polls have shown that, not only Republicans and Democrats, but Independents. And that is why we had the vote and will continue this effort.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman.

If I could just add one thing before we conclude, one of the things that I found in the 2 months that we had the recess and we were back in our districts and I had a lot of forums on health care on seniors or just in general with my constituents in the various towns that I represent, we are living in very good economic times and the economy is good and generally most people are doing fairly well, but there is a tremendous frustration that the Government does not work. And it is I think, for whatever reason, Congress seems to be the main focus of that, the notion that somehow all we do down here is talk and we never get anything done.

The reason I was so frustrated today when I heard some of the arguments from the Republican side is because I know that this issue, the Patients' Bill of Rights issue, the HMO reform issue, is something that we can get done. Because the public wants it done. And we had Republicans join us on this Patients' Bill of Rights, and I know that the President will sign it. So I do not want this to be another issue that is important that falls by the wayside because the Congress and the President could not get their act together.

If there is anything that we can pass this year, this is the issue. And I think we just have an obligation to our constituents to show that, on something so important as this, that we can actually accomplish something and not just sit here and argue back and forth.

Obviously, we need to argue, otherwise my colleague and I would not be up here. But we also need to pass something. And that is what we are all about.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to say, sure, I would like to talk about access, prescription medication for seniors, medical mistakes. Let us take it one step at a time.

□

ANTIBODIES TO SQUALENE IN GULF WAR SYNDROME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Madam Speaker, joined by several colleagues, today I wrote Secretary of Defense William Cohen asking for an objective analysis of the ''Antibodies to Squalene in Gulf War Syndrome,'' an article that has just been published in the February 2000 issue of Experimental and Molecular Pathology.

This peer-reviewed article found anti-squalene antibodies in a very high percentage of sick Gulf War-era veterans. As a bio-marker for the disease process involved in Gulf War illnesses, the blood tests cited in the study could provide a vital diagnostic tool. We hope this will quickly lead to improved medical treatments for many who are suffering.

Many who have heard about this issue are anxious to understand the ramifications, especially those veterans and their families whose lives sadly have been directly affected.

We certainly acknowledge the need for further research. However, that should not preclude a vigorous examination of the immediate benefits this study may provide doctors treating those who suffer from Gulf War illnesses.

The House-passed version of the Fiscal Year 2000 Defense Appropriations Bill included report language instructing the Department of Defense to develop and/or validate the assay to test for the presence of squalene antibodies. This action was taken in response to DOD unwillingness to cooperate with the March 1999 General Accounting Office recommendation. It reflected my firm belief that the integrity of the assay was the first step in finding answers.

Now that this study has been peer-reviewed and published, we need to take the next step and build on established science. An internal review by the same individuals within DOD who were unwilling to cooperate for months does not constitute the kind of science that those who sacrificed for this Nation deserve. Given the published article, it seems prudent to use the assay if it could help sick Gulf War veterans. At this critical juncture, my colleagues and myself fervently hope that Secretary Cohen agrees.

We must stay the course and find the answers that will bring effective medical treatments for those who suffer from Gulf War illnesses. Let me assure my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I intend to do so.

□

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, our tax system is unfair, for many reasons. It punishes those who invest, those who succeed in business, even those who die. But one tax provision which seems particularly unfair is the marriage tax penalty. This tax penalty occurs when a married couple pays more in taxes by filing jointly than they would if each spouse could file as a single person.

For example, an individual earning $25,500 would be taxed at 15 percent, while a married couple with incomes of $25,000 each has a portion of their income taxed at 28 percent.

In addition, while two single taxpayers receive a standard deduction of $6,950 apiece, for a total of $13,900, a married couple only receives a standard deduction of $12,500.

Madam Speaker, that is simply unfair. When a couple says, ''I do,'' they are not agreeing to higher taxes. When a couple gets married, they receive a number of nice presents, China, silverware, linens, appliances. But guess what they get from the IRS? A bill for an average of $1,400 in taxes.

Last year, 28 million Americans were subjected to this unfair, higher tax. For most families $1,400 means a down payment on a house or a car, tuition for in-state college, several months' worth of quality child care, or a home computer to help their children with their schoolwork.

Madam speaker, it makes common sense to end the unfair marriage tax penalty. That is why the House of Representatives is making marriage tax reform our first order of business this year.

Tomorrow the Committee on Ways and Means, a committee on which I serve, will consider a bill to provide married couples with relief from the marriage tax penalty. This bill increases the standard deduction for married couples to twice that of singles, beginning next year. It also provides up to $1,400 in relief to couples who itemize their taxes.

I am pleased that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, have made the commitment to consider this important legislation as one of the first orders of business this year.

Madam Speaker, we have an opportunity this year to do the right thing for middle-class families. We can give them more control over their own hard-earned money. We have a chance to help working women and lower-income couples with children who are unfairly affected by the marriage tax penalty. We have an opportunity to allow common sense to prevail and to provide relief from the marriage tax penalty.

I would also like to take this moment to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) for his leadership on ending the marriage tax penalty. He has truly been dedicated to correcting this tax policy and to easing the tax burden for married couples.

Madam Speaker, a few details on what the marriage tax penalty would do. Our bill provides $182.3 billion in tax relief over 10 years for more than 50 million Americans.

President Clinton, who vetoed the marriage penalty last year, recently proposed a smaller marriage penalty proposal that provides only $45 billion in relief over 10 years. Our plan, the Republican plan, provides working couples with four times more marriage penalty tax relief than the President has proposed. But I do want to thank the President for recognizing this as a problem and becoming involved in this very important issue.

Our current Tax Code punishes working couples by pushing them into higher tax brackets. The marriage penalty