

Fattah	McIntosh	Sununu
Franks (NJ)	Meeks (NY)	Sweeney
Gilchrest	Miller, George	Towns
Goodlatte	Murtha	Vento
Hayes	Owens	Walden
Hinchev	Price (NC)	Watts (OK)
Kasich	Ryun (KS)	Weiner
Klink	Sanders	Weygand
Lazio	Schaffer	Young (AK)
Martinez	Serrano	
McCollum	Sherwood	

□ 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 penalty 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 ex-

pected 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 penalty, we will find plus \$200 billion that does not even relate to the problem that we are addressing. The same thing was true when they tried to do something with the estate tax. No, my