

PAT DANNER (D—MO) and I have authored H.R. 6, The Marriage Tax Elimination Act.

H.R. 6, The Marriage Tax 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; H.R. 6 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 \$4,150). Under H.R. 6 the standard deduction for married couples filing jointly would be increased to \$8,300.

H.R. 6 enjoys the bipartisan support of 230 co-sponsors along with family groups, including: American Association of Christian Schools, American Family Association, Christian Coalition, Concerned Women for America, Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, Family Research Council, Home School Legal Defense Association, the National Association of Evangelicals and the Traditional Values Coalition.

It isn't enough for President Clinton to suggest tax breaks for child care. The President's child care proposal would help a working couple afford, on average, three weeks of day care. Elimination of the marriage tax penalty would give the same couple the choice of paying for three months of child care—or addressing other family priorities. After all, parents know better than Washington what their family needs.

We fondly remember the 1996 State of the Union address when the President declared emphatically that, quote “the era of big government is over.”

We must stick to our guns, and stay the course.

There never was an American appetite for big government.

But there certainly is for reforming the existing way government does business.

And what better way to show the American people that our government will continue along the path to reform and prosperity than by eliminating the marriage tax penalty.

Ladies and gentlemen, 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 hearth to America's children, the U.S. tax code should not be one of them.

Let's eliminate the marriage tax penalty and do it now!

[From the Chicago Tribune, January 31, 1999]

HOW TO HANDLE THE BUDGET SURPLUS

WASHINGTON.—Four years ago when I was first elected to Congress, I ran on the need for fiscal restraint in Washington, D.C., and a return of power to people back home. We

fought for our belief that we could balance the budget and provide tax relief for America's working families. For months we were told by Washington insiders and the media that it couldn't be done. Well, we proved them wrong, and we did it ahead of schedule.

Today Congress has a great opportunity as well as a significant challenge before it. A massive surplus of extra tax revenue is projected as a result of a balanced budget. The challenge lies in what Congress chooses to do with the budget surplus.

Saving Social Security is the first priority for the surplus. It's a bipartisan consensus. Last fall, House Republicans showed tremendous responsibility and leadership by passing a plan that earmarked 90 percent of the surplus for Social Security. President Clinton used this month's State of the Union message to call for setting aside a minimum of 62 percent of the surplus (\$2.7 trillion over 15 years) for Social Security.

Although we were prepared to set aside much more to save Social Security, Republicans agree to the president's request to set aside 62 percent of the surplus for Social Security. But the question remains of what to do with the rest. President Clinton proposes to spend it on big, new, expensive programs; Republicans want to give this back as tax relief.

Those who oppose tax cuts will fight tooth and nail against lowering today's tax burden. According to the U.S. Treasury, the total income tax take from individuals and families has increased 63 percent since 1992. In fact, according to the Tax Foundation, if you add up the local, state and federal tax burden, taxes are almost 40 percent of the average family's income. Wouldn't most people agree that today's tax burden is too high?

We can save Social Security and cut taxes at the same time. Some say we can't—they were the same ones who opposed balancing the budget and cutting taxes. We proved them wrong. For example, using only 25 percent of the surplus (allowing for an additional 13 percent of the surplus to be dedicated to shoring up Social Security or paying down the national debt) we could enact a 10 percent across-the-board tax cut for all American taxpayers while still eliminating the unfair marriage tax penalty and relieving family farms and family businesses of the inheritance or “death” tax.

The president's step gives us a window of opportunity to save Social Security. We commend the president for his new-found willingness to work with us to save Social Security, secure retirement savings, provide sorely needed tax relief and equip the next generation to compete in a global economy. But now that we have agreed on the first step in saving Social Security, we need to focus on the details. It is irresponsible to spend the people's surplus on new, big government programs. We must give this money back to the American people. Saving Social Security, paying down our national debt and offering real and substantial tax relief to all working Americans are three strong ways to spur our economy and lead the way into the next century.

