The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

With grateful appreciation, O God, and with earnest thanksgiving, we remember those people to whom special responsibility has been given and who occupy offices of great trust. For those in authority, we offer this prayer of petition that they will be good stewards of the resources of our land and do those things that bring justice and fairness to all people. May Your spirit, O God, that renews and gives strength and courage to do justice, to love and mercy, and ever walk humbly with You. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on approving the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the consideration of the Journal.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yes 212, nay 136, not voting 86, as follows:

[Vote list]

NAYS—136

[Events]

THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Will the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] please lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LINDER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces he will receive fifteen minutes on each side.
WHEN THE AMERICAN PUBLIC JOINS IN, GOP BALL GAME WILL BECOME FULL CONTACT SPORT

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post today reminds me of the similarity of elections and football. In football, some people keep wanting to try to run the same play.

Take supply-side economics. Remember that one? Cut taxes for the wealthy, increase spending, and promise to balance the budget. The result, a political touchdown, but everybody in the stands was thrown for a $3.5 trillion loss.

Now that famous backfield is back: Michael Boxton, who quarterbacked us into the greatest recession we have had in decades, says he would sign on immediately. So does Dan Quayle. We remember him, one of the galloping horsemen. James Miller, who lugged the ball for Ronald Reagan right into a recession. They want to run the same play again.

This time, Mr. Speaker, the public will not be fooled by that flashy ball handling and contract signing, not when they find out that it means Social Security cuts, Medicare cuts, an exploding deficit, adding $1 trillion more. That is when the public jumps into the ball game, and those who signed so proudly in Washington will be found out what full contact sport they are in.

WHY THE UPROAR OVER THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA?

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week the Republican contract with America was unveiled on the Capitol steps, and signed by more than 350 Republican incumbents and candidates from around the country. Apparently, from the speech we just heard and from what we have been hearing over the last few days, this has struck a raw nerve with the Democratic leadership and the liberal media.

The contract spells out exactly what a Republican majority will do on the first day of the 104th Congress, and what legislation it will bring to the floor in the first 100 days: a plan and a pledge. Why the uproar from our Democratic friends?

The uproar is because we have promised the American taxpayers that the public's House, the people's House, will actually vote on a number of issues that are very important to them: a balanced budget amendment, a line-item veto, welfare reform, tax reform, and a real crime bill.

The Democrats do not want to vote on these issues. These are issues important to the American people. They should be debated, they should be amended, they should be voted on. Some will pass and some will not, but at least they should be discussed in the people's House.

GOP URGED TO RELEASE THE SECRET LIST

(Ms. DELAUNO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAUNO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week, Republican House Members and candidates from across the country stood on the steps of the Capitol to sign a contract with the Republican leadership. The feel-good contract proposes more tax cuts for the wealthy, increased defense spending, and a secret plan on how to pay for it all. But, that is not the only secret of the contract.

Now that this budget-buster has been widely panned for being a cynical, election-year gimmick, the Republican leadership is keeping the names of contract signers secret. The same party that led the fight to make the names of discharge petition signers public, now has its own secret list.

If the Republican leadership truly believes in open government, it is time to prove it. The American people have a right to know which candidates signed a contract to explode our deficit—a $1 trillion explosion—which candidates signed a contract to cut Social Security and Medicare; which candidates signed a contract to bring back the star wars program. Release the secret list.

DEMOCRATS' LACK OF IMAGINATION

(Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday the Republicans did indeed unveil a plan, in response to America's demand for change. Called the contract with America, it is a positive plan to end once and for all the special interests, and tired old government-knows-best nannyism.

What has been the Democrat response? The carping criticism of closed craniums that cannot imagine having a record they could run for instead of running from. They cannot imagine offering the opportunity to debate issues that are important to America, rather than special interests. They cannot imagine giving America a chance to shut down the Washington spending machine with a balanced budget amendment.

They cannot imagine putting aside personal responsibility, putting it back into the Nation's life and pulling big government from it. They cannot imagine any of those because they go right on like a stake in the heart of the Clinton agenda, an agenda that seeks to turn the Federal Government into every nook and cranny of the American life, from health care to welfare. Democrats cannot imagine ending big government, big taxes, and big bureaucracy.

THE NEW REPUBLICAN PARTY?

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party has had a bad week.

First, Republican candidates signed a bizarre, blood oath contract that abridges their judgment and independence to the Republican leadership.

The contract is a combination of proven bad ideas from the past and feel-good, political snake oil which, Thankfully, has fooled no one.

Next, after thumping their chests about cleaning up Washington, the first thing this new breed of Republican candidates do is go to the ultimate Washington insider, a fundraiser financed by the gun lobby, the tobacco lobby, and the insurance lobby.

Who are these Republican candidates kidding?

And yesterday, Republicans, led by their leadership, voted to allow lobbyists—paid, special interest lobbyists—to buy them rounds of golf, trips to the Virgin Islands, and meals at restaurants that you and I could never afford.

Mr. Speaker—golf games? Insider Washington fundraisers? Blind, meek obedience to the Republican leadership and their snake oil plan?

This is the new Republican party? This is what the voters want in November?

Come on.

WHAT THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA OFFERS

(Mr. GOODLATTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, during nearly all of my lifetime, the Democratic Party has completely dominated the House of Representatives—that is 40 consecutive years of one-party rule. And in recent years it has been American families and businesses who have paid the price for the Democrats' tax increases, ethical scandals, budget deficits, and tired old government-knows-best nannyism.

However, simply opposing the President and the Democrats in Congress is not enough. So this week, over 350 Republican congressional candidates have
signed a solemn contract with America that lays out in detail our vision for America and the specific steps we are going to take to make our Nation an even better place to live, work, and to raise our families.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans should take a look at what our contract offers.

THE GINGRICH MANIFESTO

(Mr. SKAGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, we now have seen the Gingrich manifesto—the contract. This is an incredible proposal to redistribute wealth—up. It stakes out new depths for cynicism and political pathology by promising to deceive the American people. What a thing to behold. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) railed his troops to reckless utterances of health care bills. It was a little scary to watch the shock troops of the Gingrich revolution marching up in lockstep to sign the manifesto. Slightly Orwellian to talk about Clinton's promises? Behe. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SKAGGS.) asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute my constituent, Mrs. Patsy Pye of Summerville, SC, who is the 1994 recipient of the National Distinguished Principal Award from the National Association of Elementary School Principals and the U.S. Department of Education. Mrs. Pye is a 1969 graduate of Charleston Southern University. After 6 years of classroom teaching she became an assistant elementary school principal. Since 1987 she has served as principal of Oakbrook Elementary School in Dorchester County which just last year received the "Palmetto's Finest" Award, was also named one of 1000 beds magazine's "America's Best Schools," and now will be receiving the "Blue Ribbon" Award. Naturally it is with a sense of pride that I recognize this exceptional leader and educator, Mrs. Patsy Pye.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, this week Republican congressional leaders summoned their candidates to Washington to sign a contract to raise voodoo economics from the dead.

Instead of moving forward the Republican contract will turn the clock back to the days of tax cuts for the rich, outrageous wars defense spending, and exploding deficits.

The numbers on the Republican contract have been punched. The Republican plan will blow a $1 trillion hole in the budget and ask people on Social Security and Medicare to pick up the tab.

It is clear that the Republican contract will mortgage our future and threaten the middle class.

What is not clear is just who signed the contract. We know what it says. We know what it will do. But we do not know who signed it.

As long as the Republican leadership wants to take us back to the past the American people have a right to know the names of everyone who wants to take them for a ride.

I ask the Republican leader to release the names. We are waiting.

TRIBUTE TO PATSY PYE, RECIPIENT OF NATIONAL DISTINGUISHED PRINCIPAL AWARD

(Mr. RAVENEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAVENEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute my constituent, Mrs. Patsy Pye of Summerville, SC, who is the 1994 recipient of the National Distinguished Principal Award from the National Association of Elementary School Principals and the U.S. Department of Education. Mrs. Pye is a 1969 graduate of Charleston Southern University. After 6 years of classroom teaching she became an assistant elementary school principal. Since 1987 she has served as principal of Oakbrook Elementary School in Dorchester County which just last year received the "Palmetto's Finest" Award, was also named one of 1000 beds magazine's "America's Best Schools," and now will be receiving the "Blue Ribbon" Award. Naturally it is with a sense of pride that I recognize this exceptional leader and educator, Mrs. Patsy Pye.

READ THE FINE PRINT IN REPUBLICANS' CONTRACT

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have pressured the American people with what they are calling a contract. However, this contract is more like a bill because it costs at least $800 billion to fulfill the promises they make. Yet they do not say which programs they will cut to achieve these needed savings. The Republicans did not strike a nerve, they slashed their wrists.

I urge my colleagues to read the fine print in this contract and discover what this contract will really mean for America. It will cut Social Security and Medicare. In order to make that cut, they will have to drastically cut Medicare and Social Security. This contract means that senior citizens will no longer be receiving their health benefits under Medicare or their Social Security checks. Just this year, Congress voted on a balanced budget amendment. The reason it did not pass is they would not exempt Social Security. Yet we are going to get it again and they are going to say, “Well, we can't balance the budget without cutting your cost of living or Social Security.”

For the first time, the people are finally realizing that they are not going to lose their benefits. We are not going to balance the Federal budget on the backs of senior citizens for their 30-second TV spot.

BRING THE TROOPS HOME

(Mr. MANZULLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk this morning about a contract. Our President has a contract with the United Nations but not with the U.S. Congress. Pursuant to the terms of that contract, he has brought into play thousands of American troops that are now in Haiti being subjected to the rioting that we see live from Port-au-Prince, all for the purpose of installing the democratic leader, the one in whose biography he praises his good friend in memory Che Guevara, the man who loves Che Guevara into power? No way. Let us bring our American troops home as soon as possible.

REPUBLICANS REFUSE TO DISCLOSE NAMES OF CONTRACT SIGNERS

(Ms. McKinney asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. McKinney. Mr. Speaker, this week the Republican Members and candidates held a press conference to sign a contract with the Republican leadership. But, guess what, Mr. Speaker, they will not disclose the names of the people who signed it.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be surprised that Congressman GINGRICH will
not tell us who signed the contract; Congressman GINGRICH will not even disclose the names of the people who pump millions of dollars into his very political machine.

The American people deserve to know who wants to cut programs for their souls to the Republican leadership before even one vote has been cast.

WHY DO DEMOCRATS DISLIKE THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA?

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I was thinking about this morning as I was running on The Mall, what, what is it that the critics of our contract with America, what is actually that they do not like?

Maybe it is the balanced budget part that says that we as a Congress are going to have to balance our books the same way that we balance our books as persons, as individuals, that companies have to balance books, that States and municipalities have to, maybe that is the part they do not like. No, they probably do not like that.

It is probably the term limit, that is the part they do not like, the part where we are going to vote on terms limit. I can understand that because let us face it, their own Speaker has sued his own constituents to say that we are not going to have term limits. So perhaps that is it, maybe that is the part they do not like.

Let me tell them something I do not like. Maybe this is why they do not like it. It does not have something that addresses campaign finance reform, and I would like to see some real campaign finance reform in our contract with America. It does not have that.

But now what the good news is, is that is all under an open rule. That means that I can represent the people of Los Angeles, or the people of northern Washington can be represented as well.

