

Zachary, is only able to see objects that are held close to his face. He's been that way since he was an infant, when his father, Brenda's first husband, accidentally dropped the child during a bath. Zachary's head hit the side of the tub, which damaged his brain and ruptured his retinas.

The accident almost killed the child, and doctors warned Brenda that if Zachary lived he'd never be able to see or walk or talk. He survived, despite seizures in the hospital, and when the Warners got married, Kurt adopted the boy, and his sister, Jesse, 8.

"To go home and see how he struggles with everything he does helps me keep things in perspective," Warner said. "I have realized how special a child he must be to go through life with the excitement and joy he has even though he has to struggle doing everything he does."

So that is the Kurt Warner story. It's difficult not to pull for a guy like him.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I begin by congratulating my very good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) for his very thoughtful special order. Representing Los Angeles, the former home of the Rams, I would like to extend hearty congratulations to Kurt Warner and Dick Vermeil and all associated with the Rams organization for their very impressive and exciting victory towards the end yesterday.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1838, TAIWAN SECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-490) on the resolution (H. Res. 408) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1838) to assist in the enhancement of the security of Taiwan, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO PROMOTE PIPELINE SAFETY

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 1999, a liquid gasoline pipeline owned by the Olympic Pipeline Company ruptured and spilled over 200,000 gallons of gasoline at Whatcom Falls Park, a 241-acre park in my district in the city of Bellingham. Gasoline was carried into Whatcom Creek, where it reportedly filled the creek at depths of up to 10 feet.

The spilled fuel was inadvertently ignited by two 10-year-old boys, Wade King and Stephen Tsiorvas, who were playing with bottle rockets at the creek. The resulting fireball raced down the length of the creek for a mile and a half, killing King, Tsiorvas, and an 18-year-old fly fisherman named Liam Wood. Swaths as wide as 200 feet along the creek were burned within minutes.

The explosion of June 10 caused millions of dollars in property damage and did immeasurable harm to the families and friends of Wade King, Stephen Tsiorvas, and Liam Wood.

I have long held reservations about our system of pipeline safety regulations. In 1996, I voted against the pipeline deregulation bill because I felt it removed too many essential safeguards. Since the tragedy, I have redoubled my efforts to improve the regulatory climate.

I have been in close contact with industry, public interest groups, local officials, Federal regulators, and constituents.

□ 1900

The bill that I have introduced today addresses several concerns. Under my legislation, number one, pipelines will be required to be inspected both internally and with hydrostatic tests. Pipelines with a history of leaks will be specifically targeted for more strenuous testing. All pipeline operators will be tested for qualifications and certified by the Department of Transportation.

The results of pipeline tests and inspections will be made available to the public and a nationwide map of all pipeline locations will be placed on the Internet where ordinary citizens can easily access it. All pipeline ruptures and spills of more than 40 gallons will be reported to the Federal Office of Pipeline Safety. And States will be able to set up their own pipeline safety programs for interstate pipelines.

In addition, the bill requires studies on various technologies that may improve safety such as external leak detection systems and double-walled pipelines.

The bill has already bipartisan support. My distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Washington (Ms. DUNN), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) have agreed to cosponsor; and I thank them very much for that.

Mr. Speaker, we hope to move this legislation through Congress and I hope the rest of my colleagues can join with me in support of this bipartisan proposal.

CBO COST ESTIMATE ON H.R. 1838, TAIWAN SECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, set forth below is the cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office on H.R. 1838, the "Taiwan Security Enhancement Act." This estimate was not available on October 28, 1999, when the Committee on International Relations filed its report on H.R. 1838.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE—H.R. 1838, TAIWAN SECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT

H.R. 1838 would emphasize the security relationship between the United States and Taiwan. Specifically, the bill would authorize an increase in the technical staff at the American Institute in Taiwan, and would require the Administration to report on Taiwan's defense needs, its security situation, and the United States' ability to respond to contingencies in the Asia-Pacific region. Also, the bill would require the Administration to enhance the opportunities for training and exchanges of Taiwanese officers at U.S. military schools and academies. CBO estimates that enacting the bill would have no significant budgetary effect.

