

much needed assistance towards the Territories.

There are many other programs, and we will discuss this as we go along, but the IGIA meeting early next month is the perfect vehicle through which to craft and review policy initiatives which will bring prosperity to those American communities which are offshore and have a very different relationship to Washington, D.C. than most Americans.

I call upon the administration to work with the representatives of the Territories here in Washington and the chief executives of the respective territories to craft a new economic policy which will make sure that no child in Pago Pago goes without the educational life chances that children in the U.S. mainland have, that no family in St. Croix or St. Thomas will not have the same access to health care that Americans everywhere deserve, and that bread winners in Hagatna, Guam, do not have to leave their homeland and travel 6,000 miles to find a decent job.

#### ENACT H.R. 6, MARRIAGE TAX ELIMINATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, over the last several years, many of us have been asking a question that we hear time and time again back home. I have the privilege of representing the south side of Chicago and the south suburbs, communities like Joliet and Lansing and Morris and rural communities like Tonica and elsewhere; and they often ask me a pretty basic question. That question is, as we talk about taxes, they say, why? Why do married working couples, a husband and wife who are both in the workforce, why do they pay higher taxes when they get married? They ask, is it right, is it fair that under our Tax Code, married working couples pay higher taxes? On average, 25 million married working couples pay, on average, \$1,400 more in higher taxes than identical couples who choose not to get married, but live together outside of marriage. That is not right.

The folks back home tell me that it is time that those of us here in Washington should do something about it, that we should work to eliminate what has been called the marriage tax penalty. Mr. Speaker, \$1,400, the average marriage tax penalty, is a lot of money back home in Illinois. Mr. Speaker, \$1,400 is one year's tuition for a nursing student at Joliet Junior College, our local community college; it is three months of day care for a working mom and dad with children. It is almost 4,000 diapers for a family with a newborn child.

It is real money for real people; and there are, of course, some here in

Washington who say they would much rather spend that money here in Washington than bring about tax fairness by eliminating the marriage tax penalty.

Well, I am proud to say this House is doing something about the marriage tax penalty. Last year we passed and sent legislation to the President which would have wiped out the marriage tax penalty for over 25 million couples; and unfortunately, President Clinton and Vice President Gore vetoed that bill. They had a lot of excuses. They wanted to spend that money. But this year, there is no excuse. We have Valentine's Day approaching, and what better gift to give 25 million married working couples who suffer the marriage tax penalty than to pass legislation wiping out the marriage tax penalty.

This Thursday, we will be considering in the House legislation approved by the Committee on Ways and Means, H.R. 6, the Marriage Tax Elimination Act, which I am proud to say now has 236 cosponsors, including almost 30 Democrats who have joined with us in our effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. We help real people.

Let me introduce a couple here. This couple here, Shad and Michelle Hallihan of Joliet, Illinois, two public school teachers in Joliet, Illinois. They happen to make about \$60,000 in combined income from their two teaching salaries, and Shad and Michelle suffer almost the average marriage tax penalty.

Well, under the legislation that the House is going to be considering this week, Shad and Michelle will benefit, because two public school teachers who chose to get married who now suffer the marriage tax penalty will essentially have their marriage tax penalty wiped out. Michelle told me the other day, she says, Congressman, tell your friends in the Congress, particularly those who believe it is not a good idea to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, what wiping out the marriage tax penalty would mean for them.

They say \$1,000, which is essentially the marriage tax penalty, would buy 3,000 diapers for their newborn baby. That is money that is currently going to Washington that they could use to take care of their child. Frankly, if we want to be fair, it is their money. We should eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

This Thursday, H.R. 6, the Marriage Tax Elimination Act, will help couples like Shad and Michele Hallihan. We do it in several ways. We double the standard deduction. One-half of married couples do not itemize their taxes; they use the standard deduction, so we double it for joint filers. The marriage penalty is created when a married couple of course get married, they file their taxes jointly, their combined income usually pushes them into a higher tax bracket. That is what pushes Shad and Michelle into the 28 percent bracket.