TODAY ENDS FEDERAL FUNDING FOR EDUCATION

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, today we will either stand up for Federal funding for education or we will let special interest politics dictate once again. If those special interests prevail, Federal funding for education will expire on October 1.

If the gun lobby can get mad, wait until they face parents, school administrators, and kids.

Mr. Speaker, the arguments against the bill are bogus. On school prayer we can vote for language that was endorsed and voted on by Senators KASSEBAUM and HELMS.

On sex education, there are strong restrictions including a prohibition on funds to purchase condoms, to distribute obscene materials, or to promote sex education unless the benefits of abstinence are also taught.

How much further can we go? Once again, it looks like some want politics to permeate education.

The conference report contains a broader prohibition on sex education than the original Helms amendment while retaining local control for implementing these decisions.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6 on final passage.

LET'S FACE UP TO THE PROMISES BEFORE THE NATION GOES BROKE

(Mr. HORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the end of the Federal Government’s budget year. Since every responsible organization regularly reviews its achievements, we can ask “How well has the Federal Government performed this year?”

Many may not know that in 1994, for the 25th straight year, the Federal Government has failed to balance the budget. This year’s deficit according to OMB is $220 billion or $880 for every man, woman, and child in the USA.

But this is only part of the story, the USA annual shareholders’ report assembled by citizens for Budget Reform uncovers the astonishing fact that cost of Federal promises are increasing 10 times faster than the national debt. Analysis by Citizens for Budget Reform shows that each citizen’s share of these Federal promises is $145,000. The total for all Americans is $36.2 trillion—yes trillion—with a “t”, not a “b”. Thus, the average family is responsible for $400,000.

Taxpayers cannot afford these promises. How can we in Congress continue on this irresponsible course? The top 10 Federal promises each total $1 trillion dollars or more. And the next 19 promises each exceed $100 billion.

The $1 Federal welfare programs—over $5 trillion—and nuclear waste cleanup—$1 trillion—are indicative of the bill that we citizens have been committed to pay.

We need to examine these promises. Social Security and Medicare and civil service, military service, and veterans commitments should be kept, but let us carefully examine each of the others.

Existing Federal promises will require that by 2030 Federal taxes would be doubled, as spending moves from 21.9 percent of GDP this year to a projected 37.3 percent. The cataclysmic consequences of too many Federal promises should be every citizen’s nightmare.

REPUBLICAN CONTRACT IS SAME OLD SONG AND DANCE

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, in the greatest miscalculation since Adolf Hitler made clear he did not want a wake-up call on D-day, the House Republicans made an announcement this week that they were going to enter into a contract.

When we look at the specifics, it is warmed over Reagan-Bush economica, a trillion dollars more for the national debt, and they promise tax cuts for everybody. We have heard that song and dance before.

Let take a look at those who showed up to sign the contract, it is very interesting. Not one Senate Republican would walk across the Rotunda to sign this contract. When the House incumbent Republicans were to sign it, they did it in private. They did not want the public to see which Members of the House caucus on the Republican side refused to sign it. Now they come tell us they are for open government.

We would like to see a list of the names, which Republican candidates and which Republican incumbents were willing to sign on to this contract which has been universally scorned.

Name names, NEWT, and do it now.

RETURNING THE PEOPLE’S HOUSE

Mr. KNOLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but in light of what we have been hearing in the last few minutes, the House needs to be informed that at 3 o’clock last night the list of everybody who signed the contract with America was in fact released.

Further reserving the right to object, it is in fact a list which is now available to the public, and we do believe it is not time to release Hillary’s list of all of the people who participated in the health care conference.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNOLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, 3 days ago over 300 Republican Members and challengers signed an historic contract with America. This contract not
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only changes the fundamental way Congress does business, but also the business that Congress does.

The contract creates an open system—where issues are debated on the floor of this Chamber, for all of America to see, instead of behind the closed doors and iron fists of committees and committee chairmen.

The current committee system, run by the Democrat leadership, bottles up legislation and blocks an honest and public debate of the issues.

Why is it that the vast majority of Americans support term limits, yet this House refuses to debate the issue on the floor?

The Republican contract with America guarantees that bills such as term limits, a balanced budget amendment, and tax cuts for the middle class come to the floor of the House for an open, honest debate within 100 days.

Mr. Speaker, let us put an end to the old committee system and move forward with the country's business.

IT IS TIME FOR JAPAN TO LIVE UP TO PROMISES ON TRADE

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Fact, Mr. Speaker, for 40 years Japan's trade practices have ripped us off.

Fact, Mr. Speaker, for 40 years Japan has promised to stop it.

Fact, Mr. Speaker, for 40 years the White House has threatened sanctions.

Now the truth is if America had one dollar for every promise Japan made on trade we would have no deficit, and the truth is if American workers had one job for every threat the White House made, we would have no unemployment.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is time for Congress to say it is high noon with America to see, instead of behind the closed doors and iron fists of committees and committee chairmen.

The current committee system, run by the Democrat leadership, bottles up legislation and blocks an honest and public debate of the issues.

Why is it that the vast majority of Americans support term limits, yet this House refuses to debate the issue on the floor?

The Republican contract with America guarantees that bills such as term limits, a balanced budget amendment, and tax cuts for the middle class come to the floor of the House for an open, honest debate within 100 days.

Mr. Speaker, let us put an end to the old committee system and move forward with the country's business.

Both are wrong. But if I were faced with an agenda which had the overwhelming support of the American people I would be reluctant to take issue with the specifics too.

Which of our issues is wrong? Do the Democrats not believe we should vote on a real balanced budget amendment? I guess so since they have successfully prevented that vote from coming to the floor.

Do they not believe that the Nation needs legal reform? Do they think that a real crime bill is out of step with America? Do they believe that everything is just wonderful with our welfare system?

No—they cannot take issue with the substance so they make up charges.

The cost issue is, of course, made up of whole cloth. I never tire of seeing the Democrats repeat these outrageous statements with a straight face. It is a sight to behold. This proposal is only slightly different than the last Kasich budget which according to the CBO had more deficit reduction than the President's budget.

I ask "You remember the CBO; don't you?" That is the estimating office that the President said is the only reliable source for numbers. But that was when he was selling his agenda.

On the question of marching in lock step let me just observe that it was not NEWT GINGRICH marching Members to the well of the House yesterday to change their votes on the lobbying rule—it was the Democrat leadership.

One by one—arm in arm—they were marched to the well to obey the leadership.

Who is fooling whom?
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BRING THE TROOPS HOME NOW

(Mr. PARKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I have always been willing to give the sitting President much latitude in his role as Commander in Chief—even when I am in disagreement. However, I am gravely concerned about our Nation's escalation of military activity in Haiti—particularly in the absence of decisive leadership and in light of the inaccurate information that this administration provides.

 Shortly after the American occupation of Haiti, Secretary of Defense William Perry advised Members of this body that less than the originally planned complement of 15,000 troops would be needed to secure Haiti and restore their democratically elected government. However, news reports today are confirming that over 20,000 American soldiers are now on Haitian soil. If there has been a change in circumstances that necessitates additional troops, President Clinton needs to advise this body, and the American people, of that change.

I am extremely concerned about mission creep in Haiti. Additional troops only add to my concerns. It is imperative that we get our young men and women out of harm's way.

If our efforts in Haiti are going to be multinational in scope, we should be replacing our troops daily with a true international force. Our troops do not belong in Haiti. On behalf of every American who is putting his or her life on the line, I ask that the President bring them home now.

REQUEST FOR ACCOUNTABILITY ON HAITI

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi who just made such, I think, a telling comment.

I stood in this well last evening and talked to reports received by phone yesterday of the chaos in Haiti; pictures say so much more than words can.

Today we see on the TV news this morning the chaos. It is a sense out of control. We did not see the whole picture, because they did not have the TV cameras everywhere. They were not up on the north coast where pro-Aristide people, the Lavalas, were killing their opponents. So in Port-au-Prince we have one group killing one side, and on the north coast we have the other group killing the other side.

This is called a civil war, and it is not our civil war, and this 12th day of occupation, the smartest thing we can do is start getting our troops out of harm's way right now.

The next thing we have to do, once we get the troops out of the way, is get through our constitutionally required exercise of congressional oversight of what this has been about. There is going to have to be accountability.

Why has the Clinton administration been less than candid and straightforward with the U.S. Congress on how we got there, what we are doing, and what is going on? That accountability will come.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF WORLD SUMMIT FOR CHILDREN

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today is the fourth anniversary of the World Summit for Children. On September 26, 1990, 71 national leaders and delegations from 88 other countries...
met at the United Nations to outline a series of goals to be reached by the year 2000. These goals include: Reducing child and infant deaths by at least one third, material deaths by half, child malnutrition by half; and providing universal access to basic education, safe drinking water, and family planning services.

Four years later, millions of saved lives are the result. If the United States is to meet the commitment we made 4 years ago, however, we must safeguard and increase development aid targeted for child survival. By doing so, we will also ensure that when political upheavals occur, as we have witnessed in Somalia and Rwanda, the cost in human lives will be greatly reduced because of simple preventive health measures already implemented.

I urge my congressional colleagues to honor our promise to the children of the world.

QUESTIONS RAISED ON ARISTIDE'S VIOLENT PAST AND TALBOTT'S TESTIMONY ON CAPUTO'S MEMOS

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey: Mr. Speaker, several crucial questions remain unanswered about the explosive situation in Haiti.

One, is President Aristide sufficiently fit for office to justify the risk of American soldiers' lives to force his return to power?

While it was one thing to broker a peaceful diplomatic return of a duly elected President, it is quite another to risk American lives to effectuate that return.

Knowing of the serious charges against Mr. Aristide regarding his support of violence, I asked him yesterday in a Foreign Affairs Committee meeting if he has ever supported violence in a General or necklacing in particular.

Necklacing is a barbaric practice of assassination where the victim is bound, his arms tied or hacked off and a gasoline-filled tire put around his neck and ignited. In Haiti, necklacing is called Pere lebrun (Father Lebrun), the name of a popular Haitian tire dealer.

President Aristide said, "I did not, am not and will never embrace necklacing."

Mr. Aristide's speeches and credible evidence suggest the opposite. For example, Mr. Aristide was ejected from the Salesian Order of the Catholic Church in 1986 for "incitement to hatred and violence * * * ."

In an address at the National Palace on September 27, 1991, President Aristide said about necklacing:

"What a nice tool! What a nice instrument! What a nice device! It is a pretty one. It is elegant, attractive, splendidous, graceful, and dazzling. It smells good. Wherever you go, you feel like smelling it. It is provided for by the Constitution, which bans macoutes from the political scene * * * ."

President Aristide said yesterday that he saw the translation, and it was bad. Maybe.

The bottom line remains, with American lives at risk, we absolutely need to know the truth.

Another crucial question remains as to whether politics and the November elections had anything whatsoever to do with the United States invasion of Haiti and the timing of that operation.

Earlier this week at a Foreign Affairs hearing, I asked Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott this question and exactly what U.N. Envoy to Haiti Dante Caputo meant in a confidential memo that represented the United States position on Haiti "as a test case for which the United States has to have found a solution before November?"

Mr. Caputo, a former Argentinean foreign minister, also wrote in a memo to U.N. Secretary General Boutros Ghali on May 23, that "the Americans see in this type of action a chance to show, after the strong media criticism of the administration, the President's decision making capability and firmness of leadership in international political matters," and pointed out that a U.S. armed deployment was "politically desirable" and that "the current opposition of public opinion to an armed invasion will change radically once it has taken place."

