

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 29, 2001

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Willie T. Lockett, St. Martha Missionary Baptist Church, Oak Hill, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Eternal all wise God, Thou who art from everlasting until everlasting. It is again that we come into Thy presence. We come with grateful hearts and we come thanking You first for the privilege of coming to You and You hearing our prayer. We thank You for this day. We thank You for this session and for this place in our Nation's capital where we are assembled.

We thank You for these legislators and pray that You will touch their hearts and minds so that they will be mindful of the needs of our Nation; and that, while You control their thoughts, You will give them the courage that they might play the game of life with boldness, fairness, and integrity.

Help them to stand firmly on their belief if it is within Thy sight and in Thy will. Help them to keep this Nation one that others will continue to look to for guidance and direction. Help them to propose the kind of legislation that will increase the quality of education for our children. Help them to pass the laws that will set a new standard in housing, employment, and health care.

Then, God, teach us to love one another as You have commanded us to do.

This we ask in Your name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. McNULTY. 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. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. McNULTY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 1 minute. All other one minutes will be at the end of the day.

INTRODUCING THE REVEREND WILLIE T. LOCKETT

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to have one of my constituents, the Reverend Willie Lockett, helping us this morning by offering today's morning prayer.

The Reverend Lockett holds degrees from the University of Illinois, Atlanta University, Morehouse College, and the Interdenominational Theological Center.

In addition to being a learned minister, he is truly a man of all seasons. He has been a teacher, a salesman, a civil servant, and most importantly a pastor.

He is a leader in our community in helping organizations like the United Negro College Fund, the NAACP, the American Heart Association, South Brevard Sharing Center, and South Brevard Habitat for Humanity. He also has a long history of working with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and Dr. King from 1955 through 1975.

His ministry over 36 years is a testament to the power of faith and commitment to one's God and community.

I thank the Reverend for his service to us today and for over three decades of service to our community and to our Nation.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6, MARRIAGE PENALTY AND FAMILY TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2001

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 104

and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 104

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. 6) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the marriage penalty by providing for adjustments to the standard deduction, 15-percent rate bracket, and earned income credit and to allow the nonrefundable personal credits against regular and minimum tax liability. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Rangel of New York 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. BONILLA). The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST); 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.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MS. PRYCE OF OHIO

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, now printed in the bill and proposed to be considered as adopted in the pending resolution, be modified by the amendment that I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: Page 11, after line 8, insert the following:

“(3) LIMITATION BASED ON AMOUNT OF TAX.—The credit allowed under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed the excess of—

“(A) the sum of the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) plus the tax imposed by section 55, over

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

“(B) the sum of the credits allowable under this subparagraph (other than this section) and section 27 for the taxable year.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the modification offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means requested, House Resolution 104 is an appropriate and fair rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 6, the Marriage Tax Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act of 2001.

This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

After general debate, it will be in order to consider a substitute amendment offered by the minority which is printed in the Committee on Rules report and will be debatable for 1 hour. Finally, the rule permits the minority to offer a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill as well as the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. Speaker, as taxpayers all across America are completing the dreaded annual ritual of filling out tax forms and writing checks to the government, thousands of newlywed couples across the Nation have had a rude awakening.

By simply saying those magic words “I do,” newlyweds across our great Nation may be surprised and probably outraged to find that their tax bill has increased by hundreds and maybe thousands of dollars.

Hopefully, these couples have not cashed and spent the wedding checks they received from Grandpa Joe and Aunt Lucy, because they still have to pay Uncle Sam.

We should not really be surprised. After all, there is not much that the government does not tax. But it is hard to find a good reason to tax marriage and penalize the most fundamental institution in our society.

Still, each year, 42 million working Americans pay higher taxes, not because their incomes have gone up, but simply because they are married. This is fundamentally unfair and discriminatory.

Mr. Speaker, most families find that, to make ends meet, both spouses have to work. Under our current Tax Code, working couples are pushed into a higher tax bracket because the income of the second wage earner, often the wife, is taxed at 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 and living alone or single and living together.