What we want to do, of course, is for the nonitemizers, which is about half

of the married couples who suffer the marriage penalty, to double the standard deduction for joint filers to make it twice that of singles. For those who itemize, who are the other half of married couples who suffer the marriage tax penalty, those who itemize are homeowners. The average middle-class family itemizes their taxes because they own a home. We want to help them and provide marriage tax relief as well. So we widen the 15 percent bracket, the basic tax bracket that every one of us pays. We are all in the 15 percent bracket, regardless of our income, for the lowest bottom bracket of our income. By widening the bracket so that joint filers, married couples, can earn twice as much as a single filer and be in that same bracket, we help those who itemize.

We also help the working poor. There is a marriage penalty for the earned income credit, and we provide tax relief for them.

This Thursday, let us have an overwhelming bipartisan majority. Let us work together. Let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty. There are no excuses. We want to be fair. Eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

#### EXTREMISM, RACISM AND XENO- PHOBIA SWEEPING AUSTRIA: HOUSE RESOLUTION 417

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, last week I called the attention of my colleagues to the rise of neofascism in Austria. The deed is now done. The extremist, racist, xenophobic FPÖ party has entered the Government of Austria. I want to thank all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have joined me in supporting this resolution expressing our regret and dismay.

Joerg Haider, the leader of this party, had ample praise for Adolf Hitler and for SS veterans whom he described as "decent people with character who stuck to their beliefs."

I want to commend the European Union, all 14 nations, which have chosen to downgrade their diplomatic relations with Austria. I want to commend our own State Department for recalling our Ambassador to Austria and for promising to watch developments carefully.

At a time, Mr. Speaker, when the European Union, the United States, and other democratic nations are working actively to discourage ethnic hatred in the republics of the former Yugoslavia and elsewhere, Joerg Haider and his neofascist allies are appealing to racist sentiment and xenophobia. Haider learned this lesson early on. His father joined the Nazi Party in 1929. His mother was an active and enthusiastic Nazi Party member as a teacher. Haider has surely learned the lesson well.

We recognize the right of the Austrian people to elect anybody they choose. However, we reserve the right to express our views when people elect Communist totalitarian regimes or Fascist totalitarian regimes.

We are not there yet. This extremist xenophobic, far right-wing political party is only one of two parties of the Austrian coalition, and we will follow their activities with great care. They have made many commendable promises; but we will have to see how—in the unfolding of Austrian policy, domestic and international—these high-sounding promises are implemented.

The leaders of the European Union, all 14 nations, as well as other nations outside the European Union like Canada, Israel, and Norway, have expressed their deep concern about the new Government of Austria. One of the concerns that I shared in looking at this new far right-wing regime is the impact it is having in legitimatizing anti-democratic, racist forces in other countries of Europe.

This is an awful way to begin the 21st century. Therefore, we need to engage in a voluntary ban against tourism to Austria, the purchase of Austrian products, the use of Austrian airlines, and investments in that country. People need to understand that elections have consequences; and when 27 percent of the Austrian electorate chooses to support an extremist who has made complimentary remarks about Adolf Hitler and who has repeatedly expressed the most obnoxious, racist and xenophobic sentiments, the American people and the people of other civilized countries must respond.

We hope that this government will be better than the past record of Haider's party. There is always an opportunity for change, for reformation, for learning lessons. I call on all of my colleagues and I call on our administration to watch with the utmost care the actions of the new Austrian Government. It is important for us to realize that Adolf Hitler was voted into power, and the fact that people come to power through elections says nothing about their values. Democracy is not just elections; it is the sharing of a set of values of free and open societies.

I call on all of my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this resolution so it can be the voice of the Congress in expressing our concern over political trends in Austria.

#### SUPPORT H. RES. 414 FOR STEM CELL MEDICAL RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. MORELLA) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, last week I joined with my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), in the introduction of H. Res. 414 to allow Federal

funding of pluripotent stem cell research to help us further understand Parkinson's, cancer, blindness, AIDS, Alzheimer's, diabetes, Muscular Dystrophy, Sickle-Cell Anemia, brain and spinal cord injuries, heart, lung, kidney and liver diseases, strokes, Lou Gehrig's Disease, birth defects, and other life-threatening diseases and disabilities.

