

income of \$61,000 pushes them into a higher tax bracket of 28 percent, producing a tax penalty of \$1,400 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. Everyday we got closer to April 15th more married couples will be 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 years 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 Elimination Act.

It would allow married couples a choice in filing their income taxes, either jointly or as individuals—which ever way lets them keep more of their own money.

Our bill already has the bipartisan cosponsorship of 232 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 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 Gentleman, 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!

WHICH IS BETTER?

The President's Proposal to expand the child care tax credit will pay for only 2 to 3 weeks of child care. The *Weller-McIntosh Marriage Tax Elimination Act HR 2456*, will allow married couples to pay for 3 months of child care.

Which Is Better, 3 Weeks Or 3 Months?

CHILD CARE OPTIONS UNDER THE MARRIAGE TAX ELIMINATION ACT

	Average tax relief	Average weekly day care cost	Weeks day care
Marriage Tax Elimination Act	\$1,400	\$127	11

CHILD CARE OPTIONS UNDER THE MARRIAGE TAX ELIMINATION ACT—Continued

	Average tax relief	Average weekly day care cost	Weeks day care
President's child care tax credit	358	127	2.8

□ 1330

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

TRAGEDY IN SARASOTA, FLORIDA

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I rise today to describe to my colleagues a tragedy which occurred in my congressional district of Florida. On the afternoon of November 7, 1997, in Sarasota, Florida, a 13-year-old girl returned home to discover the body of her mother, Sheila Bellush, on the kitchen floor. Bellush, a mother of six, including 2-year old quadruplets, had been brutally murdered. Her throat was slashed and she was shot in the head. When her body was found, her quadruplets were crawling next to her in her blood.

The trail of evidence immediately led to Jose Luis Del Toro, a United States citizen born and raised in Texas. Del Toro fled to Mexico where he was captured on November 20th.

I would like to share with Members, Mr. Speaker, an excerpt from a message sent to me by my constituents Paul and Anita Marshall: Both my wife Anita and I are constituents of yours residing in North Port, Florida. We are also full-time law enforcement officers. Recently I responded to the Bellush murder scene and had a firsthand account of this brutal crime. Having been in law enforcement for 19 years, this was the most brutal of crimes I have ever seen."

Now, Del Toro has been captured. This should have been an open-and-shut case. Del Toro should have been quickly deported for illegal entry and quickly returned to Florida to stand trial for murder. However, when Mexican officials learned of the charges against Del Toro, they refused to simply deport him and instead started lengthy extradition procedures and de-

clared Del Toro would not be returned unless the United States waived the death penalty.

The Sarasota community I represent was outraged, and rightfully so. This move by Mexico is an obstruction of the United States judicial process. It is a violation of U.S. sovereignty, and it is an abomination that we allow this to happen.

This was a United States citizen who was accused of committing a heinous crime against another United States citizen on United States soil, and Mexico apparently feels that it can step right in and prevent this murderer from being brought to justice. I am offended by the arrogance of any Nation that seeks to dictate to the United States what United States judicial policy should be.

Mr. and Mrs. Marshall, my constituents from North Port, continued on in their correspondence: "How can Mexico dictate what judicial action should be taken in our country, especially after all the financial aid and other assistance we have given Mexico over the years?"

I would like to ask the same question. The answer is amazing. The United States actually grants Mexico the right to interfere with our judicial system in this manner. The U.S.-Mexico Extradition Treaty of 1978 allows Mexico the right to deny extradition if the individual in question may be subject to the death penalty upon return.

I believe this is a dangerous policy with a bordering country where murderers can drive across the border within hours of committing a crime. This is why I am introducing a resolution calling for the administration to renegotiate our extradition treaty with Mexico. I ask my colleagues to join with me and support this resolution.

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

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

IMMORALITY AND HIGH CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam Speaker, many constituents have called on me to condemn President Clinton or to condemn former Judge Kenneth Starr. Many are convinced that the President has not been honest in his disavowals of indecent behavior, and it is time for others in public life to demand a fuller explanation from him. Many others are convinced that the recent allegations about the President are irrelevant to his performance in office or his right to stay in office and should be dropped.

It is wrong for the President of the United States to have sexual relations

with a White House intern. It is wrong even if she consented. It is wrong because the President is married. It is wrong because the concept of consent is strained between persons of such differing persons of power. It is wrong because sex outside of marriage is wrong. It is wrong to lie about all of these matters. It is wrong to ask, induce or threaten others to lie about them as well.

Not everything that is wrong is illegal. Not everything that is illegal should be grounds for impeachment. For example, taking God's name in vain is wrong. A law to punish it, however, would violate the first amendment, and it is inconceivable that we would impeach a President for blasphemy, no matter how flagrant.

In addition, our country has rules to protect all of us, and we are all better off for those rules' existence. Foremost among these rules is that we demand proof of wrongdoing. Not simply in criminal wrong, but also in our daily judgments of each other, it is wise and good to require proof rather than to operate on a presumption of guilt, fueled by rumor.