Mr. Speaker, if one is paying taxes today, one is paying too much; and if one is married, one is unfairly singled

out to pay even more. It is simply wrong and irresponsible to increase taxes on married couples, especially when marriage is often a precursor to added financial responsibility such as owning a home or having children.

The Marriage Tax Penalty and Family Tax 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.

But H.R. 6 does not just help out newlyweds. It also helps out our Nation's families as well by doubling the child tax credit from \$500 to \$1,000.

H.R. 6 provides relief to all couples suffering from the marriage penalty tax, which means lower taxes for almost 59,000 couples in my district alone.

Mr. Speaker, since earning the majority, Republicans have kept our promises and reached our goals of balancing the budget, paying down the debt, and protecting Social Security and Medicare; and there is no turning back.

The fact is the government is currently taking in more money than it needs to operate. That is the very definition of a budget surplus. The surplus is big enough that we can give some of it back to the people who earned it because, if one is paying taxes today, one is just paying too much.

What better place to start than by correcting the inequity in the Tax Code that affects 25 million married couples.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to either defend the marriage penalty or to eliminate it altogether. There should be no more excuses.

I urge all my colleagues to support this fair and appropriate rule so that we can once again pass the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Act and send it to the President who this time is waiting to sign it. It is long overdue.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, Democrats support tax relief for American families. Let me say that again so that everyone understands. Democrats want fair and meaningful tax relief for working American families.

But, Mr. Speaker, Democrats want tax relief in the context of a real budget with real numbers. The budget passed by the House yesterday is, quite frankly, bogus. It is bogus because it uses phony numbers and faulty assumptions. It is bogus because it has been written to be rewritten.

The Republican majority has used winks and wishes instead of the real numbers that would give the American public the real picture of what is really going on with the Federal budget.

Here is the bottom line: Democrats do not want to go down the same path we found ourselves on 20 years ago after the last big tax cut endorsed by a Republican President.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues have, for the past few months, waxed ever so eloquently that the surpluses now flowing into the Federal Treasury are merely signs that Americans are overtaxed. They say the money which is forecast to come rolling into the Treasury over the next 10 years belongs to taxpayers and should be returned to them.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats do not disagree that American families need tax relief, but we need to put that tax relief into context. The country ran up a \$5 trillion debt because of the tax cut we passed in 1981.

The real story is that the national debt belongs to every man, woman, and child in this country. The real story is that those projected surpluses are just that, projections. We have no idea if they will ever materialize. Frankly, it seems more than a little foolhardy to base our economic security and prosperity on wishes and winks.

We passed a bankruptcy reform bill a few weeks ago that says American consumers have to own up to their debts and cannot just erase them so they can go out and spend more money they do not have. Well, it seems to me that we need a little of that reform in this Chamber.

Congress has spent the past 15 years struggling to get deficits under control; and now, finally, we are on the road to paying back those huge debts.

Those are the same debts that have forced the Congress to ignore pressing national needs like infrastructure development and replacing or modernizing sewer systems, roads and highways, and our Nation's airports.

We have been forced to put off modernizing our military, ensuring that every child has access to a good education, providing a real prescription drug benefit for our seniors, and shoring up Social Security and Medicare to prepare for the retirement of the baby boom generation.

But now the Republicans want to ignore our debt and ignore our national needs just so they can give us another tax cut like the one they gave us 20 years ago.

Yesterday, any number of times, Members on the other side of the aisle said their constituents want their money back. But, Mr. Speaker, we as a country have an obligation to pay off the debts we incurred because of a tax cut we enacted 20 years ago.

The Reagan tax cuts were supposed to give Americans their money back. But look what those tax cuts got us. They got us high unemployment, high interest rates, and an economy that only began to recover when the Congress drastically cut spending on national priorities and raised taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the tax cuts of 20 years ago were nothing more than a game of three-card monte, and the tax cuts the Republican majority is rolling through the Congress in 2001 are just another version of the same scam.

