

Pakistan in building a sophisticated nuclear arsenal. Unfortunately, this arsenal is not subject to international inspection.

In fact, the administration continues to look the other way as China continues to exploit technology and ballistic and missile components to Pakistan. I would like to remind my colleagues that Pakistan is not a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency and bans investigators from several of its nuclear facilities.

Mr. Speaker, why is the administration willing to grant certification? Eight days ago, the Chinese Prime Minister signed regulations that would limit the export of nuclear technology. Is the administration satisfied that 8 days is the sufficient amount of time to show China's commitment to change its practices for the last 12 years? I certainly do not think so.

Nuclear proliferation experts are concerned as to whether the Chinese Government even has the ability or is willing to enforce these regulations.

Mr. Speaker, United States officials have expressed concern that the upcoming China-United States summit, which is supposed to take place later this month, would be a failure if there is not some positive development in our trade relations. And this is particularly true since the process of including China in the World Trade Organization may not be completed by the time of the summit.

The idea, from what I can gather, is that the U.S. certification regard to nuclear technology exports would somehow salvage the summit. But this, I would submit, is the wrong reason for granting certification.

Is the upcoming summit so important, Mr. Speaker, essentially, that we, as Members of this body, should be willing to compromise the United States position on nuclear proliferation and grant China this certification? I do not think so. I think that is an inappropriate way to proceed.

Members of this body have supported and at times insisted that China receive United States peaceful nuclear technology only if China halts all nuclear exports to nations with unregulated nuclear facilities. Earlier this year, a letter was sent to President Clinton by Members of Congress stating that China has not earned or behaved in a manner which warrants such certification.

Mr. Speaker, basically, I am asking, and I hope that many of my colleagues will insist, that the administration change its mind and not grant the certification to China. I am not willing to compromise the United States position on nuclear proliferation simply to appease the Chinese Government in this upcoming Sino-United States summit. I think it is the wrong way to proceed, and hopefully many of us in Congress will continue to insist that we not proceed in that direction.

#### U.S. DOES NOT FUND ABORTIONS WITH TAXPAYER DOLLARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, the House cast a very important vote today on a motion to instruct on the foreign operations bill, a motion to instruct the conferees not to recede from the language which was inserted in the amendment on the House floor on that bill, language which says simply that when in that bill we spend money for population control abroad, that money cannot be spent or given to organizations that procure or counsel abortions.

Now, it seems to me the basic issue with this kind of language is as follows: We do not fund abortions here in the United States with taxpayer dollars. We certainly should not use taxpayer dollars to fund abortions abroad. There are two very important reasons for this.

In the first place, whatever our divisions may be on this very contentious issue, we all basically accept, a vast majority of people in this country accept, that our public policy should, at minimum, discourage abortion. The vast majority of the people believe it is an evil even if there are many people who believe it is a necessary evil.

If we say something is an evil, we do not subsidize it, we do not spend the taxpayer dollars on it. We may believe very passionately it should not be outlawed, but that does not mean we want to encourage people to do it. That is the policy we follow here within the borders of the United States. We should follow a policy at least no less vigorous with regard to the money that we send abroad.

There is another issue. There are millions of Americans, and I am one of them, who believe as a deep matter of conscience that abortion is wrong, that if anything is wrong, abortion is wrong. Out of respect for them, as well as because we want to discourage that practice, we do not take their money which they pay in taxes to support their Government and use it to fund abortions here in our borders in the United States. Out of a similar respect for them, we should not take their money and spend it on abortions in other countries.

It was a very important vote. I was very pleased that the House, by a margin that was actually larger than the one which the House originally adopted this language called the Mexico City language, The House instructed its conferees not to recede from it.

One other point that I want to make with regard to this, Mr. Speaker, it is an important one, and it is one I think we may actually have some agreement on. Everyone here is concerned that we not stall the whole foreign operations bill because of this dispute, as important as it is, that only relates to a particular part of it.