According to the Department of Defense (DoD), implementing H.R. 1838 would not require any additional staff because DoD has already increased the number of technical staff at the American Institute in Taiwan during the last year. CBO estimates that preparing the required reports would not increase costs significantly, and any additional officer training and exchanges would be paid in full by Taiwan. The funds for training and exchanges would flow through the foreign military sales trust fund—a direct spending account. Because the bill could affect direct spending, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply; however, CBO estimates that the net effect of any increase in collections and outlays would not be significant.

H.R. 1838 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

The estimate was prepared by Joseph C. Whitehill. The estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES SHOULD RAISE CAMPAIGNS TO HIGHER LEVEL OF TRUTHFULNESS

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I know many Americans and also an awful lot of people in Washington, D.C., are focusing intently on what is going on in New Hampshire, not only tonight but over the past several weeks. We are obviously in the midst of a presidential primary season. It is very exciting to watch the democratic process playing itself out seeing who is going to be elected the next President of this great republic.

It has not been too surprising to see the differences between the Republican and the Democratic Party. The Republicans obviously have five or six conservative candidates whose fight mainly centers around who wants to cut taxes more, who wants to cut the size and scope of this mammoth bureaucracy, who wants to spend less and promote greater freedoms for individuals across the country.

Likewise, it is not a surprise that the Democratic primary has been consumed by battles, a left-wing battle for

those swinging wildly for the most extreme elements of the Democratic left, whether it be in Iowa or New Hampshire.

They are fighting for bigger government. They are fighting for higher taxes, fighting for Federal funding of abortion on demand, not only here but also across the globe, and they are also fighting for socializing medicine, the same schemes that were rejected in 1994 by Americans.

Now, that is also not a surprise to most observers. But what is surprising, I think, to many observers have been the exploits of the Democratic front runner, ALBERT GORE. I say it is surprising because he has shown a remarkable disregard for telling the truth in his campaign battle against Senator Bradley.

In the USA Today today, Walter Shapiro, who is a regular columnist who writes "Hype and Glory," wrote this:

"To tell the truth, Al Gore is having trouble out there. There he goes again. Al Gore simply can't help himself. With his veracity challenged by Bill Bradley and questioned in recent news stories, Gore might have been expected to use his major campaign event Sunday to end the final weekend before the New Hampshire primary on a high note. Instead, the Vice President, stretching truth as if he were competing in a taffy pull, went after Bradley with the kind of rhetorical overkill that made . . . Ted Kennedy standing next to Gore seem like Caspar Milquetoast."

"Speaking to both passionate supporters and still-wavering undecided voters, Gore dispensed with any pretense of subtlety in his new super-hero role . . . Gore used the word 'fight' . . . 44 times in roughly a 20-minute speech . . . But what was the most stunning about the Gore speech was not the Rocky imagery, but unabashed and unashamed mendacity."

Shapiro goes on to say, "Remember, Gore is the same candidate who insisted in Wednesday night's debate that, 'There has never been a time in this campaign that I have said something that I know to be untrue.'" Shapiro went on to say either GORE, "in both his Gingrich and abortion comments, enjoys a very permissive definition of 'untrue' or else his judgment is highly suspect if he actually believes his own over-the-top claims."

And I am quoting still from Shapiro in USA Today: "The Boston Globe disclosed Friday that during Gore's stuttering presidential campaign in 1988, his press secretary . . . warned the candidate in a memo, 'Your main pitfall is exaggeration.' This character flaw, this relentless willingness to prevaricate and demonize his opponents, might have been barely excusable in a young Senator making a premature run for the White House. But," in the words of Shapiro, "it is deeply troubling in a

senior statesman who has served two terms as Vice President."