□ 1015

As I have said before, if it looks to good to be true, it probably is. And these promises are just that: too good to be true.

The Republican majority is incapable of seeing the truth in the budget numbers. Instead, they come out onto the floor day after day to say that Democrats only want to perpetuate big government, to make it grow, and fritter away the hard-earned money of American taxpayers. Where do they get this? This is not about big government, this is about responsible government. This is not about keeping anyone's money, this is about paying off the debt and investing for the future.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats want tax relief, and we want tax relief in the context of fairness and in the context of real numbers. We want to provide real relief from the unfair marriage penalty for those couples who pay more taxes just because they are married, but we do not want to provide relief for those who already get a marriage bonus under the code, as the Republicans would do. We want to increase the child care tax credit and make sure that increase is meaningful for those families who need it most.

If the Republican majority is so dedicated to returning money to the taxpayers, why is it most of the marriage penalty relief in their bill does not become available until the year 2004? Why is it their bill will not be fully effective until the year 2009? And why, Mr. Speaker, is it that the Republican bill does not make the child tax credit, something that would really help families, fully effective until 2006? One might think taxpayers, after hearing all this big talk in Washington about giving them back their money, might say, "Show me the money." But for most American families there will not be any money to show.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to take off the blinders and deal straight with the taxpayers. Families who put off facing harsh realities often find themselves in serious financial consequences. The same holds true for the Congress. We need to face up to the fact that we cannot afford a \$2.4 trillion tax cut that benefits primarily the wealthiest of Americans while simultaneously trying to save Social Security and Medicare, making sure every child gets a good education, modernizing our military forces, facing the crises in foreign countries, and giving seniors a real prescription drug benefit. We should not pretend, Mr. Speaker. That is not what we were elected to do.

Mr. Speaker, I support providing relief to married couples who are penal-

ized in the Tax Code simply because they are married. I support increasing a child tax credit and ensuring that it is available for lower-income working families. Undoubtedly many will vote for this bill today because they, too, support these changes in the Tax Code. But we continue to hope our Republican brethren will wake up and smell the coffee. They cannot have their cake and eat it, too.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the authorizing committee, I just want to take this time to thank my colleagues in the minority, the minority leader, the Committee on Rules, and the members on the committee, for acceding to the unanimous consent request for that minor change in the legislation, because what it does do is draw to everyone's attention the fact that we have a number of professionals around here who labor long and hard, and they are almost always perfect.

Their work consists of something like this: on page 4, first paragraph B of section 1(f)6 of such code is amended by striking "other than with, and all that follows," through "shall be applied," and inserting "other than with respect to section 63(c)4 and 151(d)4(a) shall be applied."

And, Mr. Speaker, it all has to fit, and it all has to fit for hundreds of pages. They do it every time we bring a bill to the floor, with this exception. And I know they are chagrined, but I do want to thank everyone, because there are a number of professionals that allow us to appear on the floor and argue important issues such as this, but that the hard labor of making it fit is done by a number of professionals that we owe an ongoing debt of gratitude. And the fact they made a mistake, which really chagrins them, allows me to thank them for all those thousands of pages of no mistakes.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

I am flabbergasted I am getting 4 minutes on this. There should be a line of people stretching all the way down the steps asking the gentleman from Texas for 30 seconds or less so that every one of us can stand up here and say, please, let us not take another step in the direction of plunging off the cliff, in the direction of huge deficits, in the direction of invading Social Security and the Medicare Trust Funds in order to pass a series of tax cuts that we cannot afford.

I support ending the marriage penalty. Someday I might support even

greater efforts than those encompassed in the Democratic alternative. But there are three important points I need to make about this bill. The first is that over half of married couples do not pay a marriage penalty, they get a marriage bonus. Those who are insulting or degrading marriage by telling people that they will pay more taxes if they say "I do" should realize that, in fact, most who say "I do" are paying less.