U.S. Rep. Jerry Weller (R-Ill.)

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION REQUIRING POST OFFICE TO OBEY LOCAL LAND USE LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as somebody who has worked for years on

helping communities find ways to promote livability, I am excited to see the attention that has been accorded lately to the livable communities movement.

It is clear that we do not need a lot of new rules and regulations and mandates and stipulations to be able to make sure that we achieve that goal. It is indeed the simplest step for us to take for the Federal Government to just be a constructive partner with State, local governments and the private sector, working with them to make communities work better. One small but important step would be to have Federal agencies like the post office obey the same rules and regulations requirements that we require on homeowners and businesses.

There are over 40,000 post offices all across America who are these little outposts that bring communities together, and there are opportunities from coast to coast, border to border to be able to promote livable communities by being constructive partners. Unfortunately, the post office has not always lived up to that ideal. Today, in the USA Today, there is an article about Tully, New York, and their struggle with the post office. Last week, it was Byron, California, and Discovery Bay.

Now, I bring this forward not with any animosity toward the Postal Service. To the contrary. I think it is terrific that we can, for less than a dollar, send three handwritten letters all across the country, have them be delivered in a matter of days, that they are delivered by employees who give back to the community, who usually do not just give the postal service but they do so with a smile.

It is a critical function that helps unite and bring people together. In fact, main street post offices are one of the anchors of small town America that add to the business district, that add to the flavor of those communities; and, in fact, that is why it is so important that the post office be a good citizen and a full partner for livability.

That is why my legislation has been endorsed by the Trust for Historic Preservation, by main street associations representing small- and medium-sized businesses all across the country, why the National Governors Association is concerned about this, why the post office itself has recently declared a moratorium on closing and is re-addressing its relationship with the community. They claim far fewer problems than in the past and that there is a new era under Postmaster Henderson.

I have met with the Postmaster General. I am impressed with his commitment, but I think the best way to express this commitment is to stop fighting this legislation and get behind it, to make clear its support for a new era of partnership.

Why should the post office be exempt from planning, zoning and building codes that homeowners and businesses in communities across the country

must adhere to? Why, since the post office is such a critical part of our community, should the community not be as involved with potential relocation issues as they are in helping pick which version of the Elvis stamp we are going to have?

I have discussed on the floor of this House in the past problems we have had in Leon County, Florida, where the Postal Service decided that it would not abide by the same groundwater environmental standards for runoff on their parking lot as other private businesses; or where in Ball Ground, Georgia, the Postal Service was not going to abide by a comprehensive plan to help metropolitan Atlanta deal with its critical environmental problems.

□ 1045

Well, after making, as it were, a Federal case out of it, the personal intervention, I think, of the Postmaster General, it looks like we are moving towards resolution in Leon County, Florida, and in metropolitan Georgia. But it should not have to be a major battle. It is time for the post office to stop fighting this legislation. It is time for the post office to institutionalize with us to make sure that the Postal Service is a full partner for the next millennium of livable communities in America.

Mr. Speaker, this small step can lead the way for the Federal Government itself across the country to provide that sort of partnership for livability.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENTS ON H.R. 416, FEDERAL RETIREMENT COVERAGE CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an announcement. I want to inform the House of the Committee on Rules' plans in regard to H.R. 416, the Federal Retirement Coverage Corrections Act. The bill was favorably reported by both the Committee on Government Reform and the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Committee on Rules will meet on Wednesday to grant a rule which may require that amendments be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and which may limit amendments to the bill. In this case, amendments to be preprinted would need to be signed by the Member and submitted to the Speaker's table by the close of legislative business on Wednesday. Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to assure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House. It is not necessary to submit amendments to the Committee on Rules or to testify as long as the amendments comply with House rules.

Mr. Speaker, a Dear Colleague letter announcing this potential amendment process was mailed to all Member offices yesterday.

