

households—would see their capital gains rates drop by several percentage points. The bill is expected to impose modest capital gains tax increases on some of the 1½ million wealthiest taxpayers in the country—those households with incomes of more than \$200,000 per year—but it is my under-

standing that even many of these taxpayers would receive modest tax reductions under this bill. This is not a big price to pay for eliminating some of the extraordinary complexity from the tax code.

Many of my Democratic colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee—

including Representatives RANGEL, STARK, MATSUI, KENNELLY, McDERMOTT, LEWIS, NEAL, and BECERRA—are original cosponsors of this legislation. I urge my other colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this capital gains simplification bill.

CHANGES IN CAPITAL GAINS TAX RATES UNDER THE CAPITAL GAIN TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 1998

Rate bracket (Number of taxpayers in bracket)	Rate under current law			Rate under proposed legislation
	Assets held more than 18 months and not collectibles or recapture gain	Real estate depreciation recapture gain	Collectibles and assets held at least 12 months but less than 18 months	All capital assets held more than 12 months
15 percent (61.58 million)	10	15	15	9.0
28 percent (24.0 million)	20	25	28	16.8
31 percent (2.3 million)	20	25	28	18.6
36 percent (1.0 million)	20	25	28	21.6
39.6 percent (0.5 million)	20	25	28	23.8

More than 100 million individual tax returns are filed each year. Of those 100 million returns, 14 million include capital gains income. Under this legislation: approximately 11.3 million of those individual filers with capital gains would get a tax reduction, approximately 2 million would see essentially no change in their taxes, and approximately 700,000 of those filers—filers with incomes over \$200,000—would see modest increases.

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

(Mr. TIAHRT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. BONIOR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. GIBBONS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE WORLD LOST A GREAT LEADER ON THE PASSING OF BELLA ABZUG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on the last day of Women's History Month, the world lost a great leader in Bella Abzug. Tears are being shed today, not just in the United States but around the world, because Bella's vision was not confined to one issue or to one nation.

Bella Abzug was the original feminist, an icon in the women's movement here and around the world. But she worked for more than a constituency or an interest group, or even a movement. She will be remembered for her hats but, more importantly, for what was under her hat: her brains, her voice, and her heart.

I am deeply indebted to Bella, and I know many women who feel the same way. I also know that there are women today who may not feel that Bella's loss has any connection to them. But I

want to remind them about the rights Bella fought for and won on their behalf, rights so many of us now take for granted, or forget that women ever had to fight for them in the first place.

Make no mistake, there is not an American woman alive who does not have more rights, commands more respect, or enjoys more opportunity as a result of Bella's work. Because of Bella Abzug, women today stand a little taller, walk a little prouder, and accept nothing less than they deserve.

Bella broke through barriers, shattered glass ceilings, and woke people up. Even in her final years, when she was confined to a wheelchair, no woman stood taller in the fight for women's rights than Bella Abzug. Bella was a pioneer in so many forums: as a legislator, peace activist, labor lawyer, lecturer, news commentator, civil liberties advocate, and the first person to be elected to Congress on a platform of women's rights and peace.

She cofounded the National Women's Political Caucus, coauthored the Freedom of Information and Privacy Acts, cast one of the first votes for the Equal Rights Amendment, presided over the Women's Congress for a Healthy Planet, and cofounded the Women's Environment and Development Organization.

But the whole of Bella's life was much more than the considerable sum of its parts. She was a historical figure in the women's movement, a cultural icon who transcended politics and policy. Bella did not just change the law, she changed how people thought, how they looked at the world, and how they lived their lives. She was a firebrand orator, a consummate organizer, and a living symbol of the limitless potential of what women can do.

Bella was motivated by a sense of outrage about the rampant inequality between men and women that still exists today. She took this outrage to her grave.

I know if Bella were alive today she would be telling us not to mourn, but to organize and to mobilize. Bella said just last year, we are building a wom-

en's movement, and we have been making it larger and larger. It is worldwide. It is where it has never been before.

Bella's effort to connect with younger women and to create a worldwide movement for women's rights has ensured the women's movement will continue well into the next millennium. It is my responsibility, the responsibility of other women in Congress, and the women of this Nation to keep that spirit alive.

