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 health 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!

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD.

Do Americans feel that it's right to tax a working couple more just because they live in holy matrimony?

Is it fair that the American tax code punishes marriage, our society's most basic institution?

WELLER-MCINTOSH II MARRIAGE TAX COMPROMISE

Weller-McIntosh II, H.R. 3734, the Marriage Tax Penalty Elimination Act presents a new, innovative marriage penalty elimination package which pulls together all the principle sponsors of various legislative proposals with legislation. Weller-McIntosh II will provide equal and significant relief to both single and dual earning married couples and can be implemented immediately.

The Marriage Tax Penalty Elimination Act will increase the tax brackets (currently at 15% for the first $24,650 for singles, whereas married couples filing jointly pay 15% 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% tax bracket to $49,300. Thus, married couples would enjoy an additional $8,100 in taxable income subject to the low 15% tax rate as opposed to the current 28% tax rate and would result in up to $1,215 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.

Weller and McIntosh's 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.

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 (Singles 2)
Taxable Income	23,950 (.15)	23,950 (.15)	49,200 (Partial .28)	47,900 (.15)
Tax Liability	3,592.5	3,592.5	8,563	7,185

Marriage Penalty: $1378; *Relief: $1378. Weller-McIntosh II Eliminates the Marriage Tax Penalty.*

The repeal of the Marriage tax was part of the Republican's 1994 ''Contract with America,'' but the legislation was vetoed by President Clinton.

GAMBLING IS DESTROYING OUR YOUNG PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I just read today in The New York Times on the front page an article entitled, ''Those Seductive Snake Eyes: Tales of Growing Up Gambling.''

The bad news is that gambling in this country is growing. The worst news is that the gambling addiction is growing fastest among young people. The article says,

> There is a growing concern among experts on compulsive gambling about the number of youths who, confronted with State lotteries, the growth of family-oriented casinos, and sometimes lax enforcement of wagering laws, gamble at an earlier and earlier age and gamble excessively.

The story quotes a recent Harvard Medical School study which was conducted by Dr. Howard Shaffer which found that the rate of problem gambling among adolescents is more than twice the rate for adults. Twice the rate of adults, and these people are going to soon be adults.

The article is shocking. It cites stories of young people who have hit the bottom at a very young age, and all because of gambling.

One young man got hooked on gambling as a teenager. The problem was so bad his parents had to put locks on all the rooms and closets in the house so he would not run out and sell the family's belongings to gamble. He has been to prison twice for credit card fraud and writing false checks. Later in the article he talks about how he first got interested in gambling. When he was growing up, he used to help his grandmother pick lottery numbers at a neighborhood store, and then he used to go gambling with her on trips to Atlantic City. He would wait for her outside the casinos peering into the windows wishing that he could play.

The New York Times piece said that at one high school in the northeast U.S., kids said they knew a fellow student who was a professional bookie who booked bets right there at the high school. Amazingly, that school set up a mock casino as part of its prom night festivities. The school principal said the students had no problems with the various games. They knew them all well and apparently needed no coaching.

This is a problem everywhere in America, all over this country. According to the article, an LSU University study conducted last year found that among Louisiana young people age 18 to 21, 1 in 7 were, and I quote, ''problem gamblers, some of them pathological, youths with a chronic and progressive psychological disorder characterized by an emotional dependence on gambling and loss of control over their gambling.''

Everyone in this country is worried about tobacco use among teenagers, and I am too, but we have another problem, Mr. Speaker, that all of us have to address, and that is the problem of gambling in this country.

I hope the country wakes up, although I believe the country is far ahead of the Congress and far ahead of the elected officials, because every time gambling is on a referendum, they vote it down. But I hope the governors wake up, all of them who are trying to ply gambling and raise money by lotteries, I hope they wake up.

Lastly, I hope this Congress wakes up. And I will tell my colleagues, nobody in this Congress who cares about people and talks about these problems ought to be taking any political activity money from the gambling interests, because if my colleagues will read this story in today's New York Times to see how this is ruining our young people, how then can one rationalize that one has taken money from the gambling interests?

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues, I plead with my colleagues, read today's New York Times and see what is happening to our young people.

DEFENDING THE INTEGRITY OF THE CENSUS BUREAU

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I applaud my colleague from the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), for his very important statement. He is absolutely correct.

Today I rise to defend the integrity of the Census Bureau. Repeatedly, in an argument over a fair and accurate census, the opponents of accuracy have suggested that they would support the use of modern technology if they could be assured that the process would not be manipulated for political purposes.

Perhaps Jim Hubbard, the representative of the American Legion said it best at last week's meeting of the Secretary's Census 2000 Advisory Committee. He said that the only way that the census numbers could be manipulated

would be if the professionals in the Census Bureau did it. He went on to say that he did not believe that that was possible.

Mr. Hubbard is absolutely right, and the opponents of an accurate census should be ashamed of themselves for attacking the Census Bureau like that. Never in the almost 100 years of the Census Bureau has there been a breach in the integrity of that organization.

Just after Pearl Harbor, the President of the United States asked the Census Bureau for a list of the names and addresses of Japanese living in America. The Census Bureau refused. During the 1970s, President Nixon did not like the fact that the rate of poverty was increasing during his administration, and put pressure on the Census Bureau to change the numbers. The Census Bureau refused.

The reputation of the Census Bureau is unassailable, and the opponents of an accurate census do themselves and the country a disservice to suggest otherwise.

Today, the Atlanta Journal tries to make this case once again. They admit that scientific methods will make the census more accurate. They acknowledge that if the count shows a population shift that favors one party or the other, it should stand. But then they claim that only the most optimistic could believe that the numbers would not be manipulated by the politicians.

□ 1300

On that, they are dead wrong. Anyone who has any knowledge of how a census works, and how the plans for 2000 work, know that the only ones who could manipulate the numbers are the professionals in the field or in the headquarters of the Census Bureau. There is not now, and there has never been, any evidence to suggest that those professionals would abandon their professional scientific judgment.

As my Members are all aware, I am sure, my colleagues and I have been destroying, sacrificing the American forests, my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and I have, in defense of our positions on the census. He is fond of circulating editorials attacking the census and I have sent out literally dozens in suppport of a fair and accurate census.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that today the gentleman resists the temptation to use the Atlanta Journal editorial for a partisan battle, but rather joins me in defense of the professionals at the Census Bureau. The Atlanta Journal suggests that only the ''blissful optimistic'' could believe that the census process is protected from political manipulation by the professionals at the Census Bureau. I hope that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) will join me in telling the Atlanta Journal that the professionals at the Census Bureau are our best hope of a census that is free of politics and as accurate as possible, regardless of how our battle turns out.

PRESIDENT SHOULD CANCEL TRIP TO CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us are committed, along with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) to a fair census. I am glad to hear that she did not mention the words ''census sampling,'' because of course we know that what that really means is guesstimating.

Many people who are talking about the census nowadays are the same ones who suggested that we have a thing called the ''Motor-Voter Bill'' in California, which as we found out was nothing more than the ''Illegal Alien Voter Registration Act.'' So we are all dedicated to an accurate census. That is why we want people specifically counted as they always have been in the past.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned that the sampling technique is guessing, yet the National Academy of Sciences has come out with a report that was ordered really by President Bush saying that it is the most scientific method, most accurate method to count Americans.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, it is called guesstimating.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, that is what the gentleman calls it. They call it ''accuracy.''

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we do not need some pointy-headed intellectual at some university, who may or may not be an ultra liberal receiving some kind of a grant for study, to tell me that it is more scientific to guesstimate who lives over there, rather than to walk over there and count each person individually as has been the case in every past census.

Mr. Speaker, every time we change these rules and allow these standards what we end up with is the average American gets hurt. And what we did with motor-voter is we permitted massive numbers of illegal aliens to vote and degrade the voting of the American population.

Mr. Speaker, back to the issue of the day, however. Yesterday, human rights activists came to the United States Capitol and I was privileged to join them in underscoring the support for the people of Tibet, especially in light of the President's upcoming visit to Communist China.

Mr. Speaker, many concerns were raised yesterday, and today we finally got the answer to those concerns of yesterday. In a letter published in today's Washington Post, the Communist Chinese Ambassador to the United States claims all the uproar about Tibet is simply based on misunderstandings, misunderstandings of the facts. And he gave us a couple of misconceptions here in his letter to the Washington Post today. This is the Communist Chinese Ambassador.

Misconception number one is that China actually occupies Tibet. That this was a region that was liberated peacefully through an agreement reached between the Central Government and the local government in 1951. Those are his words.

Misconception number two, that there are a great number of Han Chinese who have immigrated to Tibet. He claims some professionals from the coastal areas do go to Tibet to offer expertise to develop the local economy, but after completing their tenure most return home.

And finally there is a misconception that the Tibetan culture and religion are being destroyed. When we have this type of honest dialogue, or the level of honesty in this dialogue, it makes us wonder why our President of the United States is going there to represent the people of the United States to try to give us hope that there is any type of an agreement with gangsters who make a mockery of the truth like that.

In fact, what we have got today in Communist China with the President's upcoming visit, here he has chosen the 10th anniversary of the massacre of the democracy movement in Tiananmen Square to go visit these gangsters, even though the human rights record has not improved, even though the belligerence of Communist China is in evidence in its smuggling of technologies of mass destruction to volatile parts of the world, even Libya and Iran.

Today in the Capital City's other newspaper, the Washington Times, there is a headline story about the Communist Chinese sending weapons of mass destruction technology to Libya and Iran, these terrorist states. Mr. Speaker, I quote this article, ''Libyan leader Moammar Gadhafi has said that he would like to have a missile system capable of attacking New York.''

Mr. Speaker, this is not the time to enter into a discussion with these type of gangsters who control the government in China. I would suggest, especially when we have evidence that American companies have been using American technology to upgrade Communist Chinese missiles, that this is bad enough, and now we hear that they are using American technology that could be shifted to terrorists like Gadhafi in Libya who would be even more likely to use this technology to kill millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the President is not watching out for the best interests of our country and he should cancel his trip to China.