The second point I would make is that we do not have a budget resolution. We have one passed by the House, but not by the Senate. We ought to be making major tax decisions only after we see what Congress as a whole has adopted and what kind of tax relief we can afford.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this tax bill that comes before us today is part of an overall plan of excessive tax cuts, tax cuts aimed at those with the greatest means. Forty-three percent of the benefits go to the top 1 percent with an average income of \$900,000. This wave of tax-cutting has been the most significant event leading to the economic downturn or anemia that we have suffered since even before the President came into office and began talking down the economy in order to justify things.

Second, this program provides no economic stimulus in an effort to get us out of this malaise. Seventy-nine percent of the benefits do not arrive until more than 5 years from now. That means that the bond market and the stock market are depressed because we have locked into law economic policies that are going to hurt this country, that are going to drive deficits and inflation; but at the same time, consumers will not have any more money in their pocket.

Finally, I have to oppose this package of tax bills because of the millions of people it leaves out. The President of the United States stood up there and gave us an example of a waitress without a spouse, with two kids, and said that that was the reason to adopt his tax plan, to help that waitress supporting two kids and making \$25,000. It appears as if the President's staff went through all of the restaurants and found one waitress that would benefit, because if that waitress was making \$23,000 with two kids, she gets nothing under the President's plan. If that waitress had three kids, she gets nothing under the President's plan. And if that waitress is currently exactly as the President describes her, but she has some costs for child care, she gets nothing. Not even a one-cent insult tip is left on the table by the Republican series of tax bills for the very waitresses that the President of the United States asked us to think about.

It is one thing to injure America's working poor and those who are struggling to get by by having a huge tax

plan that will ruin the economy and not give them a penny, but it is another thing to insult them and say that they do not pay taxes when, in fact, every waitress is paying FICA taxes and not getting any tax relief. Taxpayers deserve tax relief, and under this plan they get nothing.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), my friend, the chief deputy whip.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to speak on this proposal. I would point out that the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) suggested that the President was somehow responsible for the flattening out of the economy in the last 6 months of last year. I think 60 days into a Presidency is a little quick to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to speak in favor of this rule. We have passed marriage penalty relief in the House before, and it has been passed in the Senate before, and it has come out of conference before, and it has gone to the White House before. The difference is this relief will be signed into law if we do our job well here now and in the next few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, we have a budget in the House. We will not vote on the final tax package until the Senate approves its budget next week, and this will be part of it. Government has traditionally taxed what it wanted to discourage, and subsidized what it wanted to encourage. For too long in America we have been subsidizing the wrong things and taxing the wrong things. We have been discouraging things we should have been encouraging, and encouraging things we should have been discouraging.

This change in the Tax Code once again puts a premium on marriage and families as a foundation of our society. I hope there is still a bonus left for marriage in the Tax Code, and believe there will be when we pass this bill, because families and marriage is something that should be honored. If we subsidize families, that is a good thing and not a bad thing. If we help with things like the child tax credit, where we are moving today to double the tax credit on income tax returns, that has a positive impact on American families.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the rule. I strongly support the bill. It will pass the House, I predict, handily today, and this time it will be signed into law by the President of the United States.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and the work the Committee on Rules has done to structure the debate. In many ways

the Federal Tax Code is illogical, immoral and unfair. This is the case with the marriage penalty, most certainly. Currently the Tax Code is structured so a married couple pays higher taxes on their income than an unmarried couple earning the same income and filing separate returns.

Mr. Speaker, under this Tax Code many couples are punished for being married, including many in my congressional district in Indiana. Cameron Gardner and his wife Lindsey are an example of over 38,000 Hoosier families in my district who suffer under the marriage penalty. Cameron works for a local company in Anderson, and Lindsey is a student at Ball State University. They have a 1-year-old daughter. Eliminating the marriage penalty would allow Cameron and Lindsey to keep about \$1,400 more a year to help pay bills and take care of their daughter. It does not include the benefits that would accrue from the President's increased child tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, families should be encouraged today. I stand in strong support of this rule. I stand in strong support of this bill. It is time to end the illogical, immoral and unfair marriage penalty; and I believe in my heart Congress will do so today.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as someone who campaigned on the platform of providing tax relief to working families in central Florida, I am especially proud today to be an original cosponsor of this important legislation to fully eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Why do I support this legislation? Because it will make a meaningful difference in the lives of approximately 60,000 working families in central Florida, who will receive an average tax break of \$1,400 per year. \$1,400 per year will have a positive impact on the lives of working families back home.