The credibility of these statements are of particular value when one recalls that it was Mr. Caputo who brokered the Governor's Island Agreement between General Cedras and President Aristide. Sadly, in protest of the U.S. armed invasion, Mr. Caputo resigned as U.N. Envoy to Haiti hours after raimission.

Mr. Talbott, for his part, denied under oath before our committee on Tuesday, ever referring to November in those conversations or that politics had anything to do with the decision to invade Haiti.

But Americans have a right to know if the November elections—and Mr. Clinton's own political fortunes—had anything whatsoever to do with his decision to invade. Did Mr. Caputo dream all this up?

Were politics ever discussed in any way at the White House in relation to the invasion?

Mr. Talbott says no. His denial, however, raises more questions than it answers. And I strongly believe that he and other high-level Clinton administration leaders need to be questioned under oath to determine whether or not American lives have been put at risk for political reasons. For now, the jury is out and Americans have a right to know the answer.

CONTRACT BELONGS IN RIPLEY'S BELIEVE IT OR NOT

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, Ripley's Believe It Or Not should be interpreted to the Republican Party. On Tuesday they joined together to sign a contract with their leadership proclaiming how they are going to change things in Washington. Before the ink had dried on their document calling for a balanced budget. They came to the House floor and voted for the Allard amendment which would have undone the reorganization of the Republican Party. On Tuesday they sign a document they claim is a contract with Americans, yet yesterday they come to the floor of the House and fight to protect lobbyists representing foreign interests from having to disclose who they represent. Do you really think the American citizens want to protect those that lobby against American companies in favor of foreign interests, just so you can travel, eat and play for free. The only change the Republican contract will achieve is more for the fat cats at the expense of the middle class, senior citizens and students. This contract belongs in Ripley's Believe It Or Not.

WHY ARE OUR TROOPS IN HAITI?

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, why are our troops in Haiti?

You know, I was watching television the other evening, and they were showing the rioting and civil disorder and looting. There is anarchy down there.

Why are our troops in Haiti? The President says it is to restore democracy and yet U.N. Haiti Representative Dante Caputo said in a memo last May or June that this administration planned to send our troops down there before November for political purposes, to help bolster the President's image and his party's image so they could pick up seats in the November elections.

Now, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] said just a few moments ago, he questioned the Deputy Secretary of State about this who made these comments, and he said he didn't know them.

Now, if he did say them, as Mr. Caputo said he did, then he is lying to the Congress, and if he is lying to the Congress, he should be summarily removed. Strobe Talbott should be fired or resign.
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And if the President of the United States, and I hate to say this, but if the President of the United States can be proven while American troops in harm’s way for political purposes this year, he should be impeached.

DO NOT RUSH GATT
(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, no trade agreement 22,000 pages long, and no trade bill 1,000 pages long, should be rammed up against the closing deadline hours of this session of Congress. I know a fastball when I see one.

Let me congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina from the other body. Yesterday he actually made an incredible request: He wants to read the 1,000-page draft bill called GATT before the other body votes on it. The House should follow.

If this legislation is so essential, should we not give it as much time as we gave the California desert bill?

MORE ON THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA
(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I join my friends, colleagues, and Independent friends and colleagues in congratulating NEWT GINGRICH and the Republican Party for setting forth a specific plan and promises for when he becomes Speaker of the House. Instead of the usual 30-second attack Clinton ad which asserts that our opponents will go to heaven or hell depending on their voting record, Mr. GINGRICH and Republicans have crafted a specific contract. Yet many paranoid Democrats are already whining. They prefer the politics of half-truths over substance.

The contract which they have been whining about calls for votes on a balanced budget amendment, term limits, line item veto, cutting congressional staff by one-third and reforming welfare.

The Democrats prefer what we have now, even with control of the House, control of the Senate, control of the White House, we have a $200 billion deficit, no middle-class tax cut, no health care reform, foreign policy triumphs in Bosnia, North Korea, Haiti, and Somalia. If that is what they want, I say to the American people ask a Democrat Congressman for a copy of the contract and ask them to show it to you.

Mr. Speaker, the choice is clear.

SUPPORT PASSAGE OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6
(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today we have an education survival bill on our agenda. Let us not play politics with the schoolchildren of America. Let us all unite to support the largest constituency of the Congress: Teachers, students, and parents who are waiting for the school aid provided by the Improving America's Schools Act.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons for the unpopularity of Congress as an institution is the fact that we too often neglect this education constituency, our largest and our most worthy constituency.

On Monday, 3 days from now, these funds will stop flowing to all of our schools if we do not pass this bill today. Every school district in this Nation will remain funded at the same level as last year. The needs are great all over America, in all of our schools.

Let us not play politics; instead let us make a contract, let us all make a contract with the schoolchildren of America.

Vote "yes" for the Improving America's Schools Act and let us do the job today.

THE FIASCO IN HAITI
(Mr. MICA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, once again this administration has bungled the Haiti situation beyond belief. First we failed to promptly enforce an international accord and stood by while their military murdered the opposition.

Then we imposed economic sanctions killing 60,000 manufacturing jobs that were feeding nearly a third of their population.

Now our troops stand by while the Aristide supporters murder the other side and loot, pillage, and rob the last shreds of remaining business.

Honestly in my wildest imagination, I did not believe that President Clinton could concoct a wilder scheme to totally destroy Haiti.

Now—we have annihilated the entire economy, put our troops in the middle of an unfolding civil conflict and put their whole country on a Clinton-style American welfare plan.

Now we are buying guns while they use grenades, knives, tires, and machetes. I cannot wait for the next turn in this incredible U.S. taxpayer financed fiasco.

H.R. 6: MOST SWEEPING EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT IN DECADES
(Mr. KLINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, the vote on H.R. 6 is a vote on the future of education.

All the issues that you may hear about, all the motions to recommit, are red herrings. H.R. 6 represents the most sweeping educational improvement and reform legislation in decades. It is our best chance to increase Federal aid for elementary and secondary education.

Do not believe what you may hear, "constitutionally protected!" school prayer is protected under H.R. 6. H.R. 6 also prohibits the use of Federal funds to promote or encourage any sexual practice.

But the real issue is funding for education. If we recommit H.R. 6 to conference, $11 billion in education aid is in jeopardy. Federal education funding could be cut off to 13,000 school districts.


H.R. 6: WHAT DOES THE FORMULA DO FOR YOU IN YOUR DISTRICT IN THIRD, FOURTH, AND FIFTH YEARS?
(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the gentleman from New Mexico as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania as well as the gentleman from New York, the discussion today should have very little to do with the issues they talked about. There is only one issue that is major, and that issue is what does the formula do for you in your district in the third, fourth, and fifth years of this authorization?

No one, not the chairman of the committee, not the chairman of the subcommittee, not the ranking member, not any of the staff can tell you that. That is why I said we need 3 days so that we can get the runs, so we can tell you what it will mean to your district.

So I would hope that you put all the other rhetoric aside, concentrate on the ability to get the information you need to know what happens to your district.
We are moving the program from a program of educationally disadvantaged to a program of poverty. That is not what the program was all about.

The chairman said that six times in the conference. I would hope you would concentrate on the discussion in relationship to the formula in the last 3 years of this authorization.

SUPPORT THE MOTION TO RECOMMIT H.R. 6

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to provide my colleagues with another reason to support the motion to recommit H.R. 6 today.

House conferees had the opportunity to accept a Senate amendment to the bill which would have given local schools needed authority to prevent violence in the classroom. It would have closed a loophole in Federal law that presently allows students who commit extremely violent acts to claim Federal protection under the IDEA. Yes, Federal law requires that a student who commits a deadly assault, a stabbing, or a rape, stay put in that school if he or she can make a claim to IDEA protection.

The Gorton-Lieberman amendment in the Senate passed that body overwhelmingly with strong support from both parties. Many of you have expressed support for a similar bill I have introduced in the House. We have a chance to fix a law that is being exploited today, a chance to provide greater protection to our students and teachers, but we can only do it if we recommit this terrible bill to conference.

If the chapter 1 provisions and if the dilated school prayer and homosexual instruction language are not enough then the fact that we are not being allowed to even see the formulas we are voting on, on a bill that we can not get a copy of from our Document Room should be plenty of reason to vote for the motion to recommit. Please vote to recommit H.R. 6 to protect students and teachers in your local schools.

CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we have heard complaints about Republicans commitment to lower taxes, less government, and balancing the budget of the Federal Government. In particular, Democrats complain that Republicans have failed to say how they are going to pay for our contract with America. Some liberals, in traditional scare tactics style, have suggested that we are going to cut Social Security.

I just want to point out that last year, and again this year, Republicans presented this House their own budget resolution stipulating deficit reduction without tax increases, without any cuts in Social Security, and specifying exactly where spending cuts should occur.

The contract with America has a total cost of approximately $140 billion. The $140 billion is tax cuts. The Republican proposal presented earlier this year included these same tax cuts for middle income Americans and still reduced deficit spending by $300 plus billion.

Mr. Speaker, the conservatives in this Chamber believe that it is time we get this bloated Federal bureaucracy under control, cut spending, and leave more hard-earned dollars in the hands of working Americans by reducing taxes.

The rule further provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 6, the bill for which the committee has recommended this rule, will authorize the major Federal elementary and secondary education programs.

The conference committee that negotiated this bill deserves the utmost praise and thanks from all of us. We ought to especially recognize the work of the committee's chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], who is completing his congressional service this year. Mr. Speaker, throughout the length and breadth of the United States there are students, and parents, and educators who owe an enormous, incalculable debt to the gentleman from Michigan. His wise counsel and his direction in making certain that we meet the educational needs of America's children, for migrant children to homeless children, is extraordinary, and despite numerous disagreements with the other body, Mr. Speaker, the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan has produced a conference report which is substantially similar to the House-passed version of H.R. 6. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] was joined in his hard work by the committee's ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], as well as his colleague, the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. FORD's service as steward of this ambitious education bill began last year. He guided the legislation through a lengthy debate on the floor of this House, which continued for 4 weeks and involved consideration of over 40 amendments. Finally, he led House conferees during extremely complex negotiations to reconcile our bill with the Senate's proposal. The result of his labor is here before us, and it is a wonderful capstone to his legislative career.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must act very quickly to pass this legislation. H.R. 6 reauthorizes title I and over 40 other Federal education programs, including the Eisenhower Teacher Training Program, the Impact Aid Program, the Chapter Two Block Grant, the Drug-Free Schools Act, the Magnet Schools Program, the Even Start Act, and migrant education.

Under this reauthorization, approximately $11 billion of funding for these programs can be distributed to school districts for the fiscal year 1995. But the Department of Education has informed Congress that these funds cannot be released until H.R. 6 is signed into law. After 2 years of discussion and evolution, we have finally arrived at an excellent piece of legislation. Failure to pass it now will threaten Federal funding for schools in every hometown in the country.
H.R. 6 also reauthorizes Federal funds to help homeless children stay in school. I initiated many of these programs, including the Head Start program in 1969, and I am proud to see them extended and strengthened in this conference report.

An estimated 100,000 of America's children go to school homeless in this Nation every night. Families with children are the fastest growing segment of the homeless population. Given these startling realities, it is critical that every school district in the country works to remove special obstacles that homeless children face in getting their education.

