

are pursuing the proposals that I have made over these years. In fact, I have conferred with them several times and have had press conferences with them. They are ready to insert into the supplemental appropriations a measure that is similar to mine.

This is good news, because it means eventually that the House will have to act on it. Meanwhile, our own appropriations process for the supplementals is on its way to fruition. We are going to see what we can do to add it to this side's complement of the budget process for supplemental appropriations.

In the meantime, we have received endorsement from several important citizen organizations. The most recent one was from the Concord Coalition which, in response to our proposal, sent us a letter saying, quote:

Enactment now of this fall-back funding would remove the possibility that Government agencies would shut down later this year due to the inability of the Congress and the President to agree on spending. Your amendment tilts the process in favor of making these tough decisions and away from counterproductive and deficit-increasing political games.

That is an important endorsement that we received from the Concord Coalition.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce commented in a letter to us:

Your legislation's provision of temporary funding until Congress and the President come to an agreement means that the threat of closing portions of the Government could no longer be used by either side in an attempt to pass a budget. Negotiations over spending bills would then remain more focused on the legislation's merits, yielding a more rational and sound process.

So says the President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in a letter directly sent to us to endorse our legislation.

We have many, many different kinds of endorsements from citizens' groups, contractors' groups, Federal employees' groups, and others. The time has come to allow this process to become a part of our law. It is a shame to permit our Government to shut down at any time, not for 5 minutes.

I cite the most blatant example of why it should never happen. On the Columbus Day weekend of 1990, while we had amassed 500,000 of our young people in Saudi Arabia waiting for Desert Storm, our Government shut down. We should never let anything like that happen again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RUSH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. NEUMANN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HINOJOSA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HINOJOSA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. UPTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. KELLY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### TAX CODE SHOULD NOT PUNISH MARRIED COUPLES AND FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, today, on this Thursday of tax week, I would like to talk with my colleagues and the American people about one of the worst features in our Tax Code. It is the way in which the Government punishes families and punishes husbands and wives for deciding to be married.

Just a couple of weeks ago I received a letter from one of my constituents in Straughn, IN, Sharon Mallory and Darryl Pierce. Here is a portrait of them that they sent along with their letter.

Sharon writes to me, My boyfriend, Darryl Pierce, and I would very much like to get married, but we figured, if we get married, not only would I forfeit my \$900 tax refund check, we would be writing a check to the IRS for \$2,800. This amount was figured for us by an accountant at the local H&R Block in New Castle.

"Now," Sharon goes on to write, "this system is old and outdated, antiquated. I do not understand how the Government can ask such questions as single, married, dependents. Employers, bankers, realtors and creditors are forbidden by law to ask these questions. The same should apply to the Government."

The marriage penalty is clearly punishing Sharon and Darryl. They want to get married, and yet their accountant tells them the U.S. Government is

going to tax them more when they do get married.

Oftentimes, we find that the Tax Code penalizes families with children as well.

One of the worst aspects of the marriage penalty is that it discriminates against women. If a woman has been married, started to raise a family and the children start to be old enough so that she can go back to work, she faces a marginal tax rate of over 50 percent. That means for every dollar she earns, 50 cents goes to the Government in taxes.

This is wrong, and we should not be punishing women who make that choice to go back to work.

Now, married couples are punished by the Tax Code with the marriage penalty, but when couples decide to get married and then have children, they are punished once again. According to the Center for Policy Analysis, the marriage penalty for a couple earning \$20,000, that is not a lot of money, maybe about minimum wage for both people, they will be punished approximately \$1,200, and they have two children.

Right now, the marriage penalty is about \$180 for a couple. When they have children, it skyrockets to \$1,265. Or, for example, the Center points out that a married couple earning \$50,000 each is punished \$1,300 for being married, but when they start to have children, that skyrockets to \$1,500 per child. People ask me, does this really discourage families, does it discourage marriage?

Well, my wife, Ruthie and I met a couple the other week in Indianapolis. Both of them are doctors, and their accountant told them, you could save \$6,000 if you file for a divorce and file your taxes separately.

This is wrong and we must end the marriage penalty in our Tax Code. It is wrong for Government to punish married couples in this country. It is wrong for them to punish families who have children.

Why should young people, when they decide to get married and start a family, face the prospect of the Government telling them, you are going to pay more in taxes because you are married? Just think what families could do with that money. Many families need it to pay the electric bill or buy food for their children. \$1,500 per children per year means that they could save about \$30,000 when their children go to college.

We need to let these working families keep more of their money so that they can pay the bills, they can buy food for their children, and they can save for college.

Let me quote from Sharon and Darryl's letter. They closed it by saying, "Darryl and I would very much like to be married, and I must say, it broke our hearts when we found out we can't because the Government punishes us. We hope some day the Government will allow us to get married and not penalize us for it."

Sharon and Darryl are right. It is wrong for the Government to punish people who decide to get married. We must end the marriage penalty; we must pass a bill and send it to President Clinton that would eliminate that penalty, and when we do that, we will show that the Government is on the side of families, not working against them.

We will show that Government is not going to discriminate against women who go back into the work force, and we will show that Government is going to allow working families to keep more of their hard-earned income and decide how they want to spend it in raising their children, paying the bills, saving for the future, maybe giving them a chance to go to college.