□ 1030

For example, a married couple with two children, a \$1,400 tax savings translates into \$117 worth of groceries in the refrigerator every month that otherwise would not be there.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation today and vote yes on H.R. 6 when it comes to the floor in a little while. This is the type of legislation that we came to Congress for.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the power to tax is

the power to destroy. When one considers this fact, it is a travesty that married couples are taxed at a higher rate than the rest of society. We can all agree that marriage is a sacred institution. What message are we sending to young couples as they get married? Because of an unfair Tax Code, when a bride and groom walk down the aisle they lose money with each step they take.

Nearly 62,000 families in my district are adversely affected by the marriage tax penalty. I have spoken to many of them on this subject and they agree that it is wrong. They are right; it is wrong. Today I want to be able to tell them we are doing something about this. It is time to put common sense back into our Tax Code.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to end the marriage tax penalty because saying "I do" should not mean that one is saying I do to an additional \$1,400.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. RILEY).

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to allow married couples to keep more of their money. The breakdown of the family has had a devastating effect on our society. Instead of having families stay together, our current Tax Code is forcing families apart.

H.R. 6 is legislation that will lighten the tax burden once and for all on all married couples. It is time to shore up family life by allowing husbands and wives to keep more of what they earn. H.R. 6 will do just that.

The marriage penalty not only punishes our most sacred institution, marriage, but it also indirectly hurts women. When the marriage penalty first appeared in the Tax Code in 1969, most families had one breadwinner and the tax provision was actually designed to give a tax cut, a so-called marriage bonus, to all of our one-income families. The tax policy failed to envision the growing number of women that would eventually go into the workforce. Today, in nearly 75 percent of all families, both the husband and wife work outside the home. When two working spouses combine their income, the wages of the secondary earner are usually taxed at a higher marginal rate.

Since it is often the wife who is the secondary earner in the family, the marriage penalty, in my view, creates an extremely unfair bias against them. The beauty of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is that we do not penalize those families who choose to have one spouse stay at home with their families. H.R. 6 eliminates the homemaker penalty for families in which one

spouse decides to work part time or not at all. In other words, Mr. Speaker, this legislation benefits all married couples.

In my district, there will be 60,392 married couples who will benefit from this legislation. In the State of Alabama, 424,956 married couples will benefit from this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule. It is a good rule. It is high time we have done this. We have done it before. It is time to go ahead and get it signed into law.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. KERNS).

Mr. KERNS. Mr. Speaker, today the United States Congress will vote on sweeping legislation that will help preserve families and fairness in our Tax Code. This legislation will reverse a system that is currently penalizing millions of men and women simply because they have chosen to marry.

This marriage tax penalty affects persons of all races, ages, and incomes. I am fortunate to represent Indiana's Seventh Congressional District. The seventh district encompasses most of west central Indiana and is the very essence of middle America. Our residents are hard-working men and women who instill in their children the values that their parents instilled in them.

These Hoosier values include honoring the family. A recent study found that nearly 60,000 married couples in Indiana's seventh district pay a marriage penalty. Through this penalty we are telling families that it would be better for the mother and father not to be married.

Our government, in effect, is giving incentives for a split in the family. This is wrong. With taxes now at their highest in this Nation's peacetime history and many families paying more in taxes than they spend on basic essentials such as food clothing and housing, it is imperative that we allow families to keep more of their hard-earned dollars and to save and spend as they choose.

