

The Marriage Penalty Relief Act passed by significant margins in both the House and the Senate. It is overdue for tax relief to our middle-income families, who are dependent on two-wage earners, who are hardest hit by this penalty. It is especially hard on that second wage, often the wife's salary, because their income is taxed at higher marginal rates, often from 15 percent to 28 percent. You can see how tough it is.

As the President makes up his long list of end-of-the-year spending priorities, let him remember and let us remember the 25 million married couples who are struggling to make ends meet. Instead of dedicating the surplus to more spending ideas and bigger government plans, we should return some of it to the American people who earned it, while continuing to pay down the debt.

Let the American people decide for themselves what is best and what is best for their families, not a politician in Washington.

VOTE TO OVERRIDE VETO ON MARRIAGE PENALTY RELIEF

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I guess it should come as no surprise to the American people that the administration that attacks the Boy Scouts is now attacking the institution of marriage, and they are doing it from an insidious higher taxes on the couples who dare do the right thing and walk down the aisle.

Take the situation, a true story in Savannah, Georgia, woman's name is Ann and the husband's name is Steve. They were making \$25,000 each; they got married last December. Now their combined family income is \$50,000. Guess what? They went from 15 percent tax brackets to now 20 percent tax brackets. They are paying more simply because they got married. Nothing else changed.

This administration is going to look them in the eye and say no, you are wealthy, you do not deserve the tax, because guess what, some even wealthier person and, of course, that is evil in the minds of AL GORE, somebody might benefit from this, so we are not going to let you have your own money.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that a few brave Democrats will for once put their constituents first and vote to override this horrible veto and pass marriage tax penalty relief.

PASS HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT OF 1999

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is simply a matter of jus-

tice. Today the House of Representatives has an opportunity to fully legislate, and that is to support the motion to instruct to pass real hate crimes prevention legislation.

In the midst of all of this, Mr. Speaker, we will be having a number of frivolous motions, because our good friends on the other side are not serious about making a national statement against hate. They have fought us at every turn in not passing the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999, James Byrd was not enough. Matthew Shepherd was not enough. I do not know who will be next. I call upon the goodwill of this Congress to pass this motion to instruct.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of justice. I asked the FBI to tell me whether or not the indictment or the trials and tribulations of Mr. Lee regarding the Los Alamos spy incident was a matter of racial profiling? Yes, it is a matter of justice. And I expect the FBI to respond to my inquiry as to whether or not because you are of a certain origin in this country, you are a spy or you are trying to undermine the United States of America.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Chair's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. FILNER. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 337, nays 51, answered "present" 2, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 465]

YEAS—337

Abercrombie	Biggart	Cannon
Ackerman	Billirakis	Capps
Allen	Bishop	Cardin
Andrews	Blagojevich	Castle
Archer	Blumenauer	Chabot
Army	Blunt	Chenoweth-Hage
Baca	Boehlert	Clayton
Bachus	Boehner	Clement
Baird	Bonilla	Clyburn
Baker	Bonior	Coble
Baldwin	Bono	Collins
Ballenger	Boswell	Combest
Barcia	Boyd	Condit
Barr	Brady (TX)	Cook
Barrett (NE)	Brown (FL)	Cooksey
Barrett (WI)	Brown (OH)	Cox
Bartlett	Bryant	Coyne
Barton	Burr	Cramer
Bass	Burton	Cubin
Becerra	Buyer	Cunningham
Bentsen	Callahan	Danner
Bereuter	Calvert	Davis (FL)
Berkley	Camp	Davis (IL)
Berman	Campbell	Davis (VA)
Berry	Canady	Deal

