

When representing the vast majority of the American working families in that \$30,000 to \$50,000, why vote for a plan that actually reduces their opportunity to generate meaningful relief by giving them \$240 in the case of a \$50,000 income earner, and \$807 relief for those in the \$30,000 category? Why vote for such a plan?

It goes to the very point that many have made all along, and the distinguished Senator from New York has made so eloquently. Mr. President, 60 percent of the benefit in this bill we are about to vote on actually goes to those who get a marriage bonus; only 40 percent of that \$248 million actually goes to those who face a marriage penalty.

Why give, in the name of marriage penalty relief, 60 percent of the benefit to those who are actually getting a marriage bonus under current law? Why exacerbate the inequities in current law already? That is what we are doing.

The Democrats have a far better plan. This chart shows that better plan. The Republicans, as I noted earlier, deal with 3 of the 65 inequities for \$248 billion, 60 percent of which goes to those who get a marriage surplus. The Democrats deal with every single inequity currently in the code, all 65, and in one sentence.

That is the choice. Do we want to fix it or do we want to talk about it? Do we want to create new inequities and singles penalties, or do we want to deal with the problem? Do we want to fritter away \$248 billion, thinking we have fixed the marriage problem, or do we want to deal with the real problem for a lot less money?

The Democratic plan allows married couples to file separately or jointly. Very simply, taxpayers get a choice. Why deny them that choice? We provide them, for the first time, an opportunity to do one or the other, in a single sentence.

We eliminate all marriage tax penalties for those making less than \$100,000. We don't expand the marriage bonus, and we provide fiscally responsible relief.

You cannot get much better than that. I am hopeful my colleagues will think very carefully before they vote for a plan that does not solve this problem. I urge a "no" vote on the Republican plan on marriage penalty relief.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ROTH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) is absent due to illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 215 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Abraham	Fitzgerald	McCain
Allard	Frist	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Biden	Grams	Roberts
Bond	Grassley	Roth
Brownback	Gregg	Santorum
Bunning	Hagel	Sessions
Burns	Hatch	Shelby
Byrd	Helms	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Chafee, L.	Hutchison	Snowe
Cleland	Inhofe	Specter
Cochran	Jeffords	Stevens
Collins	Kerrey	Thomas
Craig	Kohl	Thompson
Crapo	Kyl	Thurmond
DeWine	Landrieu	Torricelli
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Enzi	Lugar	
Feinstein	Mack	

NAYS—38

Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Baucus	Graham	Moynihan
Bayh	Harkin	Murray
Bingaman	Hollings	Reed
Boxer	Inouye	Reid
Breaux	Johnson	Robb
Bryan	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Lautenberg	Schumer
Dodd	Leahy	Voinovich
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Durbin	Lieberman	Wyden
Edwards	Lincoln	

NOT VOTING—1

Coverdell

The bill (H.R. 4810), as amended, was passed.

[The bill was not available for printing. It will appear in a future edition of the RECORD.]

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, on rollcall vote No. 215, I voted "nay." It was my intention to vote "yea." Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it would not change the outcome of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate insists on its amendment, requests a conference with the House, and the Presiding Officer appoints Mr. ROTH, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. MOYNIHAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I take this occasion to thank the persons who have supported us and, most particularly, to thank the minority staff of the Finance Committee which produced what we think to have been a fine measure.

We are, as ever, indebted to our chief of staff, Dr. David Podoff, who, in the

course of these deliberations, had Marshall's "Principles of Economics" on his desk for reference; to our tax team, led by Russ Sullivan, Stan Fendley, Mitchell Kent, Jerry Pannullo, Cary Pugh, John Sparrow, Lee Holtzman, Matthew Voge, and Andy Guglielmi; to our health team, Chuck Konigsberg, Kyle Kinner, Kirsten Beronio, and David Nightingale.