As Bella herself said, women will change the nature of power, rather than power changing the nature of women.

A TRUE DIALOGUE ON TAX CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized for half of the time until midnight, approximately 21 minutes after 11 p.m., as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, last week we were here on the floor of the House talking about the extreme tax proposals being offered by our Republican colleagues and the Democrats' record of providing tax relief to middle-class families.

Unfortunately, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD incorrectly recorded my words. Here is what I said: "We shouldn't let Republicans get away with saying that Democrats are against tax cuts." It appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that I said Democrats were against tax cuts. That is an error, and it has been corrected in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I know this was an innocent mistake on the part of the recordkeepers, and I want to say that I have the greatest respect for all of their hard work and the long hours, especially during Special Orders like this one. But the recorders are human, and in this case, the way my words were recorded changed the meaning of what I said to mean the exact opposite.

As I have said, this has been corrected. But what was interesting is that this misprint suddenly engaged our Republican colleagues in a dialogue on this issue. If this error is what it takes to engage Republicans in a debate on tax cuts, then it is a good thing.

□ 2245

Because I want to debate tax cuts with my Republican colleagues. That is why we were up here last week talking on this issue and why we are here tonight.

I am happy to put the Democratic plan to provide real tax relief for working families up against these risky Republican tax schemes any night of the week. I understand why Republicans are nervous about the American people hearing the details of this plan, and I understand why they would rather divert attention and try to make political hay out of an obvious misprint. The Republican proposal to, quote, scrap the Tax Code and impose a 30 percent sales tax on the American people is a radical and extreme proposal.

Democrats are the mainstream party on tax cuts. President Clinton and the Democrats have passed targeted tax relief for middle-class families. The Republican party is proposing a 30 percent sales tax increase on American families. Just one example, one group that would be hit harder than others by the Republican sales tax: senior citizens.

Senior citizens would gain nothing from the elimination of income taxes, since most are retired and pay no income taxes. But a 30 percent sales tax would hit seniors on fixed incomes square between the eyes. One of the most burdensome expenses faced by senior citizens is the price of medication. We have taken a look at five of the most common medications used by seniors and looked at how the 30 percent Republican sales tax would impact those prices.

Mr. Speaker, let me just put up briefly this chart. These are five medications that seniors continually avail themselves of and how the 30 percent sales tax would hit them:

Blood pressure, arthritis, diabetes, heart disease and inhaler all would be increased between \$24 and \$37.50, to create prices that would make it incredibly difficult for seniors to have to pay for these basic medications.

The Republicans' other tax plan, the flat tax plan of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), would raise taxes on 90 percent of Americans and it would provide a tax cut for the wealthiest of Americans. It looks like the GOP is up to their old tricks, helping the very wealthy at the expense of ordinary Americans.

Democrats have more credibility on cutting taxes than Republicans. That is why the GOP is left resorting to misquotes to try and change the subject from their extreme proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to open up the dialogue with my col-

leagues to talk about the Democrats' record of providing real tax relief to working families, as well as these radical tax schemes being offered up by our Republican colleagues. Let me yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), who was with us on the floor last week and who has been an outstanding proponent of providing tax relief to working middle-class families in this country.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO). I think it is sort of ironic, or maybe kind of scary, that the Republicans were so upset that they resorted to misquoting the gentlewoman. Anyone who was here that evening or listened to the debate, knows that one of the major points that the gentlewoman was making, and I think we all were making, is that Democrats have been out front on providing tax cuts and the targeted type of tax cuts that help families, families particularly with children, working families.

We actually, that evening, recited some of the tax cuts that the Democrats have put in place over the last few years that have actually made the situation where the tax burden on working class families has actually been reduced somewhat as a result of the Democratic efforts and as a result of the President's efforts.