I could not agree more. We should not hold up the whole foreign operations bill because the House and the Senate cannot agree on this language. I do not know why the Senate will not at least try to pass the bill over in the Senate with language saying, we do not fund abortions here, we are not going to fund it abroad. If that is their position, we ought not to let the whole bill go down because of that.

It is very simple to prevent that from happening, whether it is simply resolved in the conference committee that this measure is going to be worked out in a separate bill on the authorization bill. And at that point, we can free up the rest of the foreign operations bill, the aid to Israel, the other things that are important, and pass that.

That is the position I hope the House continues to take, Mr. Speaker, first of all, that we do not use taxpayer dollars to fund abortions here in the United States. We are certainly not going to do so abroad. We understand that the Senate and others have sincere and deep disagreements about that. We are not going to let those disagreements hold up the foreign operations bill.

None of us are going to go have to recede from positions that we hold as a matter of honor. We will simply agree we will not hold up that bill, we will fight it out in another venue. That is the position I hope the House takes. I think it was a courageous vote today, Mr. Speaker. I hope we continue it in the weeks ahead as we work toward the adjournment.

#### TRIBUTE TO WADE STEVENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my remarks tonight to the Stevens family of Bay St. Louis, MS, Sue Stevens, but in particular Eric and Laura Stevens, two young people who lost their dad recently.

I can only imagine how horrible it is for a child to lose their mom and dad. And I know that nothing I can say or do can lessen your sorrow. But I want you to know and I want the people of our Nation to know that I think your dad was a hero.

□ 2230

For his courage and his compassion and his unselfishness, he should be, and he will be, remembered.

Just a few weeks ago, Eric and Laura's dad was diagnosed with an aneurysm in his brain and he was told that he required surgery to correct it. Their dad, Wade Stevens, told a coworker, Deb Sellier, that should things go bad that he wanted her husband to have his heart. Deb's husband, Dave Sellier, is a retired St. Louis policeman who was medically retired because of a heart condition a few years back. He has

been on a waiting list for an organ transplant since March of 1996.

Wade died during surgery. At the time of his death he was 44 years old. I feel very fortunate to have known him for 20 of those years. He was a loving father and husband, active in his church and in his community. He leaves behind his wife Susan and two children, Eric and Laura, and my prayers are with him and his family.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to somebody I think is a hero, my good friend, Wade Stevens. On behalf of his many friends, I wish to extend my deepest condolences. He will be missed and remembered by all.

#### THE MARRIAGE TAX ELIMINATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLUNT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, let me say, first of all, that one of my predecessors in this district, serving this district in the Congress, was another Gene Taylor, and I am honored to be able to follow the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAYLOR] on the floor tonight and recognize really the commitment that so many of our Members have to families, not only their own family but families in their district.

I want to talk for a few minutes about families when it comes to paying taxes. We need to repeal the marriage penalty, the marriage tax that penalizes 21 million American couples.

Few couples of course decide to marry based on their tax burden, but every couple understands the tax implications on April 15. On a web site that those of us who are sponsoring the repeal of the marriage penalty have established, we have gotten many letters from married folks who are concerned about that.

Sean McGowan from Jefferson City, MO, writes, "I think the marriage penalty is a major cause of the breakdown of the family here in the United States. Your bill would do a lot to cut down on the incidence of cohabitation by unmarried couples and give more children two-parent families where there is a real commitment between the parents."

Mark Wyckoff from Baldwin, MO, writes, "My wife and I have been truly among those hardest hit by the marriage penalty. In my position as a physical therapist, I have been fortunate enough to benefit from a well-paying, high-demand occupation. In the 4 years we have been married, we have had one refund, our first, mainly because of taxes taken out based on a full year's salary when each of us worked only part of the year. Since the 1993 tax year, we have paid out an additional \$8,868 as a well-earning, rich if you adopt the standards of the current administration, married, no dependents, no real property holding couple,"

and they pay a penalty because of what happens in the Tax Code. It is really another hidden tax, one of those kinds of taxes that Washington is famous for imposing.