From simple matters, like completing paperwork without home addresses, to tougher issues, like affordable school supplies and transportation, the grants will help schools to keep homeless kids enrolled. This is more than simple compassion; it is an investment in our future. Without special interventions, these children will not receive the education they need to break the cycle of poverty, and the homeless students of today will become the welfare dependents of tomorrow.

I would especially like to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] and the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD] for their assistance in this portion of the legislation.

Hand in hand with Goals 2000, this conference report establishes a new framework for education in our country. We in Washington will give local communities, parents and teachers greater flexibility, and in exchange they will hold our Nation's children to higher educational standards.

But that flexibility does no good to our local school districts if the programs are not reauthorized. Some 13,000 local educational agencies are relying on Federal funds authorized by H.R. 6. At this late date, a vote to recommit this conference report, or to defeat this rule, could well prevent its consideration this year.

This is carefully crafted and balanced legislation. I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentlewoman from Rochester, NY [Ms. SLAUGHTER] for graciously giving us half her time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the Members who are not on the floor, you should turn up the volume on your TV's back at your offices, and you better listen up because you're about to see the school districts in your area receive short shrift.

Mr. Speaker, we are being asked in this rule to waive every rule of the House against the conference report on this 5-year, $50 billion elementary and secondary education bill. That means quite simply, Mr. Speaker, we are waiving the 3-day layover requirement specified in the score and the germanness requirements, appropriations in an authorization bill, the budget act itself, and every other House rule.

I say to my colleagues, I want you to just look at this. Twelve hundred pages. And we are going to do this whether those rules have been actually violated in the conference report or not.

Perhaps the most telling provision of this rule is the last sentence which reads, and I quote, "The conference report shall be considered as read."

Well, what does that mean?

That language would not be necessary if we were complying with House rules in the first place, since under clause 2 of rule XXVIII, if a conference report has been available to Members for 3 days, it will be considered read when it is called up for consideration. If it has not been available to Members for 3 days, the authors of this particular provision of rule XXVIII thought it should be in order for Members to hear the conference report read in its entirety.

No one would have had the time to have read it for themselves, but this rule makes sure that no one will have time to either read the conference report or to hear it read. As my colleagues know, there is no way that we are going to have this read on the floor by the Clerk because it is 1,200 pages of legalese. So, that's why we needed the 3-day layover, so that Members would have had the weekend to actually understand what is happening here.

Mr. Speaker, at the time this conference report came to the Committee on Rules yesterday, we only had this foot-high stack of papers. I must confess I was afraid to read it for fear of causing an avalanche. How ironic is it that on an education bill, we are asking Members to vote on such a massive, 1,200-page document without being fully educated to its contents? We are being asked instead to cast an uneducated, uninformed vote on an unread bill, all for the sake of educating our Nation's elementary and secondary school students. Let us just hope that they do their homework a little better than we are going to do.

Mr. Speaker, when I asked the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, who I have great respect for and who is leaving us after, I think, 30 years of service; I asked him why we needed to waive the 3-day layover requirement. He pointed out to me that the authorizing legislation expired at midnight tonight. But does anybody expect the other body to pass this bill, as well, by midnight tonight? We know they will not, and I say, let's get serious around here.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I am informed that it is not true that the money will run out at midnight tonight. Under permanent statutory authority, the Education Department tells me the existing programs can continue to receive funds at current levels—so the money is not going to stop flowing tomorrow. It is going to continue to flow as it always has.

The chairman also testified on something more, and I say to my colleagues, if you're listening back in your offices, you ought to listen to this because this is terribly important.

If we wait until Monday to vote on this conference report, the chairman said, we would be flooded with phone calls on Monday morning when people found out what it really does.

That testimony yesterday was the second day in a row that the Committee on Rules was asked by a chairman to waive a 3-day rule for a conference report on the grounds they did not want there to be time to people to read what was in their bills, for fear that opposition would mount.

Wednesday, the Committee on Rules voted 5 to 4 against waiving the 3-day layover for the conference report. Yesterday, they reversed themselves in the Committee on Rules and voted 4 to 3 to waive the 3-day layover on this bill. Why? What kind of democracy have we come to, when we are afraid to let the people know what we are doing here?

I always thought that our system of Government was dependent on an informed citizenry. Now we are being told we cannot even afford to have informed representatives before we make decisions on massive bills costing billions of dollars like this.

Mr. Speaker, I am not just talking theory here; I've actually heard the real winners and the real losers. I was fortunate enough, and I think, Members, you better listen back in your offices again, because you are real winners and there are real losers. I was fortunate enough, and I think, Members, you better listen back in your offices again, because you are real winners and there are real losers. I was fortunate enough to get an early printout on this new title I formula that was concocted in the conference committee, and it shows that all nine of my rural counties will lose money under this bill.

The chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor admitted that there are a lot of losers under this bill. He talked about a teeter-totter tipping back and forth between the east coast and the west coast, depending on how you tinker with the formulas. Well, if that is the case, I feel like the victim of a school yard prank, where the person at the bottom of the teeter-totter suddenly jumped off and the person goes plunging to the ground with a major jolt that sends him tumbling down in pain.

Mr. Speaker, if this bill becomes law, my district gets the short end of the
teeter-totter and gets a major jolt to the wallets of my constituents. And I am talking about rural counties that are already severely strapped financially due to a lagging economy and thousands of job layoffs. 10,000 in the Hudson Valley alone just in the last 18 months.

I suspect that there are a great many Members in this House who are similarly affected by this bill, and they will not have time to find out because they are not going to have time to read the bill. Try to explain your support for this rushed rule to your local districts when they find out how much they will be losing under this new formula.

Think about it back in your offices now. Do you know how much they are going to be losing? You had better come find out. You are not going to have time to find out because they are not going to have time to vote on this rule. Please do.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETE GOREN of Texas). The Chair will remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair, and not Members sitting in their offices.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes for the purpose of debate only to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule providing for the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 6, Improving America's Schools Act of 1994.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most important reauthorization since ESEA was enacted in 1965, and the process for its development was very open and very inclusive.

We began several years ago with an invitation from the Committee on Education and Labor, signed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], myself, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], to countless organizations with an interest in education to send us their comments and recommendations. Then we considered this bill on the House floor for 29 hours under an open rule, 1 full month of debate, from February 24 to March 24. We all remember H.R. 6.

We had a very lengthy conference during which many issues were extensively discussed. The result of our deliberations is a good agreement, which reflects a strong defense of House-passed provisions, and includes all the major components of the House bill.

As refashioned by H.R. 6, Federal elementary and secondary education programs now become an integral part of State and local reform efforts by providing more local flexibility, requiring greater accountability for results, and, through the use of waivers, allowing funds to be creatively combined in order to improve student achievement.

In the process of reconciling the differences between the House and Senate versions of this massive reauthorization, it is not surprising that there are several minor scope and budget exceptions. For instance, the agreement includes a Senate provision authorizing the National Education Goals Panel to accept gifts from private donors, a provision requested by the administration and supported by the House Republicans.

There is also a provision reauthorizing the Even Start Program, authorized by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], to include a limitation on school districts forming partnerships, a change proposed by a Republican Member that was contained in neither bill.

For these reasons and for other reasons, this rule protects the conference report from all points of order. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to bring this very important conference report before the House for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes for the purpose of debate only to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am for this education bill. Among many other things, it contains an impact aid provision I urged the committee to write which will help keep the North Chicago Schools in my congressional district from closing this year.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about one argument that is being made about the need to pass the bill. The Department of Education and I, understand, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee are arguing that because the Education appropriations bill, for which I am the ranking committee member, references the Improving America's School Act, if that act is not passed, then the education funding cannot be obligated in line.

I believe that argument is absolutely absurd. I can tell you, that regardless of what position the Department or the committee may now take on the technical merit of the appropriations language, it was my understanding, and I believe that of every other participant in the conference, that the appropriations language provides a fall back to the expired authorization if the Improving America's Schools Act were to fall enactment.
Mr. Speaker, I want to illustrate the absurdity of this situation. We all know that appropriations bills are not supposed to fund unauthorized programs, but yet we have an accumulation of programs. And yet, over the years, it has been common practice to fund programs whose authorizations have expired because the authorizing committees were unable or unwilling to pass the necessary legislation. In the Labor, Health and Education bill, for example, we have funded the title X pregnancy counseling program without a current authorization for a decade. Are Members on the other side now suggesting that the Department of HHS ought to have withheld funding for that program? Substance abuse treatment programs, which will receive over a billion dollars in 1996, are not authorized. Is HHS going to withhold funding for those programs pending a reauthorizing bill which may not come until late next year?

Mr. Speaker, across the government, there is a long list of programs that I believe it is the responsibility of Members of the House Appropriations Committee to reauthorize. For instance, the entire Department of Energy, except for fossil fuel which hasn't been authorized since 1984: the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; the Immigration and Naturalization Service; the Bureau of Land Management; the entire Department of Education—10 years unauthorized; NASA, unauthorized since 1992; and, FBI general appropriations $2.2 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on for some time. The point I am making is that if the administration is going to start withholding funding for programs which have not been timely reauthorized, it must apply this consistently and withhold funding of all unauthorized programs. No, clearly, the appropriations bills, where authorizations, for whatever reason, have not been made, only to appropriate but to reauthorize existing law, and this one is no different. That, plainly was our intent. I want to reiterate: I am for the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman on the Committee on Appropriations, if he would say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], about impact aid. But I want to tell the gentleman that impact aid is not authorized beyond midnight tonight. It is not authorized beyond midnight tonight.

All of the education programs that are in this bill were authorized for a finite period of time. The authorization runs out at midnight tonight.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would say to the gentleman, I am very strongly for this bill. I will vote for the bill. But I believe that the opinion of the counsel of the Department of Education is simply wrong. The authorization would not expire tonight. In fact, the appropriation bill would operate to reauthorize existing law.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is on the Committee on Appropriations. Does he remember that he put language in the appropriations bill saying that the expenditure of 1995 appropriations is contingent upon the passage of this law?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, no, I do not believe there is any such language in the appropriation.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yes, it is. The gentleman even nailed it down tighter than the law would have been without it. Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, claiming my time, that is only on the new programs that are involved. Here are $60 billion of programs that were appropriated the third, fourth, and fifth year. In the Labor, Health and Education bill in 1994, $60 billion with no authorization whatsoever, no reauthorization whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I went to the Committee on Rules yesterday, primarily because I believe it is the responsibilities of Members of a committee authorizing legislation and bringing it to the floor of the House to be able to tell all the other Members exactly what the legislation does in relationship to their district.

As I said earlier in my 1 minute, we have a magnificent staff on both sides of the aisle. They cannot tell Members what happens in the third, fourth, and fifth year. The chairman cannot tell Members what happens in the third, fourth, and fifth year. The subcommittee chairman cannot tell Members what happens in the third, fourth, and fifth year. I cannot tell my colleagues what happens in the third, fourth and fifth year. That is why it is so important that we not waive the 3 days so that we have the opportunity to be able to tell Members just that.

This is very misleading. Somebody is sending out this kind of information. When we get over here to 1996, it says, 'The conference statements are in the record.' They do not. We need that column in there to be able to tell Members exactly what it means to them in 1996, 1997, 1998, the out years. We positively cannot tell anybody what it means to them. I think that is a fault on our part as an authorizing committee. We should be able to tell every Member exactly what happens in their districts.

During the last hours of our conference, unfortunately, things started moving rapidly. I guess we got impatient. I guess Members started thinking: 'You tell me how much more money I am getting. In relationship to what? Not in relationship to the current formula, not at all.'