I think what went on since that evening is that the Republicans, particularly those who have been advocating this crazy sales tax, this 30 percent sales tax, were so upset that some of us were really baring the truth and explaining how kooky it was, that they sort of overreacted I guess is the best way to say it.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed that when the gentlewoman from Connecticut was speaking, that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), who is one of the authors of the 30 percent sales tax increase, was actually on the floor. So he certainly knew what the gentlewoman was saying. It was amazing to me, I guess it was the next day, that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) came to the floor as well. They obviously knew what the gentlewoman really said. They knew that she was talking about the fact that Democrats have been successful in providing significant tax relief and tax cuts for the average American family.

Just to give an idea, this is basically what I said that evening. And in a way, I am glad that we have another opportunity to repeat it because April, and today is the first day of April, is certainly the time when most Americans think the most about taxes because April 15 is around the corner. Just some interesting statistics that come from an analysis by the Treasury Department that says that the average Federal income tax rate for a median income family of four in 1998 will be only 7.8 percent, down from 10.3 percent in 1984. This is the lowest income tax burden for a median income family

since 1966, and that is thanks in large part to Democratic efforts that this Federal tax burden has actually decreased.

Just to give an example again of some of the Democratic policies that have resulted in that decrease: Expansion of the Earned Income Tax Credit, which we have been championing for a number of years, beginning in 1993 that cut taxes for millions of families with children. My colleagues remember how many times Republicans came down to this floor and said that they wanted to eliminate the Earned Income Tax Credit when we were trying to expand it. The \$500 per child credit that Democrats ensured would be available to moderate income families. In addition, the HOPE Educational Scholarship tax credit. These are the targeted education tax credits that we put in effect. And in 1998, this year, Democrats have proposed expansion of the child care tax credit to increase the amount of the credit from 30 percent to 50 percent of expenses and make it available to more families. Democrats also support efforts to reduce the marriage penalty.

So there is no question that what went on after our last opportunity to talk about this is that the Republicans became very scared about this 30 percent sales tax that was going to hit seniors, was going to be on homes, was going to be on cars, was going to be on almost everything that we buy, and they made it their business to basically pass out a lot of misinformation about what the gentlewoman and the rest of us said, because we were making it quite clear that Democrats were providing real tax relief.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I think that the American public has every reason to be fearful of this kind of a tax scheme, if you will.

It now gives me pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), who is joining us again this evening.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, it is nice to be here at 5 of 11:00 on a Wednesday night.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Jersey and my friend and colleague from Connecticut for work on exposing the tax proposals that we talked about last week that the Republicans unveiled and which I think they are now, as the gentleman from New Jersey correctly stated, somewhat chagrined about the fact that people are actually focusing in on what they want to do.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut and my friend from New Jersey mentioned that we are the people, the party that has traditionally, historically helped middle income and working families in the tax area. And I think my friend from New Jersey has outlined very well this evening the recent issues which we have taken the lead on. The Earned Income Tax Credit, which has really lifted literally millions of Americans out of poverty, working Americans. The child tax credit, the \$500 that people will be able to

take per child when they do their forms this year. We fought for that for middle income working people in this last go round on the tax bill.

The HOPE scholarship, I mean, what a wonderful thing to have fought for and been at the vanguard of trying to provide higher education for working families' kids, working families' children in this country. And, of course, this year the child care tax credit that we are pushing very hard.

So we are very proud of the record that we have on trying to take care of the middle-class squeeze. That is where we come from. That is what we believe in. And without being too partisan, and I guess there is no way to be on the tax issue but partisan, my colleagues on this side of the aisle have historically and traditionally provided tax relief for those at the very top of the income scale in this country. That is who their constituency is. That is who supports them. That is what they are about. And they have the theory, though, that if you give to the top it will trickle down. Well, it may trickle down to the top 5 percent or the top 10 percent or maybe even the top 20 percent, but it does not go much beyond that.

Last week we were talking about the Republican tax cut plans to raise taxes on working families that they are proudly advocating around the country. They are on this tour, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) who sat in the back there. I saw him. He was right in the back in that corner as we were talking last week. He was kind of hunched down and kind of had his feet up. I was watching him. He had his feet up against the back of the chair and he was taking a few notes and he was kind of looking over here.

The gentleman has got this plan that, I mean, I just cannot imagine him going out and talking about it. But I guess he is going to be on the road again during tax week and I think the American people ought to know what he is about.

