Then the third line of defense was, ''Well, yes, maybe it was wrong. But I will never do it again.'' And then the fourth line of defense is, ''Well, it is not my fault. We had to win, you see. We had to do anything, at any cost, regardless of the law.''

Well, we must, No. 1, uphold the law here in America. Because if there is no justice in Washington, DC, there is no justice in Wichita, KS, or in Florida, or Indiana, or anywhere in the United States. We must uphold the law of the United States of America in the States.

The campaign financing must start with the individuals. Rule No. 1, as was stated earlier by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER]: Follow the law. If we are ever going to find where we are going, we have got to find a place to start from. And that is the current law today, we must follow the law.

I guess the Democrat Party in the State of Kansas, the Teamsters, and the national party in the White House are tired of breaking old laws, so they want campaign reform so they get a brandnew set of laws to break.

I want to say in closing, we cannot write enough laws. We have proved that. We have laws upon laws, statute books upon statute books. People have to do the right thing. It is up to the American people to ferret out those who will misalign what they say and what they do and mistreat the taxpayers and the people of America by not doing the right thing. So voters need to find candidates that will do the right thing and support them so we can change America.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] for his insights. And he is right, we have got to abide by the laws that we have already passed.

I have said for some time that for the Democrats and the President to talk about how they want new laws to be passed on campaign finance reform would be a lot like the driver of Princess Diana coming back from the dead and holding a press conference and demanding that the speed limit be lowered in the tunnels of Paris or that the alcohol level be lowered in Paris for DUI.

Abide by the laws that are on the books and nobody is going to get hurt. Regretfully, though, this is just another way that they can change the subject. And my colleague is right, it is shameful, a lot of the bobbing and weaving. I know the White House, the Vice President particularly said, ''I did not break the law. I did not do anything wrong. And I promise I will never do it again.''

It just does not make sense. The American people are being underestimated. They are smarter. When we see the scandals that are occurring, when we see the National Security Council, when we see money laundering with the AFL–CIO and the Teamsters, when we see the Energy Department being improperly used, the CIA, the NSC, the White House, the Vice President's office, it is time for us to do something.

I agree with the New York Times and I agree with editorial writers across the country, Janet Reno has no choice but to step up to the plate and hire an independent counsel, not a partisan Democrat, not a partisan Republican, but somebody that is independent that can look into this and look into the type of abuses, again, that the New York Times even wrote about this morning that the Democrats use State parties to bypass limits; that $32 million were sent to the local level, paid for by ads aiding Bill Clinton, possibly very, very illegal.

Somebody must look into this. We cannot allow the integrity of the American system to continue to be questioned like this. Let us get somebody independent in that can look at the law and apply the law equally to both sides. If that happens, America is the winner, not just Republicans or Democrats.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. PEASE]. The Chair will remind all Members that they are to refrain from references to individual Members of the other body.

ELIMINATE MARRIAGE PENALTY TAX

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, I would like to report to my colleagues today about a project that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER] and I have started in the last few weeks. I want to thank each of my colleagues who have joined us in cosponsoring our legislation to eliminate the marriage penalty tax in our Tax Code.

I first started focusing on this when I received a letter from a constituent of mine, Sharon Mallory, who lives in Straughn, IN. Sharon wrote to me about how she and her boyfriend wanted to get married, went to the accountant, and found out that she would have to give up her $900 tax refund and start paying $2,800 if they got married. Sharon closed her letter of last February saying, ''We hope some day the government will allow us to get married by not penalizing us. It broke our hearts when we found out we can't afford it.''

And it broke my heart to think that Sharon and those like her that want to get married and start families in this country are not able to because our Tax Code penalizes them simply because they are married.

I have started a project on my website, and I wanted to share the results of this with my colleagues. People, when they want to communicate with me about the marriage penalty, have started leaving me e-mails at my site, www.House.gov/McIntosh, where we have got a special page on the marriage penalty and what it means to people. So, if I may, let me show my colleagues the map of the United States and some of the dozens of responses that we have gotten.

My colleagues, these are just a few of the communities around the United States where people have written me these e-mails explaining to me what the marriage penalty has meant to them. Let me share with my colleagues a few of them.

Wayne Shelly, who lives in Dayton, OH, wrote this:

> Penalizing for marriage flies in the face of common sense. This is a classic example of Government policy not supporting that which it wishes to promote. In our particular situation, my girlfriend and I would incur an annual net penalty of $2,000 or approximately $167 a month. Though not huge, this was enough to pay our monthly phone, cable, water, and home insurance bills. Therefore, the net effect to us is that, if we remain unmarried, the United States Government will pay these four bills for us.

He might have gone on to say, conversely, if we do get married, instead of paying those bills, we are going to have to dig into our pockets and pay the Government that money.

A second message was from William Dixon of Osgood, IN.

> I was a single parent paying child support. I remarried in 1990. Because of my change of status, I owed a tax bill that I could not pay. I am still trying to pay these taxes and penalties.

Terri Wyncoop of Springfield, VA, wrote to me:

> I knew it was more than enough because I had never owed before I was married. However, when I married I owed every year. We could owe anything from $500 to $1,000. We both claimed zero, and took out an additional $25 weekly out of both of our checks and still owed. Unfortunately, our marriage failed because of financial reasons.

Does it not just break the hearts of my colleagues to know that there are American citizens like Terri Wyncoop of Springfield, VA, who attribute the breakdown of their family to the fact that this government penalized them for when they were married?

I can just picture the desperate straits of those two young people who want their marriage to succeed deciding, ''Well, let us take more out of our paychecks in order not to pay taxes at the end of the year,'' and to find themselves still penalized and hit with that terrible burden.

Now, those financial crises oftentimes come in at a time when young people are trying to make a new life together. And people say to me, how can that make a difference? Well, I want to share with my colleagues a few statistics of what has happened in this country since 1969 when we started penalizing marriages in our Tax Code.

The National Fatherhood Initiative reports that since the marriage penalty was created for the average American, the probability that a marriage taking place today will end in divorce or permanent separation is calculated to be