Also, I extend a very special thank-you to Lisa Konwinski from the Budget Committee staff who provided extraordinary assistance on the reconciliation bill rules and procedures.

I yield the floor, sir.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is currently on S. 2, which is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WHAT PRICE LEGACY?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the peace talks that President Clinton has been hosting at Camp David between Prime Minister Barak of Israel and Chairman Arafat of the Palestinian Authority appear to be reaching their climax. The President has made clear from the outset that the negotiations would be difficult, but that it was his hope to recreate the spirit of the Camp David summit hosted by President Carter more than 20 years ago that resulted in the historic peace treaty between Egypt and Israel.

The goal of the current discussions is no less ambitious than the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt that was enshrined in the first Camp David accords. Certainly, a peace agreement between the Israelis and the Palestinians would be a welcome advance in the quest for a lasting peace in the Middle East. We would all like these discussions to lead to an end to the conflict that has caused so much suffering and instability in that troubled region.

Whether such a positive outcome is possible is still very much in doubt. There is no guarantee of success; indeed, many think the chances are dim. But when there is a chance for peace, the opportunity should be seized.

That being said, Mr. President, it should be made clear what the role and responsibility of the United States are here. The most important role of the United States is our ability to serve as the facilitator of these discussions. That is due to the nature of our relations with Israel and the Palestinians, and the personalities of the leaders involved at this time in history.

But providing a forum and encouragement for the Israelis and Palestinians to solve their own conflict should

not be translated into a commitment to solve the conflict for them. Stability in the Middle East, including the state of relations between Israel and the Palestinians, is a matter of great importance to the United States, but it is not our conflict. It is theirs. We can help them find common ground, but ultimately it is their ground to find.

This distinction is significant in light of the potential cost of a peace agreement between the Israelis and the Palestinians. Figures ranging from \$15 billion to \$40 billion have been floated in the media over the past several days as the possible sums that U.S. taxpayers will be asked to contribute to a peace agreement. If history is any guide, this is only the beginning.

According to the Congressional Research Service, from 1979 through 2000, the United States has provided over \$68 billion to Israel, and over \$47 billion to Egypt to support the Camp David accords. That amounts to more than \$115 billion in U.S. tax dollars to two countries alone. Besides that, from 1994 and 2000, the United States has provided \$927 million—almost a billion dollars—to the Palestinians.

I wonder how many Americans are aware of this. I wonder how many Americans knew, at the time of the first Camp David summit, that the price of an Israeli-Egyptian peace agreement would be an open-ended financial commitment of U.S. tax dollars exceeding \$100 billion. Yet after more than 20 years of paying the bills, that is indeed the cost. And there is no end in sight.

Mr. President, there has been a lot of talk about President Clinton's legacy and Secretary of State Albright's legacy. I appreciate their zeal to achieve historic agreements and to be remembered for their achievements. I recognize that peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians would be a crowning achievement. But what legacy at what price? Are we going to be told somewhere down the line that in order for the Israelis and Palestinians to agree—and this does not include the Syrians—the Administration had to promise them billions and billions of dollars in U.S. taxpayer aid? Why is it the responsibility of the United States Congress to pay to implement an agreement that we are not a party to, and about which we have, so far, received no details?

There is a disturbing tendency on the part of the Administration, and it is by no means unique to this Administration, to negotiate agreements and make costly financial commitments behind closed doors, and then inform the Congress, in so-called "consultations," after the fact. I fear that is what is contemplated again, and I think it is wrong.

If consultations are happening, that is news to me. As ranking member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I have not been consulted, and perhaps for good reasons. I am not aware of any other Senator who has been approached

by any administration official who has suggested what the price of implementing a peace agreement might be, or why it is the responsibility of the American taxpayers to pay that price. I say this particularly when it was only last year that the Congress provided a total of \$1.6 billion to Israel and the Palestinians to implement the Wye River agreement—another deal that was made without any prior consultations, as far as I know, with Congress. Again, I fear we are being led down the path of "sign now, pay later" without even knowing how much we are going to be asked to pay later, or why.