The gentleman's chart I think indicates it very well. Thirty percent sales tax hits people on fixed incomes, i.e., senior citizens. If they have a medical problem and they have medication, those are the numbers. Their blood pressure medicine will increase by 30 percent from \$110 a month by \$33 up to \$143 a month. If they have heart disease, they are going to pay an extra \$27 a month. For prescriptions that normally would cost \$90 a month, it is up to \$117, and on and on and on.

If they have a grocery bill, that goes from \$100 a month to \$130 a month. If they are a middle income family and they want to buy a minivan, a wonderful car that is, by the way, designed and created in my district, they go out there and they want to buy a \$25,000 mini van, forget it. Under their proposal they are talking at least \$32,000.

So what we are talking about here is a tax shift to working and middle income people and a tax shift away from those at the very top who are doing the best in our society today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to show a chart here and take it out again. I had this chart available last week. This is their other proposal. They have two. They have this sales tax thing and then they have got this Armeys flat tax proposal which will raise taxes on working families.

Now, this chart shows in the green what people are paying now who have incomes of \$25,000, \$50,000, \$100,000, a quarter of a million dollars and a million dollars. Under the flat tax plan of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Armeys), this goes up from less than 4 percent to close to 12 percent for people making \$25,000 a year. If they are at the \$50,000 income level, their taxes again will go up. Not quite to 20 percent, but somewhere in the neighborhood of 17 and 18 percent from less than 13 percent.

If they are making \$100,000 a year, they still go up about a percent. Now, if the taxpayer is making a quarter of a million a year, of course they are going to get a huge tax cut. That is what they are now. Under the flat tax offered by the gentleman from Texas, they go down. Their taxes are cut substantially. And for those who are making a million or more a year, they are cut even further.

There is no progressivity here. Those least able to pay will pay more. Those most able to pay will get a free ride. And nothing surprising there. That has typically been the historical reality of their plans.

In addition to that, Wall Street brokers will pay no, and I repeat this, no taxes on their unearned income from stocks and bonds. Now, that is absolutely crazy.

□ 2300

Actually when you tell people that, they kind of look at you like you are making this stuff up. But it is what they are proposing under the Armeys flat tax. Of course what they are proposing under the Tauzin scheme is just beyond reality.

During the debate last week, as the gentleman from Connecticut stated, there was a misprint in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think this kind of speaks to the problem that we have here. The Republican leadership has tried to take advantage of an innocent mistake to twist the words into the opposite of their meaning. I think that shows how desperate they really are on the issue of taxes, and the lengths that they are going to go to. They are trying to distract attention from their own plans that are really loony and very indefensible.

There is no better champion of working men and women in this Congress than the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO). She has been at the forefront of the breaks, the tax breaks that the gentleman from New Jersey mentioned a little earlier, the HOPE scholarship, the child tax credit that we are discussing right now and, of course, the child tax credit and the

EITC. So it is kind of sad actually when you really think about what they will resort to out here to distort the record, and the record speaks very clearly on what you have done in terms of providing middle-income people the relief they need from the squeeze that they are in and what those folks are trying to do in terms of fattening the wallets, feathering the nest, doing all that they can to take care of the top, with the hope, I guess, that some of it is going to trickle down.

We know historically that that has not happened. What has indeed happened is that the top 20 percent or 25 percent in this country have done extremely well. Folks in the middle, about 60 percent of the American wage earners today, their incomes have basically been frozen or they have fallen. Of course the bottom 25 percent of working Americans have had their incomes plummet about 25 or 30 percent over the last two decades. So it is that middle-income group, and it is those folks that are working that are trying to struggle at the bottom that we represent. That is what we are about. That is why we are here.

We thank you for your vigilance and for correcting the record, and we look forward to working with you to make sure that when they take offense to what we say, especially when it deals with a question as important as this, that we are here and we will continue to be here to correct the record to make the American people understand that there really is division in this place in terms of who people represent. And the clearer that becomes, the better off the American people are going to be in terms of making the right decision on who they want to represent them.