We need that column in there to be able to tell Members exactly what it means to them in 1996, 1997, 1998, the out years. We positively cannot tell anybody what it means to them.

Again, the issue has nothing to do with all the issues we heard in the 1 minutes. The issue has strictly to do with what happens to Members in their districts, because when they get down here to the third year, our 2 percent drops out, if they have less than 2 percent poverty.

Some will say, that is good. We ought to concentrate it. I tell my colleagues, this bill, as the chairman said six or eight times during the conference, was written for educationally disadvantaged youngsters. It was not a poverty program, so you are in this, there is three different categories. It is something else.
The educationally disadvantaged have to suffer, particularly in those out years. So before we vote on the bill, we really need to know what happens in the third and the fourth and the fifth year. Members are coming down here making speeches who have no idea what will happen and they have very little knowledge, if any, about the formula.

I have studied and studied the formula and still cannot tell Members in the third, fourth, and fifth year how they will fair under this new formula, very convoluted, very confusing. And it will take a lot of study on Members’ parts. We needed 3 days so that we could get runs that mean something so that we could tell every Member in this body exactly how they fair under this particular piece of legislation in the out years.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to try to clear up a little of the smoke that has just begun to waft across the floor here. I tried to engage in exchange with the gentleman from the Committee on Appropriations who denies that this language is there, so I got the report, dated September 20, from the conference on the appropri­ations that cover this legislation. I would like to read from that report.

Both the House and the Senate bills provided funding for education for the disadvan­taged activities based on proposed changes in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act currently being considered by Congress. The House bill provided funding based on the authorization as passed in the House on March 24, 1994. The Senate bill provided funding based on the bill as passed in the Senate on August 2nd, 1994. The conference agreement provides funding based on the au­thorization “as enacted into law.” This action protects the rights of both the House and the Senate as the reauthorization proc­ess is completed.

That is the language that says, we are appropriating this money on condition that you complete action on the law.

Now, as Members know, under nor­mal circumstances, we cannot appro­priate money for anything that is not authorized by the Congress. And it has been a continuing practice for the Committees on Appropriations on both sides, if we pass in the House, the reau­thorization to appropriate to that level contingent upon us finishing the process by going to conference and coming back, as we are here with this conference report.

The long and the short of it is, at midnight tonight, on all the programs, including the program of the gentle­man, money for impact aid, which we worked so hard to protect for him, it is drop dead time. It would be the height of irresponsibility to vote down this rule and not have the House of Representatives do its part to meet that deadline. It is up to the Senate, when we finish, to determine whether they meet the deadline or not.

I feel it is my obligation as the chair­man of this committee to send the House Members back to see their con­stituents, not faced with a headline next week saying the XYZ school dis­trict in their district has just learned that they have lost hundreds of thousand dollars that has been coming year after year after year to that district, will not be coming be­cause Congress did not complete its work on the reauthorization.

Mr. Speaker, I am supporting things in this conference report that I in past years would have fought very bitterly, to the very end, to oppose, because of the urgency of getting this job done. I have sublimated some of my strongest feelings in order to accomplish this for the Members of this House. I hope they appreciate that we are giving them a chance to go home and say “I did my job.”

If we are going to stop at this point and start quibbling, to hear the gen­tleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Good­ling] say he does not know what is going to happen in the third, fourth, and fifth years of this authorization at this late date is a disappointment to me. The formula passed the committee 41 to 2, and the gentlemen voted for the formula. The formula passed this House after 7 days on the floor without a single amendment to that formula being offered, and a single word of crit­icism of the formula.

The formula that we brought back to you from conference is far more like the House-passed formula than the Senate-passed formula. I spent days in that conference defending the House formula, in large part because the Rep­ublicans on my committee, the Demo­crats almost universally, the two votes that cover this legislation. I am going to lose, incidentally, were Democratic votes. Not one Republican voted against the formula in the commit­tee.

I kept faith with what they asked for on this floor, and in the conference. For them to be coming up at the last minute and saying “We do not know how much it is going to be in the third, fourth, and fifth years” is disingen­uous, at best.

Let me say, the first year we appro­priate numbers in this legislation. Each year therefore it is such sums as may be necessary, and it is up to the Committee on Appropriations to decide what the numbers are.

Therefore, if there is any doubt about what is going to happen in the third, fourth, and fifth years, it is no dif­ferent than the doubt has always been. We do not know how much the Com­mittee on Appropriations is going to appropriate in the third, fourth, and fifth years. The sheet we passed out that the gentleman showed does not purport to have you going crystal ball and predict for us what the Com­mittee on Appropriations will do.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentle­man from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDER­SON], a member of the committee.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing I think is the reason people hate the Congress of the United States, it is because we play these games of fiscal brinksmanship. We hear this rhetoric that says “Vote for this bill today, or you are not going to have any kind of money for schools.” We all know that is crazy.

No. 1, we can go back and change this formula. We are all going to be here for another week. No. 2, we have a bill in that extends every one of these pro­grams for another year. Do not let any­body tell you it is this or nothing for your schools.

Second, let us understand exactly what we are dealing with here. There is probably nobody in this Congress that wants to vote for an education bill more than I do. I have voted for every education bill in this entire Congress, and I am proud of that. I thought until Monday of this week that I would be voting for this one.

However, the reason we ought to be defeating this rule today is because ab­solutely nobody knows what we are voting on. I know there is not a Mem­ber of Congress that has read the bill, but I am not going to make that case. I am going to say that I know there is not a member of Congress who can tell a school district in their State or in their congressional district what they are going to get under this bill for funding when the new formula goes into effect.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week I got this formula right here. It told me my district was going to lose $288,000. No one has ever accused STEVE GUNDERSON of having a rich congres­sional district, but I was going to lose $288,000 in my small, rural schools.

Thursday of this week I got a for­mula that said I am going to lose not $288,000, I am going to lose $344,000 in Chapter 1 money under this particular new compromise formula.

Then Friday morning, earlier this morning, the Chairman sent me, and I suspect many others, a letter. The let­ter says “Don’t worry, all this rhetoric is untrue. In 1996 you are going to be better off than you are under the 1994 allocation.”

Mr. Speaker, everybody is better in 1996 than they are in 1994, because, No. 1, we have added $500 million new money and, No. 2, we hold everybody harmless.

In all due respect, Mr. Speaker, if Members got this letter in their offices, tear it up. It is not worth the paper it
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is printed on, because it does not tell you the truth, which is, the new formula makes the bill worse."

The chairman of the committee stands up and says nobody is going to lose money under this act. That is simply untrue. In 1994 funding, every school district had more money than in 1997, unlike the formula passed by the House of Representatives, that "That is all you are going to get. You are going to lose everything because the new formula will make the bill worse." If you do not have the amendment, will you vote for the bill?" we do not get any affirmative responses.

Let us see this for what it is worth. It is an attempt to defeat this rule and defeat this bill next week, and to throw everything into turmoil. Unfortunately, that seems to be what is happening. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] and Mr. Img. Speaker, that 89 school districts covering 5,569 students, Chapter 1-eligible students, would be, under this new formula, told that they will have a declining revenue from that 1994 formula base on out, and they will get no new money ever in the future. Bill would have no provision that the formula that passed the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, if Members worried about previous votes, they ought to worry about this bill also. If they do not know what they are voting on, nobody knows. No. 2, we are going to vote on a proposal and a formula that is going to cut Chapter 1 dollars big time to our schools in 1997, 1998, and 1999 under this program. That is not a commitment to education, that is fiscal irresponsibility by the Congress of the United States.

Defeat this rule, send us back to the conference to restore the Chapter 1 formula. It was approved on a bipartisan basis by the House early on.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], for yielding me time. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the conference report on H.R. 6, the Improving America Schools Act. I was a conferee, and we met many, many times with the Senate to hash this out.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard delaying tactics here and partisanship here and over here and partisanship over there, but then when you ask the other side "If we do not have the amendment, will you vote for the bill," we do not get any affirmative responses.

Let us see this for what it is worth. It is an attempt to defeat this rule and defeat this bill next week, and to throw everything into turmoil. Unfortunately, that seems to be what is happening. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] and Mr. Speaker, that 89 school districts covering 5,569 students, Chapter 1-eligible students, would be, under this new formula, told that they will have a declining revenue from that 1994 formula base on out, and they will get no new money ever in the future. Bill would have no provision that the formula that passed the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, if Members worried about previous votes, they ought to worry about this bill also. If they do not know what they are voting on, nobody knows. No. 2, we are going to vote on a proposal and a formula that is going to cut Chapter 1 dollars big time to our schools in 1997, 1998, and 1999 under this program. That is not a commitment to education, that is fiscal irresponsibility by the Congress of the United States.

Defeat this rule, send us back to the conference to restore the Chapter 1 formula. It was approved on a bipartisan basis by the House early on.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], for yielding me time. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the conference report on H.R. 6, the Improving America Schools Act. I was a conferee, and we met many, many times with the Senate to hash this out.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard delaying tactics here and partisanship here and attempts to defeat this rule in order to stall this bill. It is not a matter of giving people a few more days to study. No. 1, they do not know what they are voting on, nobody knows. No. 2, we are going to vote on a proposal and a formula that is going to cut Chapter 1 dollars big time to our schools in 1997, 1998, and 1999 under this program. That is not a commitment to education, that is fiscal irresponsibility by the Congress of the United States.

Defeat this rule, send us back to the conference to restore the Chapter 1 formula. It was approved on a bipartisan basis by the House early on.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], for yielding me time. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the conference report on H.R. 6, the Improving America Schools Act. I was a conferee, and we met many, many times with the Senate to hash this out.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard delaying tactics here and partisanship here and attempts to defeat this rule in order to stall this bill. It is not a matter of giving people a few more days to study. No. 1, they do not know what they are voting on, nobody knows. No. 2, we are going to vote on a proposal and a formula that is going to cut Chapter 1 dollars big time to our schools in 1997, 1998, and 1999 under this program. That is not a commitment to education, that is fiscal irresponsibility by the Congress of the United States.

Defeat this rule, send us back to the conference to restore the Chapter 1 formula. It was approved on a bipartisan basis by the House early on.
meantime under this formula, many States do lose. For that reason, I am going to vote against the rule, but I will vote for the bill because of what it does for California. It also is a fairly good bill. I look at a bill for the good, the bad, and the ugly of it. This has got more good than it has bad in it. But for a lot of people it has more bad than it does good.

Ms. Slaughter. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. Clayton].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewomen from New York [Ms. Slaughter] for allowing me to participate in this discussion on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for H.R. 6, the Improving America's Schools Act.

It is imperative that we put partisan politics aside and pass the rule on this conference report for this is a fair and equitable rule and this conference report is in the best interest of children of our Nation.

We will have failed as legislators if we do not work toward our Nation's future by providing adequate funding for the education of our children.

My district, the First Congressional District of North Carolina, is severely economically disadvantaged. These funds enhance equal opportunity for improved education for all students, regardless of locality. The school districts of my constituency desperately need the Federal funds provided through this bill to provide the necessary educational services to the children of eastern North Carolina so that they have the skills to be productive members of society. If we willingly deplore the loss of these funds, we doom them to failure not only in the present but in the future.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of this aisle to support the rule. If we fail, our children may achieve to the levels that we know they are capable of.

