United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 10, 2000 No. 87

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 10, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JUDY BIGGERT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

S. 2071. An act to benefit electricity consumers by promoting the reliability of the bulk-power system.

S. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent Resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the importance and value of education in United States history.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) for 5 minutes.

THE MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

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

Mr. WELLER. Madam Speaker, over the last several years many of us have asked a question that we hear back at home time and time again. I represent the South Side of Chicago, the south suburbs, Cook and Will Counties, communities like Joliet, bedroom communities like Morris, Frankfort, a lot of farm towns.

I find whether I am in the city, the suburbs, or the country people often ask a pretty basic, fundamental question. That is, they ask a question: Is it right, is it fair that under our tax code 25 million married working couples pay on average $1,400 more in taxes just because they are married? They ask that fundamental question of fairness: Is it right, is it fair, that under our Tax Code if one chooses to get married, their taxes are going to go up?

We call that the marriage tax penalty, and it occurs where we have a husband and wife who are both in the work force, a two-earner household who, when they choose to join together in holy matrimony, one of our society's most basic institutions, they end up paying higher taxes than if they stayed single or got divorced. The vast majority of folks back home tell me they believe that is wrong.

The marriage tax penalty essentially works this way. Let me introduce a couple here, Shad and Michelle Hallihan, two public school teachers from Joliet, Illinois. They just had a baby this year and are starting a family. But because they are both in the work force, they suffer on average the average marriage tax penalty of almost $1,400.

Back home in Joliet that $1,400, that is 3 months of day care for their child at the local day care center while they both teach. That is a year's tuition at Joliet Junior College. The marriage tax penalty on average is real money to real people.

For some here in this House and some over in the Senate, particularly the folks down at the White House, they want to spend that money here in Washington rather than letting good folks like Shad and Michelle Hallihan keep what they suffer in the marriage tax penalty, money they could spend on their newborn baby.

Madam Speaker, Shad and Michelle's marriage tax penalty occurs because when we are married, we file jointly, we combine our income. So Shad and Michelle with their current income, if they stayed single or just chose to live together, they would each pay in the 15 percent tax bracket. But because they combine their income when they file jointly, they are forced to pay in a higher tax bracket, which causes them to pay $1,400 more in higher taxes.

I am proud to say as a key part of the Republican agenda this year this House passed overwhelmingly the Marriage Tax Elimination Act, H.R. 6. Every Republican and thankfully 48 Democrats broke ranks with their leadership and said they, too, wanted to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. We passed it out of the House with overwhelming bipartisan support.

Unfortunately, I guess I should congratulate the Senate Democrats because they prevented the Marriage Tax Elimination Act from moving through the Senate. Of course, we are now moving it through the budget process to get around their parliamentary procedure that they are using to prevent us from eliminating the marriage tax penalty.

Later this week we are going to be voting on an agreement between the House and Senate which essentially wipes out the marriage tax for 25 million couples. In fact, the legislation we will be voting on later this week is

Printed on recycled paper.