Ms. DELAURO. Let me say thank you to the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from New Jersey. I think as we did last week and this evening and I venture to say that if we were not leaving tomorrow, because the Republican leadership does not want this House in session to debate the real issues that people are concerned about, that we would be up on our feet every single night trying to expose what are two schemes that would seriously hurt working people in this country.

It is almost like a magical mystery tour that they are running about on here and trying just to create some smoke and mirrors, but we are going to be vigilant. Whatever it takes, we will stand up every single night and talk about what this means to seniors, what it means to working families and how in fact Democrats have provided tax relief for working families and how clear we stand in supporting tax cuts for working families in this country.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to thank the gentleman again. I think you are absolutely right. The only regret I have is that we unfortunately are going home because I

think that as we lead up to April 15th, if we had the opportunity over the next few weeks to get on the floor and really expose this GOP 30 percent sales tax and what it would mean for the average working person, we would really drive the point home. And the Republicans on the other side would be very nervous because the truth would come out.

One of the things that this whole incident with you, I think, points to is the fact that I think that many of our colleagues on the other side, on the Republican side think that if they keep saying something that is false over and over again and keep repeating it, that somehow the American people are going to believe it. Perhaps we as Democrats have not brought up enough times here on the floor or even out in our districts that, in fact, it has been the Democrats that have taken the lead on tax cuts for the average working person. I think it is unfortunate in a way.

Perhaps we should be talking more about it because maybe the word is not getting out. Maybe when some of these Republicans keep talking about the absurd 30 percent sales tax, people start thinking in their mind, oh, you know, they are for some kind of tax cut. And they do not necessarily pay attention to the specifics of it.

So I think it is incumbent upon us to point out how we, as Democrats, have been the backbone of these tax cuts that have benefited the average American over the last few years and that what the Republicans are proposing, whether it is the 30 percent sales tax or the flat tax proposal, that these things are not going to help working people; that they are basically giveaways, if you will, to the rich.

I just want to thank the gentleman again because I think you started something here, and when we come back after this break, we need to come to the floor and keep pointing out over, and over, and over again how crazy and what a lunatic proposal this sales tax is and that if there is going to be real tax relief, it has to be more of the targeted tax relief that the Democrats have provided that helps working families with kids, with education needs, with health care needs. This is, with child care needs. These are the kinds of things that we have to keep pushing for.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, which is until, as I understand it, 21 minutes after 11:00, to the gentleman from New Jersey.

ARMENIA CONCLUDES SUCCESSFUL PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to switch to another topic tonight, which is totally unrelated to the one that we discussed so far, but I think is very important for my constituents and a million and a half Armenian Americans around the country who I know are very pleased with the elec-

tion that took place just this past Monday in Armenia for the new President.

The voters in Armenia have elected Robert Kocharian as the new President of Armenia. With 99 percent of the ballots from Monday's run-off election counted, Robert Kocharian, currently the prime minister, who has served as acting President since early February, has received approximately 59 percent of the vote and his opponent Karen Demirchian, who led Armenia when it was controlled by the Soviet Union, received about 41 percent of the vote. An estimated 55 percent of eligible voters participated in the run-off election.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is significant because this really was a free election in Armenia. President Kocharian, who I have met, and who has been here to the United States, is a free market advocate who has pledged to revitalize Armenia's industrial sector and to track more foreign investment. I believe he is a strong leader, a consensus builder and someone who is committed to democracy and economic development.

The election has been judged as peaceful, well-organized and legitimate by the Council of Europe, the Commonwealth of Independent States and other international observers. Even the organization for security and cooperation in Europe, the OSCE, which was harsh and, in my opinion, unfairly so, in its criticism of the first round election 2 weeks ago, even the OSCE has not questioned the outcome.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to read a quote from Lord Russel-Johnson, head of the Council of Europe's monitoring mission in Armenia. It says, "The second round of the Presidential voting was well organized; the elections were passed peacefully and in accordance with law. This is a steady step along the path toward Armenian accession to the Council of Europe."