Mr. Solomon. Mr. Speaker, this body has distinguished new Members from both sides of the aisle. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Holland, MI [Mr. Hoekstra], one of those new Members and member of the committee.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. Solomon] for that kind introduction.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago when I decided to come to this House, it was pretty easy to say that Washington did not look very good from west Michigan. The disappointing thing is that when you come to Washington, you find out that what goes on in the House here does not look a lot better when you come up close. That is what we are talking about here today. We are talking about the rule, the process by which we are going to consider 12 billion dollars' worth of spending.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Ms. Collins].

Mrs. Collins of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to come before the House to support the conference report to accompany H.R. 6, the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994.

The legislation includes several provisions that are designed to ensure gender equity in education. These provisions, backed by the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, will go a long way toward making sure that our young women and girls as well as our young men and boys receive the best education possible.

There are two provisions that I supported and that are especially important to me. They are the provisions concerning athletic disclosures and child abuse.

Two years ago, Congress sought to eliminate sex discrimination in education, including athletics, when it passed title IX of the education amendments to 1972. Despite initial progress in women's sports, sex discrimination continues at our Nation's college and universities. Women's teams are often given less financial support, which includes operating expenses, scholarship expenses, and recruiting expenses. They are given poorer facilities for training, worse hours for practice and competition, inferior travel accommodations, and little, if any, support. Things do not have to be this way and we should not let them stay this way.

Earlier this Congress, I introduced H.R. 921, the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act to require colleges and universities to publicly disclose data concerning their commitment to ensuring gender equity in athletics for men and women. Senator Moseley-Braun introduced companion legislation and was victorious in attaching the disclosure provisions included into the Senate version of the bill.

A goal of the disclosure provisions is to ensure that young women have equal access to educational and athletic opportunities; however, gender equity in athletics is not only about providing young women with physical exercise. A report sponsored by the Women's Sports Foundation found that, 'Younger the level of women's past involvement in organized athletics, the more likely they are to positively evaluate themselves in regard to setting objectives, leading a group, motivating others, sharing credit and feeling comfortable in a competitive environment.'

This legislation will require colleges and universities to publicly disclose data concerning their commitment to ensuring gender equity in athletics for men and women. By encouraging gender equity in athletics, we are laying the groundwork for creating a new generation of women leaders with increasing abilities to compete and excel in corporate America. In addition, this legislation will shine a light on the schools that take their women athletes seriously and those that do not. Students will know the record of the college or university because they decide which schools will be encouraged to comply with Title IX.

The other provision that I want to address relates to child abuse. In response to the growing problem of child abuse in our Nation, I introduced H.R. 125, the Child Abuse Prevention Act. The provisions of H.R. 125 are included in the conference report and will enable elementary and secondary schools to use Federal grants to train teachers and develop curricula regarding child abuse prevention and education in elementary and secondary schools. Clearly, the provisions of the legislation will help child abuse victims that would otherwise remain unnoticed or unrecognized.

Mr. Speaker, many individuals helped craft this legislation and time will not permit me to congratulate everyone. However, at the very least, I would like to commend the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. Ford, the chair of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, Senator Kennedy, the chair of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, Mr. Kildee, the chair of the Subcommittee on Select Education and Civil Rights, Mr. Owens, and their staffs for all of their hard work in designing this legislation. Also, I would like to commend Congresswoman Mink, Senator Moseley-Braun, Congresswoman Woolsey and their staffs and the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues for help in perfecting the legislation.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would remiss if I did not acknowledge the Feminist Majority, National Women's Law Center, American Association of University Women, Women's Sports Foundation, and the National Association for Girls and Women in Sport for their assistance in promoting the athletic disclosure provisions. I urge the support of my colleagues for the rule and for the conference report.

Ms. Slaughter. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. Unsold].
Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing some of the things that are being said on the floor today and that we should hold this over so that runs can be made to predict how this bill and these formulas are going to affect particular areas in 1997 and beyond. The problem with those statements is that we are creating a formula that is based on, "Let us send the money to where the problem is, let us send the money to where the poverty is, and then give flexibility to those schools to use that money within their entire school program." We are not going to have the money done until 1997 and 1999. So how are we going to make any runs this week or next week that are going to predict how individual schools are going to be affected?

What is happening instead, Mr. Speaker, is that we are seeing the first attempt at paying for the Newt Gingrich plan. This is the first attempt at putting a dollar amount or a formula of balance in the budget that is in the Republican contract, because this effort now by the Republican leadership is to take away from those school children, from those programs that need this money and instead slide it over and give additional tax benefits to the wealthy.

We need this bill, and we have to recognize that the money has to go where the need is and where the poverty is.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Hickory, NC [Mr. BALLENGER], a member of the committee.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, as a conferee on H.R. 6 who was unable to confer with the gentlemen from Missouri and Tennessee and Secretary Education Act. My opposition to this legislation is based, in part, on my belief that pages of Federal education policy requirements and directives should not be attached to the relatively small amount of Federal aid for elementary and secondary education. By making so-called Federal education funds contingent upon State and local school agency adoption of bad education policy, we are wronging accepting the idea that there are so-called Federal funds. Mr. Speaker, I have yet to see the Federal Government raise money without the American taxpayer. Federal funds are taxpayer funds, and Federal education dollars should flow back to the people from whence they came without burdensome spending stipulations. I trust the elected school board members and school administrators throughout this country make those education policy decisions—decisions that mirror the concerns of parents and work in the best interest of our schoolchildren. Although I support many of the existing programs in this legislation, I simply cannot support any move toward a Washington takeover of our schools.

So far, I have spoken in broad terms. Mr. Speaker, imagine an example of flawed education policy coupled with taxpayer dollars. This bill requires States receiving funds to adopt a 1-year expulsion policy for students bringing guns to school but allows school administrators to waive the policy on a case-by-case basis. We are all against guns and violence in schools, but expulsion policy should not be dictated from Washington, and the case-by-case wording only leaves the schools open for litigation based on alleged inequities in policy enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, Washington wants to dictate expulsion policy, but when it comes to formulating a policy to protect a constitutional right to voluntary school prayer, Washington comes up short. The school prayer language in this bill places legal hurdles in front of children wishing to exercise their right to voluntary prayer. Parents throughout this country have asked Congress to protect this fundamental right, and I feel we can do better than the language contained in this bill.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this conference report. Let us be clear, this is not a vote against education, but rather a vote against growing Federal control over education. Not only are we losing our opportunity to learn standards present in this bill through State demonstration requirements for academic standards for title I children, the bill also includes gender-based reporting requirements for college athletic programs, 20 programs that may reduce funding for other more deserving programs, and a weak answer to the chapter I formula debate. I oppose the rule, the conference report, and support efforts to amend the performance provisions for 1 year under current law so a better bill may be approved next year.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that too many of us are more interested in the formula than educating our children. Instead of targeting this money to the areas of greatest need, we seem to be talking about targeting it to areas of least need. Instead of discussing the educational needs of our students we are arguing about how much some rich districts will receive or will not receive.

Mr. Speaker, three of the programs included in this legislation are very vital to the educational needs of our children, the title I program, a revised Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Program, and the Magnet Schools Assistance Program.

Since the inception of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, title I has provided through the years a vital and crucial link in helping to deliver high quality education to economically disadvantaged children.

Title I has served as a basis of hope in helping many young people sometimes perceived as losers to become winners. It has been extremely significant in providing services to our Nation's children and youths in reading and mathematics as well as in the development of critical thinking skills.

The move toward excellence and inclusiveness which began so nobly in 1965 with then President Lyndon Baines Johnson signing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act into law, must be permitted to move forward.

The Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Program in this bill will encourage professional development of teachers, staff, and administrators in increasing their knowledge and skills of the subject matter.

The Magnet Schools Assistance Program helps school districts fulfill the Federal commitment to school desegregation. Clearly, how we modify what we authorize to the Magnet Schools Assistance Program will demonstrate our continuing commitment to school desegregation in compliance with Brown versus Board of Education, 1954.

Mr. Speaker, I support the opportunity-to-learn standards provisions as included in this legislation. Opportunity-to-learn standards would identify the elements necessary in helping children to achieve the content and performance standards. Content standards indicate what children should know and be able to do; performance standards determine whether children are learning. I fully support both content and performance standards. However, I firmly believe that it is inequitable to hold students accountable for their performance without addressing the capacity of the school to educate children to the level required under the student performance standards. If we require content and performance standards, then opportunity-to-learn standards should be included in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is needed in order to enrich and expand educational opportunity for children and youths at all levels.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule so that we may be able to pass this legislation. And Republicans take control of this House,
we will pass a line-item veto, and no Member will deserve more credit for that than the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. JIMMY DUNCAN.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time, and certainly the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is one of our finest Members in this entire body.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule that brings this conference report up to the floor. This conference report, files in the face of the expressed will of this House.

Just a few days ago this body voted by an overwhelming margin of 369 to 55 to insist on the stronger House language on school prayer, yet this conference report contains the much weaker Senate language.

This comes at a time when everyone, from President Clinton to Dan Quayle, is talking about our loss of values and the decline in morality.

Morton Zuckerman, a liberal who is editor of U.S. News and World Report, wrote recently a hard-hitting editorial entitled "Where Have Our Values Gone Wrong?"

School prayer will certainly not cure everything that is wrong with this country, but it could help many, many young people across this land. We need to support the strongest possible language on this.

Janet Reno, the Attorney General, recently said, School prayer advocacy, especially in inner cities, is a symptom of people trying to figure every way they can to reinforce people's ability to work together, to live together in families, to have a sense of purpose, a sense of self-respect, a sense of regard for others, and how we get along with each other.

William Raspberry, the great columnist for the Washington Post, wrote a column recently and he said this. All attention on the current scene bemoans the increased violence, lowered ethical standards, and loss of civility that mark American society. Is the decline of religious influence no part of what is happening to us? Is it not just possible that antireligious bias masquerading as religious neutrality is costing more than we have been willing to acknowledge?

We should acknowledge those words of William Raspberry which are certainly true.

As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEVENSTA] pointed out, no one really knows what exactly is in this bill. But basically, to sum it all up, this bill is simply a last gasp at a failed big Government liberalism. It certainly could not pass in the next Congress and everyone knows that, so many are desperate to pass a bad bill at this time.

This rule and this bill should be defeated.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss], our final speaker, a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, who toils in that committee year in and year out. He is about to get a hernia here from carrying this bill down to the well.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to try and hold this up. This is about $1 billion a pound, just about $1 billion a pound. If I put it down there and stand on it, I would be 8 feet tall. Anybody who stands on this bill in this Congress is going to be at least 8 feet tall. It is about 2 feet thick.

We are going forward again, succumbing to supposed pressures here of the calendar. We are bypassing an opportunity for common sense and rational thought.

Here we have a very highly complex bill that impacts directly on our children's schools, and yet we are rushing into passage of a 1,200-page conference report whose text only became available to Members yesterday afternoon.

Even the bill's authors could not know for sure how the intricate formulas for allocating limited Federal education dollars would play out in the different school districts. The best estimate I could get suggested serious repercussions in just my area of southwest Florida with three counties expected to lose something on the order of $150,000, an unpleasant surprise.

Here we are flying headlong into this debate without all the facts and a clear picture of where this bill is going to take us.

Why? Chairman FORD gave two reasons, both equally troubling. The first was concern for the timetable of the other body, the threat that perhaps a few days' delay would give the public time to find out what was in the bill and start voicing their concerns by calling our offices. Imagine that the public were going to call their Representatives about this bill. Perhaps I have missed something, but I thought that was democracy supposed to be about.