DeGette	King (NY)	Regula
Delahunt	Kingston	Reyes
DeLauro	Klecza	Reynolds
DeMint	Knollenberg	Riley
Deutsch	Kolbe	Rivers
Diaz-Balart	Kuykendall	Rodriguez
Dicks	LaHood	Roemer
Dingell	Lampson	Rogan
Dixon	Lantos	Rogers
Doggett	Largent	Rohrabacher
Dooley	Larson	Ros-Lehtinen
Dreier	Latham	Roukema
Duncan	LaTourette	Roybal-Allard
Dunn	Leach	Royce
Edwards	Lee	Rush
Ehlers	Levin	Ryan (WI)
Ehrlich	Lewis (CA)	Salmon
Emerson	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez
Etheridge	Lewis (KY)	Sandlin
Evans	Linder	Sanford
Everett	Lipinski	Sawyer
Ewing	Lofgren	Saxton
Farr	Lowey	Scarborough
Fletcher	Lucas (KY)	Schakowsky
Foley	Lucas (OK)	Scott
Forbes	Luther	Sensenbrenner
Fossella	Maloney (CT)	Sessions
Fowler	Maloney (NY)	Shadegg
Frank (MA)	Manzullo	Shaw
Frelinghuysen	Mascara	Shays
Frost	Matsui	Sherman
Galleghy	McCarthy (MO)	Shimkus
Ganske	McCarthy (NY)	Shows
Gejdenson	McCrary	Shuster
Gekas	McHugh	Simpson
Gephardt	McInnis	Sisisky
Gibbons	McIntyre	Skeen
Gillmor	McKeon	Skelton
Gilman	McKinney	Smith (MI)
Gonzalez	Meehan	Smith (NJ)
Goode	Meek (FL)	Smith (TX)
Goodling	Menendez	Smith (WA)
Gordon	Metcalf	Snyder
Goss	Mica	Souder
Graham	Millender	Spence
Granger	McDonald	Spratt
Green (WI)	Miller (FL)	Stabenow
Greenwood	Miller, Gary	Stark
Hall (OH)	Minge	Stearns
Hall (TX)	Mink	Stenholm
Hansen	Moakley	Strickland
Hastings (WA)	Mollohan	Stump
Hayworth	Moore	Talent
Herger	Moran (VA)	Tanner
Hill (IN)	Morella	Tauscher
Hinojosa	Myrick	Tauzin
Hobson	Nadler	Taylor (NC)
Hoeffel	Napolitano	Terry
Hoekstra	Neal	Thomas
Holden	Nethercutt	Thornberry
Holt	Ney	Thune
Hooley	Northup	Thurman
Horn	Norwood	Tiahrt
Hostettler	Nussle	Toomey
Houghton	Obey	Trafficant
Hoyer	Olver	Turner
Hunter	Ortiz	Udall (CO)
Hutchinson	Ose	Upton
Hyde	Oxley	Velazquez
Inslie	Packard	Vitter
Isakson	Pastor	Walsh
Istook	Paul	Wamp
Jackson (IL)	Payne	Watkins
Jefferson	Pease	Watt (NC)
Jenkins	Pelosi	Waxman
John	Peterson (PA)	Weldon (FL)
Johnson (CT)	Petri	Weldon (PA)
Johnson, E. B.	Pickering	Wexler
Johnson, Sam	Pitts	Whitfield
Jones (NC)	Pombo	Wicker
Jones (OH)	Pomeroy	Wilson
Kanjorski	Porter	Wise
Kaptur	Portman	Wolf
Kelly	Pryce (OH)	Woolsey
Kennedy	Quinn	Wu
Kildee	Radanovich	Wynn
Kilpatrick	Rahall	Young (FL)
Kind (WI)	Rangel	

NAYS—51

Aderholt	Crowley	Hefley
Baldacci	Cummings	Hill (MT)
Bilbray	English	Hilleary
Borski	Filner	Hilliard
Bradley (PA)	Ford	Hulshof
Capuano	Green (TX)	Jackson-Lee
Clay	Gutierrez	(TX)
Coburn	Gutknecht	Kucinich
Costello	Hastings (FL)	LaFalce

LoBiondo	Peterson (MN)	Thompson (CA)
Markey	Phelps	Thompson (MS)
McDermott	Pickett	Tierney
McGovern	Ramstad	Udall (NM)
McNulty	Rothman	Visclosky
Moran (KS)	Sabo	Waters
Oberstar	Slaughter	Weller
Pallone	Stupak	
Pascarell	Taylor (MS)	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Carson Tancredo

NOT VOTING—43

Bliley	Goodlatte	Sanders
Boucher	Hayes	Schaffer
Chambliss	Hinchey	Serrano
Conyers	Kasich	Sherwood
Crane	Klink	Sununu
DeFazio	Lazio	Sweeney
DeLay	Martinez	Towns
Dickey	McCollum	Vento
Doolittle	McIntosh	Walden
Doyle	Meeks (NY)	Watts (OK)
Engel	Miller, George	Weiner
Eshoo	Murtha	Weygand
Fattah	Owens	Young (AK)
Franks (NJ)	Price (NC)	
Gilchrest	Ryun (KS)	

□ 1049

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would note for the RECORD that yesterday I was unavoidably detained because I am a United Airlines customer. There were flights that were considerably delayed. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on all of the rollcall votes yesterday evening.