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report this very positive endorsement of Armenia's democratic system by a respected and objective international election observer. Unfortunately, the OSCE, of which the United States is a member Nation, has been somewhat more stingy in its praise for Armenia's tremendous progress under very difficult conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that the OSCE has seemed to lean more heavily on Armenia, a democracy, than Azerbaijan, which is for all intents and purposes a dictatorship. The OSCE has thus far taken an unrealistic approach to solving one of the region's most important diplomatic and political challenges. That is the resolution of the conflict over Nagorno Karabagh, the Armenia ethnic enclave that Joseph Stalin gave to Azerbaijan, but which has been Armenian territory for centuries.

The people of Karabagh won their independence in a war with Azerbaijan. A cease-fire has been in place since 1994, but Azerbaijan still claims

Karabagh as its own. And the international community, the OSCE, and, I am sorry to say, the United States continues to side with Azerbaijan over Karabagh.

I raise this issue of Karabagh because it has been an important backdrop to the elections just concluded in Armenia. Most observers believe that the decision of former President Levon Ter-Petrosian to resign was based on the widespread criticism he received within Armenia for accepting the OSCE peace plan for Nagorno Karabagh, which was based on unilateral concessions in favor of Azerbaijan without safeguards for Karabagh's security. Now that that has become clear that the OSCE plan is a nonstarter in Armenia, I hope the OSCE, with strong Armenian leadership, will work with the parties to the conflict to develop a serious plan for resolving the conflict.

Furthermore, President Kocharian is the former President of Nagorno Karabagh and he has been outspoken in his view that the OSCE Minsk Group negotiations must include the democratically elected government of Karabagh.

Mr. Speaker, the important thing for us to bear in mind now is that the voters of Armenia have elected Robert Kocharian to a 5-year term as their President. The entire process of the last 2 months, former President Ter-Petrosian's resignation, acting President Kocharian's interim service until elections and Mr. Kocharian's victory in the legitimate elections just completed, was conducted in the spirit of a civil society governed by the rule of law and democracy.

I want to congratulate Robert Kocharian on his election and I want to salute the people of Armenia for making amazing democratic progress despite tremendous obstacles.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN BRAIN TUMOR ASSOCIATION

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to mention one more thing. This is somewhat personal, but also I think important for the American public as well. That is that just this weekend, March 28, marked the 25th anniversary of the American Brain Tumor Association, an organization devoted to funding brain tumor research and providing information to patients and families about their health care options.

I know a number of Members of Congress died suffering from brain cancer and my own father-in-law, Andy Hospodor, passed away 3 years ago in March as a result of a brain tumor. I wanted to say that at the time when my father-in-law was suffering from a brain tumor, we received a lot of help from the American Brain Tumor Association. We received help in identifying physician specialists so that he received better treatment for his particular type of brain tumor.

After his death, they helped establish a memorial fund in his name. The association also provided a lot of information. Every question we had they were

able to answer or find someone who had an answer. They have a network of support groups that work with the various relatives of brain tumor victims.

I know that since I have been in Congress at least two of my colleagues, who I considered very good friends, Paul Henry and also Mike Synar, unfortunately died from brain tumors. I just wanted to take a little time tonight to recognize the American Brain Tumor Association for the dedication and service to patients and families with brain tumors. They provide information to their members with the latest medical breakthroughs available on brain tumor treatments. In addition, they furnish information on support services to help families deal with the issues that they face when a loved one is found with a brain tumor.

While the association has done a lot, there is a lot more that can be done, Mr. Speaker. As Congress determines the fiscal year 1999 spending priorities, funding for research needs our continued support.

I am committed to the doubling of the National Institutes of Health funding increase for 1999 and urge every Member of Congress to do the same. Every dollar that we commit to life-saving treatment oriented and basic research is an investment that will have an enormous return in terms of saving and improving lives, as well as saving health care dollars in the future.

I just wanted to say tonight, in closing, to the American Brain Tumor Association, thank you for a job well done over the last 25 years. To my colleagues in Congress, I say, we still have a lot that we must do.

□ 2315

VALUES OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) is recognized for the balance of the time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I first want to compliment the previous speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), on his thoughts and ideas about health care and the proposals that he has set forward. And we certainly look forward to learning about those proposals and possibly working to provide our opinions and thoughts and perhaps assistance in moving in a very similar direction of caring and compassion for those who are so afflicted.