I oppose the rule. I oppose the bill. I challenge every Member to respond to the question: What will this bill do to my district? Your constituents are going to ask that. Count on it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Reading Clerk read the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. PETE GREEN of Texas]. Objection is heard.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, who objected? Ms. SLAUGHTER. I did, Mr. Speaker. Mr. GOSS. The distinguished gentleman from New York objected to the reading of the bill?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOSS. Thank you very much.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, one other question to ask yourselves is what happens in your district if this bill does not pass. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN].

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the earlier speaker, coming from Houston, I stood next to Akeem Olajuwon, and he could stand on it all he wanted, and he would not be 8 foot tall next to Akeem Olajuwon.

I am proud to serve on the committee, and I would like to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], for all of their work.

This bill has been read. The folks who are opposing this bill have had a year and a half to read this bill. We have had a year and a half of hearings here in Washington and all over the country on reauthorizing elementary and secondary education. We have spent time reading.

We have heard from our constituents, and again, we can read the bill, and I have read it, but it does not mean that you may be able to understand it just by reading it, because it does a great many good things.

Let me correct some of the fallacies we have heard this morning. This is more Federal control, by one of my colleagues on the committee.

This bill has been read. The folks who are opposing this bill have had a year and a half to read this bill. We have had a year and a half of hearings here in Washington and all over the country on reauthorizing elementary and secondary education. We have spent time reading.

We have heard from our constituents, and again, we can read the bill, and I have read it, but it does not mean that you may be able to understand it just by reading it, because it does a great many good things.

Let me correct some of the fallacies we have heard this morning. This is more Federal control, by one of my colleagues on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Reading Clerk read the bill:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize any officer or employee of the Federal Government to mandate, direct, or control a State or local agency, education agency, or school's curriculum, program, instruction, or allocation, State or local resources, mandate a State or any subdivision thereof to spend any funds or incur any costs not paid for under this act."
Let us talk about the prayer amendment. This prayer provision in here is not what the House had, and I voted for the instructions for the House. But we could not get that in conference committee. But I will tell you what; Senator HELMS voted for this amendment that is in here on the floor. Senator HELMS did, and if I, as a Democrat, follow what Senator HELMS did in the Senate on prayer, I think I am probably in pretty good shape.

The people supporting the bill are a broad spectrum: education leaders, obviously religious leaders. That is why I encourage all of the Members to vote for the rule and ultimately vote against the motion to recommit.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The Speaker pro tempore. The previous question was ordered.

The Speaker pro tempore announced that a quorum is not present. The Speaker pro tempore recognized the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 454, I voted "aye" but the voting machine failed to register my vote.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in a house today, and unfortunately missed rollcall vote No. 454, the rule for consideration of H.R. 6, Improving America’s Schools Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Secondary messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6, IMPROVING AMERICA’S SCHOOLS ACT OF 1994

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 566, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6) to extend for 5 years the authorizations of appropriations for the programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for certain other purposes. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETERSON of Florida). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Wednesday, September 28, 1994, at page 26358.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].
Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the majority's time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], chairman of the Subcommittee on elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, with authority for him to yield time to Members on our side.

The gentleman from Michigan? There was no objection. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6, the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, reauthorizes and improves most of the Federal programs providing assistance to elementary and secondary education. The majority of these programs are included in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and provide approximately $11 billion of assistance to States and local school districts in the present fiscal year. The conference agreement contains numerous programmatic improvements and approves a new formula for the distribution of title I funds. While changes were made in the conference to the formula, it remains remarkably similar to the one originally passed by the House.

The major features of the formula are for fiscal year 1995. Mr. Speaker, we will continue to use the current law formula which includes both basic and concentration grants. For fiscal year 1996, we move to a two-part formula which will continue to use the current law formula for amounts up to the fiscal year 1995 level and a new weighted student formula for new money.

County allocations are also hold harmless in their fiscal year 1995 funding amounts. For fiscal year 1997 through 1999, we continue to use the two-part formula, with an 85-percent hold harmless.

The present school district could lose because of shifts and changes in appropriations would be 15 percent. Updates of census poverty data will be available for counties in 1997 and for school districts in 1999.

A major feature of H.R. 6 is that Federal educational programs are refreshed so that they become an integral part of State and local reform efforts. H.R. 6 does this by providing more local flexibility, and that flexibility is due to a great extent to the good work of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DUKE]. Particularly the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] for his good work on the flexibility portions of this bill. He has been hounding us on that for several years, and I think we have achieved a great deal on this aspect in this bill.

Reaching perhaps further into the committee for a newer member, let me mention the gentleman from California, Mr. DUKE CUNNINGHAM. DUKE may be perceived by some as being right wing, but he has been one of the most really flexible and helping hands on the committee. I have found him to be a strong supporter of education. Obviously, from time to time DUKE CUNNINGHAM and I have disagreed, but he has always listened and he is flexible. He wants to accomplish something for education, and he has certainly been a good addition to our committee.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the committee on the committee we have had a wide range of support from both sides of the aisle in developing this bill. I want to thank, obviously, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DUKE], particularly the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] for his good work on the flexibility portions of this bill. He has been hounding us on that for several years, and I think we have achieved a great deal on this aspect in this bill.

Reaching perhaps further into the committee for a newer member, let me mention the gentleman from California, Mr. DUKE CUNNINGHAM. DUKE may be perceived by some as being right wing, but he has been one of the most really flexible and helping hands on the committee. I have found him to be a strong supporter of education. Obviously, from time to time DUKE CUNNINGHAM and I have disagreed, but he has always listened and he is flexible. He wants to accomplish something for education, and he has certainly been a good addition to our committee.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear, as I did during the debate on the rule, that my argument is with the rule; my argument is not with the legislation.

In my estimation, there was no reason under the Sun that we could not have 3 days to get the runs that we should as members of this committee to be able to show to all of our colleagues what happens in the third, fourth, and fifth years. I can tell them generally what happens. What happens is that we move the program from a program dedicated to the educationally disadvantaged to a program of poverty. That is embarrassing to those in poverty; it is hard to get mad at people saying they do not have the smarts somebody else does, and that is nonsense.

If the bill would mean that in the third, fourth, and fifth years, particularly the fourth and fifth, you could have a thousand students disadvantaged in your school district and because you have less than 2 percent and then 5 percent poverty, you get nothing. There is a hold harmless which goes down so rapidly that basically you get nothing. On the other hand, you could be a district over here with 500 students and you have 2 percent poverty and more, and you get the bucks. That is unfortunate.

Let me tell the Members what the difference is between the formula when it left the House and the formula as it is now. We have heard that there is very little difference. Yes, it is closer to ours, but let me tell the Members what the differences were.

There was a 6-percent cutoff of funds; we did not have a 6-percent cutoff of new money; we did not have new money being so targeted that people who have disadvantaged youngsters in relation to their academic preparation get nothing. We kick in to the LEA in 1996 rather than waiting until 1997. What does that do to a city like York, with 25 percent poverty? They get no concentration grants. Why? Because it is the county where we kick it in. We had a 65-percent cut-off in Federal funding.

It was unfortunate in the discussion on the rule that somebody was trying to somehow or other blackmail people and say that if we did not do this, the end of the Earth comes today. Let me tell the Members that chapter 1 money is out there. Chapter 1 money is out there until July 1.

Let me also tell the Members that impact aid, as we read the report of the
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Appropriations Committee, is out there. It is there. We make a big mistake in that we do not tell the people and all of our colleagues what is in the formula and what it does. The formula does them in the third, fourth, and fifth years. It is not the bill. We have wonderful staffers on both sides of the aisle. Members on both sides of the aisle spent a year-and-a-half perfecting this bill, and it is not the bill; it is the fact that we do not know whether any money is there or how much money we get in the out years.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairmen FORD and KILDEE for all their efforts to put forward this critical bill which authorizes $12 billion for elementary and secondary education. This bill is the primary Federal funding bill for almost every school district in the country, and it must pass.

I also want to thank the chairman for working with me and Representatives SWETT and CASTLE to guarantee an appropriate level of funds for small States. I am delighted that Congress approved our amendment earlier this year that restored millions that had been cut from six small State education budgets.

Mr. Speaker, what that amendment is about is that it is not just big States that have educational funding needs. In my State of Vermont our people cannot afford higher and higher property taxes to fund education. Because this amendment is part of this bill and because the Federal Government is more adequately funding Vermont's educational needs, there will be less need for increased property taxes or State taxes in the State of Vermont.

The Appropriations Committee on Improving America's School Act, H.R. 6, provides Vermont with $14.5 million for its chapter 1 programs that assist low-income students. Vermont lost $2 million of its chapter 1 funding this year and these funds will not only restore those losses next year, but will provide additional funding for low-income students in years to come.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA], a member of the committee.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise with regret in opposition to this conference report. I supported this legislation when it was reported by our Committee on Education and Labor and when it was considered by the House of Representatives. I will not support it today—This bill needs work, a lot of it.

Let us be frank. The chapter 1 Program for disadvantaged students is where the money is. By this measure, my State of New Jersey comes out behind. Oh yes, next year we will be allocating chapter funds as we did this year. And, in the following year, New Jersey loses a full 15 percent of its title 1 funds, followed by another 15-percent cut the following fiscal year.

In essence, the conferees have rejected a bipartisan consensus House formula in favor of a scheme that attempts to lull many of our colleagues and state and local school officials into a false sense of security. When the axe finally does fall, we will be only halfway to another reauthorization during which we could possibly revamp or fine-tune the formula to correct inequities.

We have heard for 2 years now that there is no "wiggle room" in the formula because appropriations are so tight, because we don't have the money.

Will someone explain to me why then does this legislation establish 20 entities and a new Federal formula at the cost of $10 million for family support; $1 million for Alaskan native education; $10 million for Dollars for Scholars, and $18 million for prisoner education grants.

And we know how that works in this town. These programs are planted—fertilized with some minor appropriations in the early years—and soon they sprout—sink deep, deep roots and grow its own strong constituency. Once that happens, no one will be able to cut them down.

Allow me to offer another example.

Tucked away in this legislation is a program to assist local school districts to repair, renovate, or actually build new schools. Anyone who has ever served on a local school board has wrestled with this issue. The House proposed a loan program for this purpose. Arguing against establishing a burdensome loan bureaucracy, the Senate proposed a program of outright grants. So what's the compromise? Our conferees decided to do both—loans and grants.

And if that weren't bad enough, local officials recall that this year the Senate added a new Federal program for school construction dollars after voters/taxpayers may have rejected a local funding proposal.

Will we ever learn? We have a $4 trillion national debt and yet here we are assuming funding responsibilities that have been and should be left to local communities.

Mr. Speaker, we should have used this reauthorization process for a hard-clear-eyed review of every education program on the books. Fund the ones that work and eliminate all the rest.

Mr. Speaker, let me briefly express my concern regarding the so-called compromise on the "sex-related issues" in this legislation. When this bill left the House, it barred the use of funds in this bill for the promotion of homosexuality. Unfortunately, the conferees developed a compromise that causes me great concern.

And finally we come to the issue of school prayer.

Mr. Speaker, when this legislation left this House, it contained clear language regarding the responsibilities of local school district officials on school prayer. H.R. 6 contained the Helms language which prohibited funds under this bill from going to States or school districts that have adopted a policy that prohibits individuals from participating in "constitutionally protected" prayer on a voluntary basis.