Walter Shapiro concludes by talking about how Bill Bradley has been trying to elevate the Democratic primary, whether one agrees with some of the most liberal tenets in his platform or not. "But if politics is ever again to become a higher moral calling than, say, commodities trading or running a talent agency in Hollywood, then candidates must be held responsible for the tenor and the truthfulness of their campaigns. And that means you, Mr. Vice President."

Mr. Speaker, I have got to say, I was struck not only by the timing of this article, because I was absolutely stunned yesterday when AL GORE, campaigning in New Hampshire, criticized Bill Bradley for injecting Willie Horton into the New Hampshire primary, when all Mr. Bradley was saying was that it was Mr. GORE and not George Bush who injected Willie Horton into the campaign in 1988. And so then the Vice President turns around and attacks Bill Bradley for telling the American people who first introduced Americans to Willie Horton.

Likewise, he criticized Mr. Bradley for hurting the pro-choice movement for pointing out the fact that Mr. GORE has been extraordinarily inconsistent on the issue of pro-choice. I certainly hope that he and all other candidates, Republicans and Democrats, can raise this campaign to a higher level.

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, this is a great opportunity this evening to talk about an issue that many of us have raised in this Congress over the last several years. That is an issue that really is a fundamental issue of fairness, an issue of fairness that the American people have been asking some pretty basic questions about over the last several years.

I represent the south side of Chicago, the south suburbs in Cook and Will Counties, as well as bedroom communities and farm communities in Illinois. And I found, whether I was in the steel workers union hall in Hegwisch or a neighborhood in Chicago or at the local legion post in Joliet or the local grain elevator in Tonica, people often ask a basic question: Is it right, is it fair that under our Tax Code that the average married working couple pays higher taxes just because they are married? They say why do the folks in Washington allow a Tax Code to be in place that tells us that if we choose to get married and work, we are going to pay more in taxes?

Mr. Speaker, they are stunned when they learn that 28 million married working couples pay an average \$1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married.

Clearly, the marriage tax penalty suffered by working married people is fundamentally wrong and something we should change. I am so pleased that the leadership of this House, the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), has made reduction and elimination of the marriage tax penalty the first priority this year. First out of the box and on a fast track as a tax-related initiative to help middle-class families.

The marriage tax penalty has been in place for almost 30 years, and no one has gone back to fix it. I am pleased this Republican Congress has made a decision to bring fairness to the Tax Code by working to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

The marriage tax penalty is something that affects real people. I have a photo here of a young couple from Joliet, Illinois, Shad and Michelle Hallihan, two school teachers. They teach in the local public schools in Joliet. Shad and Michelle suffer a marriage tax penalty of almost a thousand dollars because they are married. They recently had a child, a baby. And as Michelle Hallihan pointed out to me, she said that \$1,000 the marriage tax penalty that they suffer, that is 3,000 diapers that they can buy for their child that goes to Uncle Sam instead of taking care of their child. It is real money.

Mr. Speaker, \$1,400 in Joliet, Illinois, where Shad and Michelle live is one year's tuition at Joliet Community College, and it is 3 months of day care at a local day care center.

Let me explain how it came about. Our Tax Code has grown more complicated and since the late 1960s, married working couples, moms and dads, husbands and wives with two incomes have paid higher taxes just because they are married. Of course, we have made this a priority, and I would like to announce, of course, this Wednesday, the Committee on Ways and Means is going to be marking up, committee action will occur on legislation essentially to wipe out the marriage tax penalty for almost 28 million married work couples. A real change that is going to help people.

Mr. Speaker, this is how the marriage tax penalty works. Take a machinist and a school teacher in the south suburbs of Chicago. They have identical incomes. This machinist is making \$31,500 as a single person. Under our Tax Code, he is going to be taxed at 15 percent rate. So he meets a school teacher, a gal with an identical income of \$31,500, and they choose to get married. And at the point they choose to get married, they begin filing their taxes jointly.