation of the chairman of the Committee on Rules by complimenting him on this floor too often, but it is strange and unusual that we would get a fair and equitable rule like this, and I would just like to rise to the occasion to compliment him.

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

Mr. RANGEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this is the second time we have given this identical rule. It is not out of character at all. We gave you this rule in February, so you know we are just continuing a long pattern of providing you with a great opportunity.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to strike that from the RECORD. This is the second time you have been fair.

Mr. Speaker, this gives us an opportunity to take a problem that we recognize as a serious problem of equity, and that is if two people filing separately can get a better tax break than someone that is married, then it is not the fair thing to do.

Why have we not taken care of this a long time ago? Why did we not follow former Congresswoman Barbara Kennelly from Connecticut as she led the fight to do it? One of the reasons was that it is difficult to be equitable when you do not have the funds to do it.

To talk about 3 or 4 years ago patching up something that the Tax Code was really unfair about and paying $100 billion in lost revenue was something unheard of. But now that the Clinton-Gore team's economic policy has clicked in and we find every day an increase in the revenue that we expect, it makes a lot of sense that we can come together, Republicans and Democrats, and see what we can do to repair an inequity in the law.

That is the problem. We do not come together, we do not discuss anything, and the Republican majority is so bent on making political statements that they are not concerned at all with what the President signs. All they are concerned with is that they are able to pass the bill in the House.

They learned a lot from their mistakes in the past, and that is putting together these tremendous irresponsible tax cuts of some $800 billion without even thinking about our Social Security system; paying down the national debt; repairing Medicare; and one of the things we are so concerned about, and that is allowing our older people who have access to health care but do not have access to the money to pay for the prescription drugs that are so important for their health.

All we are saying is why can we not deal with the Government's budget the way we do our own? We just cannot take the irresponsible, close-to-$1 trillion tax cut, and cut it up and say we are going to deliver it in small pieces. No. What we should do is to find out have we taken care of Social Security, are we working together to deal with the Medicare problem, do we have some kind of a bill that we can assure the people of the United States that, when we leave here, there would be an affordable drug program? Are we paying down the national debt? Then are we doing the things that we are sent here to Congress to do?

Already we have passed close to $500 billion in tax cuts. All at one time? Oh, no. The public relations divisions of the Republican Party have taken care of that. It does not come out of the tax writing committee; it comes out of the Speaker's office, out of the Committee on Rules. But if you want to talk about the Patients' Bill of Rights, they talk about tax cuts; you want to talk about minimum wage, they talk about tax cuts; you want to talk reforming pensions, they talk about tax cuts.

□ 1115

So here we are with the marriage penalty, both of us wanting to bring equity, but they enlarged the tax bracket for the 15 percent bracket, which causes us to lose another $100 billion in revenues and, worse than that, after 10 years, there is an explosion of the revenues that we lose. Should we give a tax cut? Yes, but not in these pieces that we come here with. We should have a comprehensive program that would do all of the things that we wanted to do. Why is it that every time our Republican colleagues steal a good idea from us, every time we agree with our colleagues that we should be working together, they have to pile on it an irresponsible tax cut to such an extent that it promises a veto.

So here we are again. We have a substitute, by any standard, that is fair. No one can challenge that what we do is take care of the inequity as it relates to the penalty.

In addition to that, we make certain that we make adjustments in the alternative minimum tax so that no one loses a benefit that is in the lower income, unlike the Republican bill. We make certain with the tax credits, the refundable tax credits, that the lower income people get a better break with that. So we do not concentrate, as our Republican colleagues do, on those that God has already blessed and they are still trying to give them additional fiscal blessings through the tax system.

Let us try to work together, not as Republican leaderships with Democrat minorities, but as representatives that truly represent the interests of the people of this country. When we do this, we will see that the President will join in and we will not have just House-passed bills, but we will have bills that will be accepted by the Senate and signed into law by the President of the United States.

The President has said, if you want to deal with this subject, put the drug issue as relates to affordable prescription drugs on your calendar, deal with it in a real way, the way we are going to do it, and we can do business.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the gentleman's instruction about what we should be doing as a Congress, but I am not sure where he has been, because he says we have not addressed Social Security. Well, have we? Of course we have. We have a lockbox. We have locked away the Social Security Trust Fund for the first time. Have we addressed Medicare? Yes, we have done the same thing. We have locked away those funds for the first time. Have we addressed prescription drugs for our seniors? Yes, we did. We voted on it just about a week ago.

So, Mr. Speaker now, once again, we will give the President his chance to sign the Marriage Penalty Tax Relief Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) who has worked so hard on this legislation.

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of the accomplishments of this Congress. We balanced the budget, the first time in 28 years; we are now balancing it for the 4th year in a row. We stopped the raid on Social Security just this past week. Sometimes I think my friends on the other side of the aisle have amnesia, because we have already passed prescription drugs, provided prescription drugs for our seniors, we are paying off the national debt with a plan we have adopted by the year 2013, already paying down the debt by $350 billion; and we are also working to make our Tax Code more fair, particularly more fair for working and middle class families.