Now, I recognize that the discussions underway at Camp David may fail. There may be no agreement. That would be unfortunate. But whatever the outcome, I want to remind the administration, and the Israelis and Palestinians, that the negotiations are being hosted by the administration, not by the Congress, not by the Appropriations Committees of the Congress. No one should assume that the check is in the mail. No one should assume that we are going to dig another hole for ourselves the way we did the last time there was such a negotiation at Camp David.

We all want to see peace in the Middle East, and if there is a legitimate need for funding to implement a peace agreement, we can discuss what role the United States should play—but not after the commitments have already been made, not after the ink has already dried, not if this ancient Senator has anything to say about it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

THE PASSING OF SENATOR JOHN O. PASTORE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, Rhode Island and the Nation have lost an extraordinary statesman and patriot, Senator John O. Pastore. Senator Pastore passed away Saturday at the age of 93. He served in this body from December 1950 until January 1977. He served with distinction, he served with integrity, and he served with the utmost commitment to helping the people of Rhode Island and the people of this Nation to achieve the noblest aspirations of this country. He committed his life to public service. Senator Pastore was, in turn, a State representative, an assistant attorney general of the State of Rhode Island, a lieutenant governor, a Governor, and then, for over 26 years, a U.S. Senator.

He began his life on March 17, 1907, on Federal Hill, the Italian American community in Rhode Island. It was an interesting combination of a young Italian American born to immigrant parents on St. Patrick's Day. He would never let anyone around forget that he was both proudly Italian and fortuitously Irish—at least for 1 day of the year. He grew up in an immigrant household that was experiencing all

the difficulty and travail of people who come to a new land to find themselves and make a better life for their children. It was not glamorous; it was difficult. He endured the difficulties with the same kind of determination that marked his whole life.

In his own words:

We lived in the ghetto of Federal Hill. We had no running water, no hot water. I used to get up in the morning and have to crank the stove and go out in the back yard and sift out the ashes and come back with a coal that I could recoup. I had to chisel ice with an ice pick in the sink so that I could wash up in the morning. And that was everybody in the family. That wasn't me alone. That was my wife's family. That was everybody's family.

The hard, difficult life of a young immigrant family in Providence, RI, in the early part of the century became even more difficult because when Senator Pastore was 9 years old, his father, a tailor, passed away. At the age of 9, he became the man of the family. His mother went to work as a seamstress to support Senator Pastore and four other children. She labored all of her life to do that.

Senator Pastore was a bright and gifted student. He progressed through the Providence public schools and finished Classical High School, which was the preeminent public high school in the State of Rhode Island. He did so well that he was offered an opportunity to attend Harvard College so that he could fulfill his dream to become a doctor. He did so well, not only by studying but at the same time supporting his family, working in a jewelry factory in Providence, RI. But the reality and the truth was, he was poor, he was without a father, and he felt the keen obligation to ensure that he protected and helped his family. And so he would forego that opportunity. He was without the funds. He had to work to support his brothers and sisters and help his mother. It is said—and he has said it, in fact—that he wept on the night of his graduation, thinking that his great talent would never be fully utilized, that he would forever be committed to a life of perhaps even menial work. But he did so willingly and voluntarily because he, too, wanted to help his mother and his brothers and sisters to make it in this great country.

As we all recognize, all of us who have in any way briefly come in contact with Senator John O. Pastore, he was a man of extraordinary determination. He went to work as a clerk at the Narragansett Electric Company, and during the day he worked hard. But in the evening he enrolled at the Northeastern University Law School extension, held at the Providence YMCA. Those were the days when you could become a lawyer without going to college and then going from college into law school. At night, while working and supporting his family, he became a lawyer. After he became a lawyer, he opened up his practice in the basement of his family's home in Providence. The clientele did not rush to him, frankly, but he also discovered that he