I urge my colleagues to join me in passing the bill to repeal the marriage penalty in our Tax Code, not only for ourselves and all Americans, but especially for Sharon and Darryl, who fondly want to get married, to let them have their dream of having a family together.

STRAUGHN, IN,  
February 17, 1997.

Hon. DAVID MCINTOSH,  
Muncie, IN.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCINTOSH: My boyfriend, Darryl Pierce, and I have been living together for quite some time. We would very much like to get married.

We both work at Ford Electronics in Connersville Indiana. We both make less than \$10.00 an hour; however, we do work overtime whenever it is available. Also Darryl does some farming on the side.

I can't tell you how disgusted we both are over this tax issue. If we get married not only would I forfeit my \$900.00 refund check, we would be writing a check to the IRS for \$2,800.00. This amount was figured for us by an accountant at the local H&R Block office in New Castle.

Now there is nothing right about this. After we continually hear the government preach to us about "family values."

Nothing new about the hypocrites in Washington. Why don't we do away with the current tax system? It is old and outdated. Antiquated. The flat tax is the most sensible method to use and no one is being penalized. Everyone would be treated the same.

I don't understand how the government can ask such questions as: single? married? dependents? Employers, bankers, realtors, and creditors are forbidden by law to ask these questions. The same should apply to the government.

Darryl and I would very much like to be married and I must say it broke our hearts when we found out we can't afford it.

We hope someday the government will allow us to get married by not penalizing us.

Yours Very Truly,

SHARON MALLORY.  
DARRYL PIERCE.

□ 1845

#### IT IS CALLED ACCOUNTABILITY

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, in the early morning of April 9, a large group of United States-trained Haitian National

Police forcefully entered and illegally searched the family home of a long-time employee of the International Republican Institute, which is an adjunct of the National Endowment for Democracy, which is of great interest to this institution.

The contents of the home, which were owned by the employee's aunt, who happens to be an American citizen, were destroyed and photographs of the employee and his family were confiscated. We have received confirmation from the United States Embassy officials that the Haitian National Police have taken responsibility for the action, and they have claimed that they were thinking that there was a gang operating out of the home. It is worth noting that they failed, regardless of the merit or lack in the claim about the gang. It is worth noting that they never gained proper authorization to take such an action or stage such a raid.

More troubling still is that this raid comes after an already-harrowing series of specific threats against this employee's family in the lead-up to the latest round of elections some 10 days ago, threats that many believe can be directly linked to the employee's work for the IRI. And those of us who have followed Haiti very closely will recall that this pattern mirrors that which preceded the forced departure of Haitian Chamber of Deputy member Dooley Brutus.

We must ask the administration if in fact the Clinton administration has lost control of the program in Haiti to the degree that we are now supporting blatant human rights violations with United States taxpayers' dollars. In fact, tensions in Haiti have been running so high in recent weeks for IRI that it has had to close its office and move its operations to a new, safe site where security can be provided more effectively. This does not sound like a democracy to me.

Mr. Speaker, an attack of this sort is inexcusable in a democracy, even a fledgling democracy. We cannot tolerate this. Not only is the victimization of an American citizen inappropriate, to put it mildly, but the attack on an individual working to further the development of democracy in Haiti is deeply troubling. The fact that the same type of raid was carried out on the same night, in the same neighborhood, in the home of a prominent business family suggests that these types of raids are not all that uncommon. Sadly, that seems to be so.

Rest assured that we will be looking to the United States Embassy, the Haitian Government, and Colin Granderson's civilian mission for a thorough report on this incident.

We also expect the administration to place a priority on ensuring that this assault against an American citizen and property is thoroughly investigated by the Government of Haiti. We know from our experience with the Gonzalez and Bertin cases that the in-

vestigation stage is generally where the Haitian judicial system breaks down totally.

The involvement of United States-trained Haitian National Police also means that there are questions to be answered about the apparent lack of progress on the rule of law in Haiti after so great a commitment of United States personnel and tax dollars. One certainly must ask if the wanton destruction of property was included as part of the training we provided with U.S. tax dollars. I hope that is not so.

How many American or Haitian citizens have to be traumatized in this way before the Clinton administration will be willing to take off the rose-colored glasses and give us an honest assessment of the situation in Haiti? It appears that it is quite a sad saga.

If we have a serious problem in Haiti, a problem directly linked to United States tax dollars, let us acknowledge it and get on with the process of fixing it. That is called accountability and the American people expect nothing less, even though we have been getting less for some time from the Clinton administration when we seek candor on the subject of Haiti.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CHRISTENSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HUNTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### EARTH DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the House tonight on the subject of Earth Day. Since the House is going out of session this evening and will not be returning because of the Passover holidays until Wednesday for any legislative action, this is the only opportunity before Earth Day, which is next Tuesday, April 22, to talk about the significance of that occasion, not only to Congress but to the American people.

Next Tuesday, April 22, is in fact Earth Day. I believe it is the 26th Earth Day. Earth Day has always been a day to celebrate the environment and our natural heritage. It has also served to raise people's awareness about the quality of their environment and the