President Clinton has asserted his innocence to every allegation listed above. There may be reason to doubt his denials, devoid as they are of any explanation for the questionable conduct. But there is also a process to follow to ensure that no one's reputation, let alone a President's tenure in office, be jeopardized lightly.

To defend his character, however, President Clinton does owe all of us a complete explanation. It is simply not true that rules of court prohibit him from comment. They do not. It is his choice alone that keeps him from comment.

It still is quite a further matter, however, to find in all of this evidence of a crime or of an impeachable offense. Herein lies the confusion. Former Judge Kenneth Starr appears to be investigating the lurid using means we usually reserve for investigating organized crime suspects. What he is attempting, I suspect, is to develop a case of the President inducing witnesses like Webb Hubbell to lie or be uncooperative in the Whitewater matter, and by showing the President to be doing so in the Paula Jones matter, he hopes to have a more convincing case. But more convincing to whom?

Judge Starr has announced he will not be seeking to indict the President criminally, pledging instead to turn over whatever evidence of impeachable evidence of impeachable offenses he may find to the House Committee on the Judiciary. That committee, however, can carry on its own investigation. It exists constitutionally apart from any special counsel. It predates the special counsel by almost 200 years.

Insofar as the President's own behavior is at issue, therefore, it is time to move from Judge Starr's forum to the House Committee on the Judiciary,

after a reasonable but short time to allow Judge Starr to do so in an orderly fashion. All matters presently pending before other committees of Congress relating to grounds of impeachment of President Clinton should also be consolidated before the House Committee on the Judiciary. These other committees and Judge Starr himself may continue investigations into the potential wrongdoing of others. Indeed, Judge Starr has already won 13 convictions or guilty pleas.

I fully expect to follow the work of the Committee on the Judiciary with great care and, if the evidence warrants it, to vote to impeach President Clinton. I would be prepared to do so on the merits, whether the economy is doing well or doing poorly. I urge this action in the alternative hope that if the President is deserving of impeachment, the process might start sufficiently soon to allow for the speedy removal of office of one unworthy of it, or in the alternative, if the President is not deserving of impeachment, that the President be freed from the strains attendant upon the several continuing investigations.

As to the President's personal reputation, I am very sad. If he continues to refuse to volunteer a more credible defense than his simple denial, then he risks becoming an object of ridicule, trivializing himself and much that he seeks to accomplish in his remaining years in office. He has already lost much credibility, and that is not because of any actions of Judge Starr. He has lost credibility because he has minced words time after time in denying what is accused while refusing to say what did happen.

It may turn out that the President did act immorally on many occasions and seemingly without remorse. And yes, this does matter to his official functions. Lying comes easier with practice. Viewing a subordinate employee as an object for one's own gratifications dehumanizes both persons. But the authority of private judgment, the sense of regret of our country might remain as the public matter goes to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Member must avoid personal references to the President of the United States in debate.

#### TRIBUTE TO WAYNE FOWLER

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend and now former employee of this great institution, Wayne Fowler. We all have two families when we come here, one back home and the one we make here. I am proud to include Wayne in my family here in this House.

It makes it all the easier that we coincidentally share the same last name.

When I first met Wayne, we became fast friends. We had so much in common besides the Fowler name. Wayne is a native of the State that I now represent. We both attended college in Georgia and found our way to careers on Capitol Hill. While I was serving as a legislative assistant to Georgia Congressman Robert Stephens in the late 1960s, Wayne was serving as an LA to Florida Congressman Don Fuqua. Prior to that Wayne worked for Congressman Charlie Bennett, the Member whom I succeeded in 1992.

Wayne and I both left the Hill for a while, only to be drawn back by our mutual interest in public service. Wayne served this House for 32 years, 22 of these right here at this rostrum in the House. As he begins his much deserved retirement, I want to wish him well and thank him on behalf of a grateful Congress. He is already missed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### IN CELEBRATION OF WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to acknowledge my colleague who spoke earlier on this whole issue of Ken Starr and the President. I thank him for his balance.

Let me say that I associate myself with the sense of his remarks that none of us should be acting precipitously. As a Member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I have repeatedly stated that this is a time for facts, measured efforts, full investigations and the cessation of accusations. I hope my colleague on the other side of the aisle would likewise join me in these comments, for, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, it seems even to me that calls for impeachment and impeachment proceedings may themselves be precipitous.

I rose today to celebrate a very important occasion this month as we begin to celebrate women's history month. That is my pride in the announcement today by the President of the United States along with Ms. Hillary Rodham Clinton and Dan Goldin, NASA Administrator, of the selection of Colonel Eileen Collins to be the first commander of the space shuttle and NASA where she is located in Johnson Space Center in Houston, Texas. As a Congresswoman from Houston and a