Current law punishes many married couples who file jointly by pushing them into higher tax brackets. It takes the income of the family's second wage-earner, often the woman's salary, at a much higher rate than if the salary had been earned at the individual rate. For many couples where both the husband and wife work, the second income becomes used simply to pay the IRS. That makes the marriage tax a penalty for working women.

For example, an individual with an income of \$24,000 would be taxed at 15 percent. A working couple with incomes of \$24,000 each would be taxed at 28 percent, a significant increase on the tax burden of \$600 in new taxes simply because they are married, simply because they are forced into a higher tax bracket by filing a joint return.

In another case, a couple where one spouse earns \$75,000 a year while the other has no income, they pay \$3,872 less in income taxes than if they were single. Compare that to a husband and wife who each make \$37,500, a combined income of \$75,000, and they pay \$1,391 more in taxes simply because they are married. Mr. Speaker, \$1,391 or \$600 are no small penalties. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the average penalty for a married couple is \$1,400 a year.

What would a family do for \$125 of additional income each month? What would they do with \$125 of additional income each month as well? That is equal to half a year's car payments on the average car payment. It could be used to secure a down payment for the first home or to pay tuition.

For the Federal Government, it is an annual \$30 billion plum and it is a plum that we need to give up. We need to give up that \$30 billion; we need to eliminate the marriage penalty. We need to go back to a tax law that really honors marriage, does not penalize marriage.

The Marriage Tax Elimination Act of 1997 that I am cosponsoring eliminates the marriage tax. It allows couples to choose which method would be to their advantage in filing their taxes, whether the single taxpayer method or the married taxpayer method for a joint return would be the best thing for them to do.

The elimination of the marriage tax also fills a void left over from the tax relief package of 1997. We have directed tax cuts for families with children; we have broadened the scope of tax relief, and in 1998 we could broaden the scope of tax relief to include all married couples with the elimination of the marriage tax penalty.

Washington should take every opportunity to help families stay together. Many times that means bringing home an income that provides them with time together, time to share values,

and time to share experiences. This is the next logical step in the 1997 tax relief that we have given to families. We now need to give it to married couples by eliminating the marriage penalty, Mr. Speaker.

#### TRIBUTE TO HENRY B. GONZALEZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] is recognized for one-fourth of the time remaining before midnight as the first designee of the minority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, if I may, before I begin my remarks, I would like to request unanimous consent for all Members who speak on this particular special order to have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our distinguished colleagues who are here at this late hour here in Washington, DC, those who are from the Texas delegation, those who may have served with the individual we are here to honor by serving on the same committee, or those who just happen to know this individual and consider him a great friend and an honorable American. I would like to say to all of those folks from that committee, from that State, from this House, thank you for joining me and other Members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus as we pay tribute to the dean of the Hispanic Caucus, the dean of the Texas Democratic Delegation, in fact, the Texas Delegation, period; and the former chairman and now ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ.

Mr. Speaker, after 36 years of dedicated service to his constituents in Texas, the Hispanic community and the Nation, Dean GONZALEZ has announced that he will soon resign from the Congress.

Dean GONZALEZ was one of five founding members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus back in December of 1976. This is just one of the reasons why I am so pleased that we could pay this tribute to him during the month of October, a month that this country has celebrated as Hispanic Heritage Month for quite some time.

This special order is a particularly fitting forum in which to pay tribute to HENRY B. GONZALEZ, because Dean GONZALEZ, as we all know, has made effective use of this particular format, the special orders, in his 36 years in Congress. In fact, before the House rules on special orders were changed in the 103rd and 104th Congresses, Dean GONZALEZ had a standing request for 60 minutes each day to speak out on matters of concern to him.