We have often asked in this House, many of us, a pretty basic, fundamental question. That is, is it right, is it fair that under our Tax Code, married working couples pay higher taxes because they are married? Do we think it is right that 25 million married working couples, on average, pay $1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married, compared to identical couples with identical incomes who live together outside of marriage. That is wrong.

We are fortunate that in February this House passed legislation with overwhelming bipartisan support, legislation that was initiated by myself and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. DANNER), a Democrat, a bipartisan bill that had 233 cosponsors. It passed this House in February with the support not only of every House Republican, but 48 Democrats broke ranks with their leadership and voted to eliminate the marriage tax penalty for 25 million married working couples.

Unfortunately, in the Senate, the Democratic leadership has used every parliamentary procedure possible to block this legislation. We are now forced to move through the reconciliation process so that the majority can rule in the Senate.

The bottom line is, we want to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. It is wrong, it is unfair.

Let me introduce Shad and Michelle Hallihan. This is a photo of them when we introduced the bill a year-and-a-half ago to wipe out the marriage tax penalty. Shad and Michelle are two Joliet township high school teachers, they suffer the marriage tax penalty because they are both in the workforce and, of course, the marriage tax penalty of $1,400 that they suffer is a lot of money in Joliet, Illinois, the south suburbs of Chicago. Mr. Speaker, $1,400 for Michelle and Shad Hallihan, that is a year's tuition at our local community college, Joliet Junior College, which is our Nation's oldest. It is also 3 months of day care for a child.

That is why I think it is important to introduce a new photo of Shad and Michelle Hallihan. Since they were married at the time that we introduced the legislation, they have since had a baby, and if Al Gore and my friends on the other side of the aisle had their way, the child will probably be grown and out of college by the time we eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Shad and Michelle have a little boy by the name of Ben. Little Ben has brought a lot of joy to their life, but because of the marriage tax penalty, there is $1,400 that goes out of the pocketbooks of Shad and Michelle and comes to Washington, money that they can use to take care of little Ben and $1,400. That is about 3,000 diapers. That is a lot of diapers for little Ben. Over 18 years, that $1,400 a year, if they just set that full amount in a college fund, that is over $25,000 that Shad and Michelle can invest in little Ben and little Ben's future for college. So the marriage tax penalty is real money for real people.

Shad and Michelle, the way they suffer the marriage tax penalty is the marriage tax penalty occurs when you have a husband and wife who are both in the workforce, they combine their income when they are married, file jointly, and when they combine their income, that means they are pushed into a higher tax bracket. If Shad and Michelle had chosen to stay single and just live together, they each, because of their income, would file in the 15 percent tax bracket. But they chose to participate in the most basic institution in our society which is marriage, and Shad and Michelle, because they are married, now pay in the 28 percent tax bracket. They suffer the marriage tax penalty.

We believe it is wrong. We want to help Michelle and Shad Hallihan as well as little Ben to make sure he has a future and they have the resources for this.

Mr. Speaker, under our bipartisan proposal, we do several things. We help those who do not itemize their taxes by doubling the standard deduction for joint filers at twice that of singles, and that helps about 9 million couples of those who suffer the marriage tax penalty. Those are the nonitemizers. Well, the rest, subtracting 9 from 25, that leaves 18 million couples who itemize their taxes who suffer the marriage tax penalty and they are people who are average folks, middle class, but they probably own a house. So if you own a home, you probably itemize your taxes, and the only way you can receive marriage tax relief is if we provide marriage tax relief as part of our proposal.

We do that by widening the most basic bracket, the 15 percent bracket so you can earn twice as much in the 15 percent bracket if you are a joint filer as a single person, and that is how we help Michelle and Shad Hallihan as well as little Ben prepare for his future by widening the 15 percent bracket.

I would also point out in our legislation that we provide marriage tax relief for those who participate in the

earned income tax credit, ensuring that they also participate and receive marriage tax relief. We also protect those who use the child tax credit for the alternative minimum tax. So we help both itemizers as well as non-itemizers, poor working families, and protect those from the AMT.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we need to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. I want to thank my friends on the other side of the aisle, particularly the 48 who joined with us, and I invite more Democrats to join with us in our effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

I would point out that under the Democratic proposal, Michelle and Shad Hallihan would not receive any relief. If one itemizes their taxes, they would receive no relief under the Democratic proposal. If one is a homeowner and middle class and itemize your taxes, you receive no marriage tax relief under the Democratic proposal. Democrats say they do not want to help special interests, so I guess they say if you are middle class and you own a home and you itemize your taxes, you are stuck and you are still going to suffer the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. Speaker, we have a bipartisan proposal that helps those who itemize, primarily homeowners; we help those who do not itemize, we help those on earned income tax credit, and we help those who may suffer the alternative minimum tax. It is a good bipartisan proposal. I urge adoption of this rule, and I invite strong bipartisan support of our effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded that they are not to characterize actions in the other body.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to engage the gentlewoman from Ohio. When I make the remark on behalf of the minority that we would like to see Social Security and Medicare taken care of and the gentlewoman asked the rhetorical question, where have I been. We in the minority, we on the Democratic side do not really believe it is taken care of when the gentlewoman says that the Republican plan is to do something next year. I mean the Republicans have been in the majority now for half a dozen years, and they have not come close to sharing with us where we are going to go to pull the Tax Code up by the roots, to reform Social Security and privatize it, to reform the Medicare system.