This bipartisan legislation will provide \$220 billion in marriage tax penalty relief. By working with the executive branch, we have enhanced the President's proposal and will, in fact, provide twice as much in marriage tax penalty relief.

The freshman class of the 107th Congress has been very instrumental in working to make today's vote possible. All these Members represent different regions of the United States and we have come together in agreement and a change that must occur.

The marriage tax issue is not a Republican issue; it is not a Democrat issue. This is about families and fairness. I am proud to join my colleagues here today and the others who make up

the 230 cosponsors of this legislation in correcting the marriage tax penalty. I am confident today that we will make good on our promise to American families.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say in closing that the time has come once and for all to eliminate this tax on marriage. If one is paying taxes today, they are paying too much. And just because they are married, they should not have to pay more. I urge my colleagues to support this rule, pass the marriage tax penalty and Family Relief Tax Act so we can send it to the President, who is waiting to sign it. This legislation is long overdue.

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. BONILLA). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. FROST. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which an electronic vote, if ordered, will be taken on the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 171, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—249

Aderholt	Buyer	Doolittle
Akin	Callahan	Dreier
Army	Calvert	Duncan
Bachus	Camp	Dunn
Baker	Cannon	Ehlers
Ballenger	Cantor	Ehrlich
Barcia	Capito	Emerson
Barr	Castle	English
Bartlett	Chabot	Eshoo
Barton	Chambliss	Ferguson
Bass	Coble	Flake
Bereuter	Collins	Fletcher
Berkley	Combest	Foley
Berry	Cooksey	Ford
Biggart	Cox	Fossella
Bilirakis	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Bishop	Crane	Frost
Blagojevich	Crenshaw	Galleghy
Blunt	Cubin	Ganske
Boehert	Culberson	Gekas
Boehner	Cunningham	Gibbons
Bonilla	Davis (CA)	Gilchrist
Bono	Davis, Jo Ann	Gillmor
Boswell	Davis, Tom	Gilman
Brady (TX)	Deal	Gonzalez
Brown (SC)	DeLay	Goode
Bryant	DeMint	Goodlatte
Burr	Diaz-Balart	Goss
Burton	Dooley	Graham

Granger	McCrery	Saxton
Graves	McHugh	Scarborough
Green (WI)	McInnis	Schaffer
Greenwood	McKeon	Schiff
Grucci	McKinney	Schrock
Gutknecht	Mica	Sensenbrenner
Hall (OH)	Miller (FL)	Sessions
Hansen	Miller, Gary	Shadegg
Hart	Moore	Shaw
Hastings (WA)	Moran (KS)	Shays
Hayes	Morella	Sherwood
Hayworth	Myrick	Shimkus
Hefley	Nethercutt	Shows
Herger	Ney	Simmons
Hilleary	Northup	Simpson
Hinojosa	Norwood	Skeen
Hobson	Nussle	Smith (MI)
Hoekstra	Ortiz	Smith (NJ)
Holt	Osborne	Smith (TX)
Horn	Ose	Smith (WA)
Hostettler	Otter	Snyder
Houghton	Oxley	Souder
Hulshof	Pascrell	Spence
Hunter	Paul	Stearns
Hutchinson	Pence	Stump
Hyde	Peterson (PA)	Sununu
Isakson	Petri	Sweeney
Issa	Pickering	Tancredo
Istook	Pitts	Tauzin
Jenkins	Platts	Taylor (NC)
Johnson (IL)	Pombo	Terry
Johnson, Sam	Portman	Thomas
Jones (NC)	Pryce (OH)	Thornberry
Keller	Putnam	Thune
Kelly	Quinn	Tiahrt
Kennedy (MN)	Radanovich	Tiberi
Kerns	Ramstad	Toomey
King (NY)	Rangel	Traficant
Kingston	Regula	Turner
Kirk	Rehberg	Upton
Knollenberg	Reyes	Vitter
Kolbe	Riley	Walden
LaHood	Rodriguez	Walsh
Largent	Roemer	Wamp
Latham	Rogers (KY)	Watkins
LaTourette	Rogers (MI)	Watts (OK)
Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher	Weldon (FL)
Lewis (KY)	Ross	Weldon (PA)
Linder	Roukema	Weller
LoBiondo	Roybal-Allard	Whitfield
Lucas (KY)	Royce	Wicker
Lucas (OK)	Ryan (WI)	Wilson
Manzullo	Ryun (KS)	Wolf
McCarthy (NY)	Sandlin	Young (FL)

