

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
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Army
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry

Biggert
Billirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady

Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal

DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslie
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)

King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalfe
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel

NAYS—51

Aderholt
Baldacci
Bilbray
Borski
Brady (PA)
Capuano
Clay
Coburn
Costello

Crowley
Cummings
English
Filner
Ford
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hastings (FL)

Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Velazquez
Vitter
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

Hefley
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hulshof
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kucinich
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