But proposals seem to be few and far between here in Washington with respect to a number of issues that we have been dealing with in recent days and in recent weeks. And we, as the Republican party in Congress, have been fighting very passionately and forcefully about issues and proposals that

are designed to help the American taxpayer, to help the American family to unleash our economy and allow for a greater prosperity throughout the country.

And with this in mind, let me yield a few moments to my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from Colorado for yielding, Mr. Speaker, and I am pleased by the fact that he joins me in this Chamber tonight along another newcomer to Washington, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. Speaker, as I was listening to the earlier portion and presentation offered by our friend in the minority, I could not help but think of three dates, two occurring in this month and another that will come in October.

We should note for the calendar that this is the 1st of April. And while I doubt no one's sincerity, the absurdity of some of the comments which preceded us in the minority Special Order I guess should be tempered by the fact that this is, in fact, April Fool's Day. And we know that that is the second favorite holiday in the minority's calendar, because the minority party and those always tied to the culture of spend and spend and spend some more really have as their favorite holiday April 15, when everyone must send in their tax returns.

And for evidence, despite a frantic effort to get away from words that were read in the RECORD here last week, my friends, my colleagues and, Mr. Speaker, the citizens who join us beyond these walls via television should look to this quote and understand all the frantic posturing and postmortems cannot change what was said on this floor. The Chief Deputy Whip, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, who stood opposite in the well, said this last week, quote, the fact is that Democrats are not for tax cuts.

Now, I could amend that statement because I know a lot of common-sense folks who offer party label second in the Sixth District of Arizona who are hard-working Americans who are pleased by the tax cuts they have this year, hanging on to more of their own money to save, spend, and invest as they see fit. And in the frantic way in which the minority, the congressional folks who are tax and spenders, tried to back paddle on this statement tonight, I could not help but note that the scenario they offered brings up a third date on the calendar, October 31.

Because, sadly, it seems that the minority, so bankrupt of ideas, so bereft of new energy at times, offers what is a rhetorical terrorism to victimize the most vulnerable in our society by setting up these scenarios that can only be described as part Orwellian, part Kevorkian. And so, we heard it again tonight.

There are many positive things to talk about and to report to the American people tonight, Mr. Speaker, as the new majority continues its quest

for common-sense conservative government with the notion that the people of America should hang on to more of their own money and send less of it to Washington. And that is why I am so pleased to join my friend again from Colorado and my friend from Texas.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona.

Wednesday night is freshmen night, typically. The freshman class is one that tries to reserve an hour every Wednesday to talk about the values of our Republican party. We are joined by many other Members from other classes, senior Members, as the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is, who has been one that we look to for leadership and guidance, one who inspires us and who is a great colleague for us as new Members.

Our goal and objective in these Special Orders is to really draw the distinction between the two parties that are here in Washington, because it really does matter. People think that there are two parties that are somehow the same. And there are votes on occasion where our votes seem to be commingled. But, by and large, the philosophies that divide us and separate us are legitimate issues; they are legitimate cause for having two sides.

Thomas Jefferson observed 220-some-odd years ago that, in all political systems there really are two sides; there is the side that believes in more government, the side that believes that the government is the best way to organize our societies, and then there is the other side that believes that we should look to individuals and families and people as the definitive feature in establishing the character of a society or community.

Well, we, as Republicans, differ very greatly from our Democrat side, the Democrats being the side that does believe in more government and that government is the organizing factor in our society. And the quote that my colleague highlighted here is probably most indicative that I have seen in recent days about the difference between them and us.

They believe that there is no cause for tax cuts. In fact, they have worked routinely in this Congress to increase taxes to oppose every effort that we have made as the Republican party to turn more wealth away from Washington and back to the people of the country and to the States.

That philosophy of less government, more reliance on States and individuals, is something that we fight for all the time and routinely.

I want to yield, if I can, to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), who is leading this Congress with a bold plan, a bold idea, a bold proposal to rein in the size of Federal Government, the scope of our government by a responsible mechanism that is used in several States called sunset.

So, with that, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.