So what I am saying is that our Republican colleagues are pretty good on supporting the ideas we come up with, but in terms of the record, if what they are saying is that they have taken care of Social Security, the rest of the country does not know it.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Once again, I do appreciate the instruction from my friend in the minority, but in the 6 short years that the Republicans have been in charge of this place, we have done more to shore up Social Security and Medicare and provide relief for seniors than in the 40 years preceding when the Democrats controlled the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), our distinguished colleague.

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and I support the bill.

America is supposed to be family oriented, family friendly. Who is kidding whom here today? America's tax policy penalizes achievement and penalizes marriage. America's tax policy promotes dependency and promotes promiscuity. America's tax policy actually subsidizes illegitimacy.

In addition to killing jobs, IRS commissioner after commissioner made the statement, and many Members have quoted it, the Tax Code is used as a behavior modification economic program, and I agree; behavior modification through and by a Tax Code of devious and manipulative machinations that should have no place in our country. If the founders wanted a Tax Code to modify behavior, they would have hired Sigmund Freud to write this thing.

Now, as far as what has been done in the last 6 years, there have been some significant reforms. The Republicans have included significant tax reforms, wage attachments have gone from 3.1 million in 1997 to 540,000 in 1999. Property liens have gone from 680,000 under the old plan to 160,000 under the new reformed plan. And listen to this, America: property seizures before the IRS reform bill passed here in this Congress through the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, property seizures in 1997 were 10,037; 10,037 Americans lost their homes, their farms. In 1999, after the reform, 161.

Now, how could we make the claim that nothing is happening? I think it is out of hand. The Tax Code is out of control. In fact, I think the IRS is so screwed up, they could not find their posterior from some hole in the ground.

Finally, we should throw the income Tax Code out and, yes, tear it up by its roots, with a simple final retail sales tax, with the proper exemptions to save, and those people on the bottom end of the ladder and those seniors.

□ 1130

Let me close by saying this, and why I support this bill. Congress should promote marriage. Congress should reward marriage. Congress should promote family. Congress should reward family. A Congress that overtaxes married couples does not reward nor promote family nor marriages.

I yield back the fact that we have in fact placed in the Tax Code mechanisms that seem to reward all that is wrong and penalize all that is right. I think the American people see it, the American people know it.

I am very comfortable voting for the rule. I will vote for this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think, yes, the Washington Post editorial said it all titled ''A Phony Issue.'' Again I will quote: ''Congressional Republicans have scheduled votes this week on a sizeable tax cut mainly for the better off, which they misleadingly describe as relief from a marriage penalty. The President has rightly indicated that he will veto the bill as it is likely to be presented to him.''

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, by the year 2008, the year that the Republican bill fully goes into effect, 47 percent of American families with two children would get no relief whatsoever. The tax will have a new name, but many of the people it is intended to help it will not help.

This is not a bill that really helps all the people and does not change the tax brackets for the very rich so they get an added bonus under the so-called marriage penalty tax. I urge Members to vote for the rule and vote for the Rangel substitute.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to urge my colleagues to support this rule, the customary rule provided for tax legislation. The House has already passed virtually identical legislation to eliminate this marriage tax penalty. All we are doing today is using the reconciliation process to speed this legislation to the President's desk so we can give him a second chance to sign it.

Mr. Speaker, our society values marriage as a fundamental institution that strengthens our moral fiber. Marriage teaches us about love, family, commitment, and honor. How can we promote these ideals if we continue to allow the government to impose an unfair, discriminatory, and immoral tax penalty on individuals solely because they are married?

Today we have another chance to send a strong message, which is the right message, to hard-working families by voting to end the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) who has been a champion of this legislation comes to the floor constantly with his charts of Shad and Michelle, and anybody who follows this legislation probably has come to know them as household names.

When he started, Shad and Michelle were just getting married. Now Shad

and Michelle have a son. Let us get this signed into law before Shad and Michelle are grandparents. I urge a yes vote on the rule and on the bill.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The Chair announces that he will reduce to 5 minutes votes by electronic device, if ordered, on two motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings de novo were postponed yesterday which will immediately follow the vote on House Resolution 545.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 16, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

YEAS—407

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—16

Conyers
Doggett
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gutierrez
Hilliard
Hinchey
Jackson (IL)
Kucinich
Miller, George
Oberstar
Obey
Pallone
Sabo
Udall (CO)
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—11

Ackerman
Campbell
Carson
Chenoweth-Hage
Forbes
McNulty
Owens
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Vento
Wynn

□ 1155

Ms. WOOLSEY changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. PAUL, REYES and DAVIS of Florida changed their vote from ''nay to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on two of the motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed on Tuesday, July 11, 2000 in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

S. 1892, de novo;

H.R. 4169, de novo.

H.R. 4447 will be voted on later today.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

VALLES CALDERA PRESERVATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 1892.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1892.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 377, noes 45, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

AYES—377

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin