

Against Women (CEDAW), introduced earlier today by Senator BOXER and 32 cosponsors, is at the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. ROBERTS. On behalf of the majority of the committee, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The resolution will go over under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. If there is a 5-minute limit on morning business speeches, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 9 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 2404 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Ms. LAUDRIEU, Mr. GRAMM, and Mr. CRAIG pertaining to the introduction of legislation are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business, with Members permitted to speak up to 10 minutes each, until the hour of 1:30 p.m. today, with time to be equally divided between the two leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 2323

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1:30 p.m. today the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 481, S. 2323, under the following limitations: 1 hour for debate on the bill, equally divided between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. I further ask consent that no amendments or motions be in order to the bill, and that following the use or yielding back of time, the bill be read a third time and, finally, the Senate then proceed to a vote on the passage of the bill, with no intervening action or debate, at a time to be determined by the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that though we have the previous unanimous consent agreement, I be able to speak for up to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, yesterday, as I listened to our Democrat colleagues talking about the marriage penalty elimination, and their opposition to our bill, I got interested in this debate and eager to speak on it.

I know we have not been able to work out an agreement yet to bring the bill to the floor. I know our Democrat colleagues have refused to agree to limiting it to amendments relevant to the marriage penalty. We all know the easiest way to kill something around here is to pile a bunch of extraneous amendments on it.

I am hopeful we can work out these differences and that we can have a vote on eliminating the marriage penalty. The American people have a right to know where Members of the Senate stand on this critically important issue.

The repeal of the marriage penalty was adopted in the House by an overwhelming vote. I believe it should be repealed. I am hopeful the President will sign the bill, even though to this point in time he says he will not. But rather than waiting around for some agreement to be made—that may never be made—I felt I had something to say that ought to be heard on this issue.

What I would like to talk about today is, first, to set this debate within the context of the President's budget and basically highlight the choice we are making between spending here in Washington, where we sit around these conference tables and make decisions to spend billions of dollars, and spending back home in the family, where the families sit around the kitchen table and try to decide how to spend hundreds of dollars or thousands of dollars for themselves.

I would like to talk about our repeal of the marriage penalty and why it is the right thing to do, why it is not just a tax issue, why it is a moral issue. This is a moral issue we are talking about.

I want to talk about the so-called marriage bonus that some of our colleagues have thrown up. I want to try to point out how it is one of the more phony issues that has ever been discussed.

I want to talk about President Clinton's alternative to our repeal of the marriage penalty.

Finally, I want to talk about the last form of bigotry that is still acceptable in America; that is, bigotry against the successful.

I would like to try to do all that in such a way as to deviate from my background as a schoolteacher and be brief.

First of all, let's outline the choices we have. The President has proposed in his budget that we spend \$388 billion over the next 5 years on new Government programs and expansions of programs.

This is brand new spending. This is \$388 billion the President's budget says we ought to spend above the level we are currently spending, and we ought to do it on a series of new programs and program expansions—about 80 new programs and program expansions.

We have proposed that we give the people of America \$150 billion of the taxes they have paid above the level we need to fund the Federal Government, and at the same time to save every penny of money that came from Social Security taxes for Social Security.

Many people who have followed this debate heard our Democrat colleagues spend all of yesterday saying, it is dangerous, it is irresponsible, it is reckless to let the American people keep \$150 billion of this non-Social Security surplus we have in the budget because the American economy is generating more revenues than we need to pay for the current Government.

The question I would ask, and that I would ask Americans as they are sitting in front of their television screens or as they are sitting around the kitchen table doing their budget, is: How come it is irresponsible for us to let working families spend \$150 billion more of their own money, but it is not irresponsible to let President Clinton and Vice President Gore and the Democrats spend \$388 billion of their money? How come it is irresponsible when families get a chance to keep more of what they earn, and yet it is not irresponsible to take more than twice that amount of money and spend it in Washington, DC?

Why repeal the marriage penalty? Gosh, most people are shocked when they discover that we have such a thing. Let me quickly point out, I do not think anybody ever set out with a goal of imposing a penalty on marriage.

When many of the provisions of the Tax Code were adopted, only 30 percent of adult women worked outside the home; now it is roughly 60 percent. The world has changed dramatically since much of the Tax Code was written.

As Abraham Lincoln recognized long ago: To expect people to live under old and outmoded laws is like expecting a man to be able to wear the same clothes he wore as a boy. It just does not work.

No matter who set out to do it, we have in today's Tax Code a provision of law that basically produces a situation where, if two people, both of whom work outside the home, meet and fall in love and get married, they end up