COMMANDANCY OF THE ALAMO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 3 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise, as is tradition by members of the Texas delegation. Today is Texas Independence Day, and today I would like to follow in the tradition that has been done for years, to read a letter that was written from Colonel Travis, who was the commandant, who was the head of the Texans who were in the Alamo that was written on February 24, 1836, from Bexar in Texas.

To all people of Texas and all Americans in the world:

Fellow citizens and compatriots, I am besieged by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Anna. I have sustained a continual bombardment and cannonade for 24 hours and have not lost a man. The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion, otherwise, the garrison are to be put to the sword, if the fort is taken. I have answered the demand with a cannon shot, and our flag still proudly from the walls. I shall never surrender or retreat. Then, I call on you in the name of liberty and patriotism and everything dear to the American character to come to our aid with all dispatch. The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily and will no doubt increase to three or four thousand in 4 or 5 days. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible and die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor and to that of his country—victory or death.

Signed, William Barret Travis, Lieutenant Colonel Commander of the Texans in the Alamo.

P.S. The Lord is on our side. When the enemy appeared in sight, we had not three bushels of corn. We have since found in deserted houses 80 or 90 bushels and got into the walls 20 or 30 head of cattle.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

AMERICAN CITIZENS OF PUERTO RICO AND THE TERRITORIES MUST BE RECOGNIZED AS EQUALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of you saw the article "Talking About a Revolution" in Roll Call yesterday. The article highlighted the 45th anniversary of the attack perpetrated by a group of terrorists on the U.S. House of Representatives on March 1, 1954. Just like Russell Weston, Timothy McVeigh, Terry Nichols and others, the terrorists in the 1954 attack were also American citizens.

In commemorating such an anniversary, I wish that the same consideration to detail was provided on other issues concerning Puerto Rico. In our society it seems that it is the negative that consumes our attention, and it is a shame that this terrorist and cowardly act continues to be resurfaced without ever mentioning that the perpetrators were part of a small Fascist party then existing in Puerto Rico.

The article did not choose to highlight also that today, March 2, is the 82nd anniversary of the day when all Puerto Ricans and those born in Puerto Rico thereafter became U.S. citizens through an act of Congress and that it is also the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Puerto Rico regiment of volunteers which later became the 65th Infantry Army regiment, one of the most decorated U.S. Army units of this century. Thus, 100 years ago today, our predecessors in this U.S. Congress were discussing the issue of Puerto Rico and voted on and approved the organization of the first body of troops on the territory which they called the Porto Rico Regiment of Voluntary Infantry, 18 years before we were granted citizenship. We have been equals in war and death, but we are discriminated against in peace and life.

Our rights to liberty and free speech are intrinsic rights of our democracy that have been defended since our Nation's inception. As troops from the United States have fought to ensure and maintain freedom and democratic values everywhere and anywhere that has been needed in this world in this century, 197,034 soldiers hailing from Puerto Rico have fought shoulder to shoulder with our fellow citizens from every other State.

When we consider the century that binds us together, it is clear that the interrelationship between the United States and its citizens in Puerto Rico is most evidenced in our participation in defense of democracy. Military leaders such as General Douglas MacArthur, the supreme commander for the allied power during the Korean War, described it best:

"The Puerto Ricans forming the ranks of the gallant 65th Infantry on the battlefields of Korea by valor, determination and a resolute will to victory give daily testament of their invincible loyalty to the United States and the fervor of their devotion to those immutable standards of human relations to which the Americans and Puerto Ricans are in common dedicated. They are writing a brilliant record of achievement in battle, and I am proud indeed to have them in this command. I wish that we may have many more men like them."

It is unquestionable that every one of the 197,034 soldiers who have served in the U.S. Armed Forces take the responsibility as U.S. citizens very seriously, willing to give their lives for American democratic values. But their sacrifice would not have been possible without the patriotism and honor to duty evidenced by the support of their families