

| | | |
|---------------|--------------|-------------|
| 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.