MARRIAGE TAX RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2000—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from further consideration of the veto message on the bill (H.R. 4810), to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ARCHER moves that the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from further consideration of the veto message on the bill H.R. 4810, an act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

(For veto message, see proceedings of the House of September 6, 2000 at page H7239.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) is recognized for 1 hour on the motion.

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

This is simply a procedural motion to move to consider the veto message which will be subject to debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time, and I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered. The motion was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the bill (H.R. 4810) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we make one last attempt to end the marriage tax penalty for 25 million married couples. Since 1995, a growing bipartisan majority in the Congress has tried time and time again to end this gross unfairness in the Tax Code. But each time, President Clinton and a majority of the Democrats in Congress have just said no. In the past 6 years, President Clinton has blocked marriage tax relief more often than Tiger Woods has won golf's major championships.

President Clinton's latest veto leaves a Clinton-Gore legacy of denying 25 million married couples relief from the marriage tax penalty for 8 years. It means that married couples will have to wait longer for relief. It means that they will have to vote for new leadership in the White House if they want justice and fairness in the Tax Code.

This bill does bring fairness to the Tax Code. It gives the most help to those middle- and lower-income Americans who are hit hardest by the marriage tax penalty. By doubling the 15 percent bracket, and, Mr. Speaker, we all know that is the lowest income tax bracket that affects primarily lower- and middle-income people, and the earned income credit income threshold, which affects the very low-income people, we erase the marriage tax penalty for millions of lower- and middle-income workers. This is especially important to working women whose incomes are often taxed at extremely high marginal rates, some as high as 50 percent by this tax penalty.

Despite all of this unfairness, I expect we will still hear some excuses from the Democrats today why we cannot do this. They will say that stay-at-home moms and dads and people who own homes or donate to charitable organizations should not get relief, and this is their idea of targeting. Their plan actually denies relief to these important parents, and I accentuate those who itemize, who have home mortgages or pay taxes on their homes, who have itemized deductions get no relief. They do not want them to get any relief, but

that is wrong. Raising a child is the single most important job in the world and we are right to provide these families with relief.

Another excuse we will hear is that our bipartisan plan is too expensive. Too expensive for whom? Too expensive for the U.S. Treasury, which is expected to vacuum in 4.5 trillion surplus dollars over the next 10 years from the American taxpayers, or too expensive for President Clinton who, just yesterday, said he needed to spend that money for more government programs.

Last week, Vice President GORE talked about a rainy day fund, but the President's deluge of spending will soak that up like a super sponge. I would note to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who undoubtedly will call this bill fiscally irresponsible that the ranking Democrat of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, voted in July for this exact same package. No one can say that he is fiscally irresponsible.

In his January State of the Union, President Clinton stood in this exact Chamber and asked Congress to work with him to fix the marriage tax penalty. We have done that. He vetoed it. So here we are today making every effort to override that veto. When he spoke, there were no preconditions, there was no quid pro quo, no wink and a nod. In fact, there was only boisterous applause and cheers from both sides of the aisle. But 8 months later, when most American families were on vacation or getting their children ready to go back to school, he quietly vetoed the bill.

Now is our chance to right this wrong and finally put an end to the marriage tax penalty for 25 million married couples. We should all vote to override the President's veto.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the rhetoric of the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means as he would have us to believe that the Democrats do not want to give relief as relates to the marriage penalty. Now, he knows that I know that we Democrats have come forward with a bill that true, it does not cost the \$300 billion over 10 years, as his does, but it takes care of the marriage penalty, the same way we tried to take care of the estate tax abuses that we found in the Tax Code.

The difference between the so-called Republican solution is that it is not concerning itself just with relief for those people who have an additional tax burden because they are married, it goes beyond that and it is a part of this tremendous, huge billion dollar, trillion dollar tax cut that they conceived in the last session which could not get off the ground. When it was vetoed, they did not even bother to override the veto. So if we were to take the cost of this bill far beyond that of marriage