

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	Landriau	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 Vogele, 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