NAYS—171

Abercrombie	DeLauro	Kennedy (RI)
Ackerman	Deutsch	Kildee
Allen	Dicks	Kilpatrick
Andrews	Dingell	Kind (WI)
Baca	Doggett	Klecza
Baird	Doyle	Kucinich
Baldacci	Edwards	LaFalce
Barrett	Engel	Langevin
Becerra	Etheridge	Lantos
Bentsen	Evans	Larsen (WA)
Berman	Farr	Larson (CT)
Blumenauer	Fattah	Lee
Bonior	Filner	Levin
Borski	Frank	Lewis (GA)
Boucher	Frank	Lipinski
Boyd	Green (TX)	Lofgren
Brady (PA)	Gutierrez	Lowe
Brown (FL)	Hall (TX)	Luther
Brown (OH)	Harman	Maloney (CT)
Capps	Hastings (FL)	Maloney (NY)
Capuano	Hill	Markey
Cardin	Hilliard	Mascara
Carson (IN)	Hinchee	Matheson
Carson (OK)	Hoefl	Matsui
Clay	Holden	McCarthy (MO)
Clayton	Honda	McCollum
Clement	Hooley	McDermott
Clyburn	Hoyer	McGovern
Condit	Insl	McIntyre
Conyers	Israel	McNulty
Costello	Jackson (IL)	Meehan
Coyne	Jackson-Lee	Meek (FL)
Crowley	(TX)	Meeks (NY)
Cummings	Jefferson	Menendez
Davis (FL)	John	Millender
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	McDonald
DeFazio	Jones (OH)	Miller, George
DeGette	Kanjorski	Mink
Delahunt	Kaptur	Moakley

Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rivers

NOT VOTING—12

Baldwin
Everett
Gordon
Johnson (CT)

□ 1059

Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. LARSEN of Washington changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. SANDLIN changed his 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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The pending business is the question of the Speaker’s approval of the Journal of the last day’s proceedings.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 354, noes 62, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

AYES—354

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Army
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bishop

Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Capps
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)

Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Townes
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Sisisky
Young (AK)

Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoefel
Hoekstra
Holden
Honda
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inlee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly

Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCreery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn

NOES—62
Baird
Baldacci
Bonior
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Clyburn
Costello
Crane
DeFazio
English
Filner
Gibbons
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hefley
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holt

NOT VOTING—16

Baldwin
Blunt
Gordon
Johnson (CT)
Lampson
Leach

□ 1109

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MARRIAGE PENALTY AND FAMILY TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2001

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 104, I call up the bill (H.R. 6) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the marriage penalty by providing for adjustments to the standard deduction, 15-percent rate bracket, and earned income credit and to allow the non-refundable personal credits against regular and minimum tax liability, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 104, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 6 is as follows:

H.R. 6

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Marriage Tax Elimination Act of 2001”.

(b) SECTION 15 NOT TO APPLY.—No amendment made by this Act shall be treated as a change in a rate of tax for purposes of section 15 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF MARRIAGE PENALTY IN STANDARD DEDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 63(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to standard deduction) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$5,000” in subparagraph (A) and inserting “200 percent of the dollar amount in effect under subparagraph (C) for the taxable year”;

(2) by adding “or” at the end of subparagraph (B);

(3) by striking “in the case of” and all that follows in subparagraph (C) and inserting “in any other case.”; and

(4) by striking subparagraph (D).

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—
(1) Subparagraph (B) of section 1(f)(6) of such Code is amended by striking “(other