House Resolution 414 does not request a specific amount of money, nor does it direct disease-specific research. It simply asks that Federal money be allowed to be utilized for the next best chance science has, not only to treat, but to cure, debilitating and life-threatening illnesses that afflict millions of Americans.

Many people have confused pluripotent stem cell research with human embryo research. Stem cells are not embryos. In fact, there is a ban on the use of Federal funds for human embryo research in the United States. Pluripotent stem cells cannot develop into complete human beings; and, therefore, under the law, they are not embryos.

Pluripotent stem cells are the type of cell that can be turned into almost any type of cell or tissue in the body. The medical community estimates that human pluripotent stem cell research makes it a very real possibility that Parkinson's Disease will be cured within 5 years. The American Cancer Society strongly supports pluripotent stem research. In fact, cancer research has shown that injections of stem cells could revive the immune response of patients undergoing bone marrow transplants. With stem cell technology, transplantation of human retinal tissue may be the cure for blinding retinal degenerative diseases which affect more than 6 million Americans.

Stem cell research holds the key; it holds the key to solve the problem of the body's reaction to foreign tissue, resulting in dramatic improvements in the treatment of a number of life-threatening conditions such as burns and kidney failure for which transplantation is currently used.

While the potential medical benefits of pluripotent stem cell technology are unprecedented, the National Institutes of Health has proposed guidelines outlining that this area of research must be conducted in accordance with strict ethical standards.

□ 1300

NIH understands the ethical, legal, and social issues relevant to human pluripotent stem cell research and is sensitive to the need to subject it to oversight that is more stringent than that associated with the traditional NIH scientific peer review process.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, Federal funding would bring with it a level of oversight that will not be present if the work remains the sole province of the private sector.

Finally, the American people support stem cell research, as shown by a na-

tionwide survey conducted by Opinion Research Corporation International last year. They found that 74 percent of those polled favored funding of stem cell research by NIH.

Federal funds are crucial to allow scientists to proceed with stem cell research, which offers hope to more than 100 million Americans who suffer from a myriad of deadly and debilitating diseases.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to urge my colleagues to support medical research in the search to find the cure for life-threatening disease and disability. I ask them to cosponsor House Resolution 414.

#### PAKISTAN'S PATTERN OF SPONSORING TERRORISM, PROVOKING CRISIS IN KASHMIR, AND THREATENING DESTABILIZATION OF REGION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the latest episode in a troubling, ongoing pattern by the military regime in Pakistan to provoke a crisis in Kashmir and to essentially pick a fight with India with results that could be destabilizing and devastating to the entire region and the entire world.

The Pakistani government, a military junta that overthrew the civilian government in a coup last October, declared last Saturday, February 5, Kashmir Solidarity Day. Pakistan's military strongman leader, General Musharraf, visited the Pakistani-administered area of Kashmir and encouraged the terrorist forces there to continue their Jihad in the Indian states of Jammu and Kashmir.

That same evening, according to an account from the Indo-American Kashmir Forum, a band of gun-wielding terrorists sought out Kashmiri Pandits or Hindus in the village of Telwani and opened fire on two families belonging to the minority Hindu community. Three Pandits, including a 9-year-old girl, were killed and many others were injured.

Mr. Speaker, this is the true face of the so-called liberation campaign being waged by so-called freedom fighters for years in Kashmir. It is a violent terrorist campaign, pure and simple. Now Pakistan's support for this violent campaign has been laid bare for all the world to see.

Pakistan has always acknowledged its political and moral support for the insurgency in Kashmir, but evidence clearly shows that Pakistan's support runs much deeper. Now General Musharraf has spelled it out. He publicly pledged his support for the terrorist groups fighting in India's state of Jammu and Kashmir.

He was quoted in news accounts saying, "All heads rise with pride when we