Let me repeat and clarify: To lose Federal funds under this act a school district must have adopted a policy that denies individuals the right to voluntary "constitutionally protected" prayer.

I would remind my colleagues that this is voluntary school prayer and would not force anyone to violate their religious rights or even participate in school prayer.

I would also remind my colleagues that this language was adopted 345 to 64 and later reaffirmed in a vote to instruct us—the conferences—by a vote of 369 to 55.

Mr. Speaker, I must take issue with my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Michigan, a colleague who has contributed mightily to the quality of this Nation's education for so long. I will say that I will miss Chairman FORD but not before I say how I disagree with him on this issue.

The Helms language will not require the appointment of a "Federal prayer czar" to determine just what is "constitutionally protected prayer." And I cannot for the life of me fathom why Chairman FORD, a fierce fighter for the rights and prerogatives of the legislative branch, would hold that "the courts" should determine whether a school district loses its Federal funds.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation needs work—a lot of it. We should start right now by adopting the motion to recommit to be offered by Mr. JOHNSON. Take this bill out of conference and begin work right here, right now.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the subcommittee chair.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 6, the conference report extending and improving Federal elementary and secondary education programs.

This is a vitally important conference report. It continues Federal programs that school districts rely on to help them teach our kids. Programs such as Title I, impact aid, bilingual education, Indian education. Unless we pass this conference report today, 13,000 local school districts will lose $1 billion in Federal education assistance.
My home State of Montana would lose $25 million in education funding. The loss of $25 million in education funding would be devastating to schools in Montana. I think most states would experience similar harmful consequences. We can't permit this to happen.

There have been a lot of rumors circulating about the impact of H.R. 6. I add the last couple of days regarding this bill. Let me try to put a few of them to rest. First, this bill does not and will not affect home schools. For some reason there are some lobbyists out there who are trying to stir up dissent on this bill by talking about home schools. They did it before. We took care of their concerns. Now they're trying to do it again. Let me read to you what H.R. 6 says on this issue.

Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect home schools.

We added this language when the bill was first before the House. We kept this language in conference.

H.R. 6 further says:

Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to permit, allow, encourage, or authorize any Federal control over any aspect of any private, religious, or home school, whether or not a home school is treated as a private school or home school under State law. This section shall not be construed to bar private, religious, or home schools from participation in programs or services under this Act.

We added this language, which was offered by Mr. ARMLEY on the House floor at the request of the national group representing home schools. We've kept this language in the conference report. H.R. 6 is clear: It does not affect home schools.

There have been rumors circulating that H.R. 6 is bad for rural schools. That just is not so. H.R. 6 helps rural school districts more than the original House-passed bill did. It helps them more than the Senate-passed bill. H.R. 6 also contains my Rural Schools of America Act, a bill that most members of the Rural Caucus have co-sponsored. H.R. 6 holds rural schools. To say otherwise is to ignore the facts.

For those of you who have military bases or Federal installations in your districts, H.R. 6 continues and improves the Impact Aid Program. And it does so by adopting the recommendations of the folks back home who run the Impact Aid Program.

For my colleagues from the West and Midwest who have Native American populations, H.R. 6 continues and improves on education programs. And for the first time Indian Schools, under H.R. 6, are given a fair chance to compete for Federal education dollars. H.R. 6 helps Indian schools. And as my colleagues know, these schools are probably the schools in our Nation that are most in need of help. With H.R. 6, these schools will benefit.

For all of my colleagues who want to help schools in their districts deal with the massive problems of deteriorating school facilities, H.R. 6 provides an answer. It authorizes a facilities improvement treatment for schools, and the funds for that program has included in the fiscal year Education appropriations bill.

H.R. 6 is a good bill that deserves all of our support. It has programs that will help schools keep up with the technological revolution that is occurring in our world. It provides some help to school districts that want to upgrade the skills of their classroom teachers. It gives some assistance to schools that want to try some ways of teaching our kids better. And it begins to take some important steps to make sure that American students are once again the best in the world.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill and reject any attempt to kill this important legislation. What we're experiencing today, and what we saw yesterday, should alarm the American people. Yesterday we began to see our colleagues on the other side of the aisle begin to flesh out their "Contract with America." Yesterday we saw their leaders oppose lobbying reform. It gives some assistance to schools that want to try some ways of teaching our kids better. And it begins to take some important steps to make sure that American students are once again the best in the world.

Let me give you just one example. When this legislation left the House there was a compromise provision that required local school boards to develop a policy for disciplining children who bring guns to school. The sensible compromise gives local communities the flexibility to address the problem. Incidentally, all the major education associations, including the National PTA, the National School Boards Association, the National School Boards Association, the National PTA, and the National Association of Elementary School Principals.

But now, that purely political purposes, the bill mandates that every school have the exact same policy automatically expelling any student for 1 year who brings a gun to school. Every Member in this body wants to keep guns out of schools. But there are a lot of Members who believe the local principals and school boards are more capable to solve the problem than two Senators running for reelection. The Federal Government is not the local school board.

Oppose this conference report.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate and thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), chairman of the subcommittee, for the 2 years of hard work that he has put in on bringing this reauthorization to the floor. I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. FORD), chairman of the committee, for his masterful leadership of the negotiating team between the House and the Senate. I also want to thank all the staff who worked on this bill, including my own.

The primary objection that is being raised today concerns the possible future reductions in some districts, in that they will be held harmless and every­

Everybody will receive the same, no less than the amount of money they received previously or they presently have for the first and second year, but they are worried about future years.

There is a simple remedy to this perceived problem: Increase the funding for education and extend the hold harmless provisions permanently.

All districts in America can make good use of Federal funds for education. We have all too few funds available now. Let us make a contract with the children of America. Let us make a contract with the students of America. The power is in our hands. The power is in the hands of this body to increase funding for education. The power is in the hands of this body to increase funding for education. Every child in this country will benefit if we hold harmless will be there forever for those districts that are in danger of losing money 3 or 4 years from now.
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We need a great increase in our Fed­eral commitment to funding for edu­cation. We can take the money simply out of the intelligence budget, the CIA,
and intelligence budget, that Aldrich Ames agency that everybody admits is a corrupt racketeering body at this point could use some reduction. They could be replaced in size and still they could do as much as they are doing now, I assure my colleagues. So from the intelligence community, which is obsolete, let us move the money into the intelligence community which is vigorous and ongoing and really the future of America, the intelligence community of public schools. Let us move forward. The power is in our hands. Let us make a contract with the schoolchildren of America. We can increase funding and everybody can be held harmless forever.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], a valued member of the committee. Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is most unfortunate that the atmosphere in this room has been weighed down on the sense of confrontation it has because it has destroyed what has been probably the best education Congress in the history of this Nation in terms of all the things we have accomplished, from Head Start to Youth Apprenticeship to National Service, to Goals 2000. It has also, I think, caused some confrontation that is most unfortunate when we are dealing with the very justified and appropriate tributes that first and foremost the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], ought to have for his long career and commitment to education. And also a special tribute, I think, goes to the lead democratic staffer on this bill, Jack Jennings, who was also a staffer during the first ESEA authorization.

So I very much regret the atmosphere that has come forth today, but I have to tell Members that sometimes we have to stand up for the school back home. Happily, in the last minutes of the conference, we took a very, very good bill in a number of areas and we made some mistakes. We decided that the Chapter 1 program, which is to be a program to fund education for educationally disadvantaged students, and we chose to, in essence, make it a poverty program. I just received, literally 5 minutes ago, the latest run. I have seen which compares what many of my rural schools would get in 1999, under the current law formula and under the formula that we have adopted. Small schools being told, like Blair, WI, that they are going to lose $14,000 in their Chapter 1 allocation. Another small school, Alma, that only gets $37,000, being told that literally they are going to have almost a 10-percent reduction in their Chapter 1 funds. Frankly, the school of my Democratic opponent in the November election, Amery, WI, is going to lose $27,000 under this new formula. And the list goes on.

I just bring that up to Members because I really wish that we would have found a way for every Member to get the data to know what they were voting on. The Title I formula was a compromise formula and we should have stuck to that.

Having said that, I want to point out, as the chairman of our subcommittee and as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], our ranking Member have done, there are an awful lot of good things in this bill that are being lost as a result of this.

We have been able to reauthorize and make positive changes in Chapter 2. I am proud to say we have included the authorization for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers, a program that I authored because I think it is most unfortunate that it is this reauthorization that designs the educational delivery system for the 21st century. And very frankly, in a high technology interactive age of lifelong learning, we need to totally rechange what we think it is we need to educate not only children but adults in our community schools.

So there are many, many good things in this bill. I regret that we have had to lose some one of this one formula fight, which has destroyed all of those good things.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], a good friend of education.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this bill has good, bad and ugly in it. And I think that when we look at any bill, we need to take a look not only at the needs of the country but an economic model. Will the bill pay for itself? Well, I think that, yes, this one will. We could make it more cost effective, but the bill, in my opinion, does pay for itself. Let me explain.

The Chairman of the Committee, the gentleman from New York was talking about, in California we have large numbers of educationally disadvantaged students. Let us take a child that is disadvantaged and let us put him through his sixth, seventh, grade. If he is not brought up to speed, then he is going to be far behind. And large numbers of these children are dropping out of school every single day.

That same child, if we educate him and give him an incentive to where he can get a job at the end of school, also has an impact on crime prevention. Education is a very good crime fighter. It does not belong in the crime bill, but it is a good indicator.

So the point is, if we can teach that child, at the end of that time period, he has a chance to go on and have an opportunity. He is less likely to get involved in crime. So it is "pay me now a little bit or pay me a lot later." I think that is important.

The last speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], talked about the child nutrition program that we sponsor. A child that is healthy is going to learn a lot better. The DARE Program keeps our kids out of the drug infested areas and at least gives them an opportunity—that saves money.

I remember the teacher that wrote President Bush a letter that had 16 misspelled words in it. We need an upgrade of our teachers and our programs. The Eisenhower Grant Program has been reauthorized in this bill. It not only improves students chances for learning, but it improves the teachers as well.

What about California? California has lost money for the last decade, why? Because the Chapter 1 funds are based on census, old 1980 census, before this bill. We had a 38 percent increase in poor children and the northeast States were stealing California's money. Under this formula, all the schools, all the California schools are under current law. The second year they are held harmless. The following year, there would be a 1997 update in our census on a county level, and in 1999, an update at the LEA level. So the California schools are going to benefit under this bill. I would tell my Californians, conservative, moderate, that this bill pays for itself.

There is an economic model to it. If Members look at the programs, like Eisenhower math and science, we are the ones on this side of the aisle that keep talking about how we want greater math and science in the schools. We want increased high tech education into our schools.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to seriously think about an economic model of this bill.

I also understand there were a lot of areas that do not gain under this bill, especially in title I, with the formula. I understand those Members and their disappoint.

For the State of California, I would like to thank my subcommittee chairmen, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], who has fought for the rights of schools. And for the disagreement, I am sorry.

As a conference on the Improving America's Schools Act, I have watched firsthand the contentious debate surrounding many of the programs in this reauthorization.

I am not pleased with all aspects of this bill. With conference, we started this reauthorization the goal was to consolidate programs—we ended up with 18 new programs.

Language regarding sex education and prayer in schools can be improved and strengthened.

And while I wholeheartedly support parental involvement and professional development I do not believe set-asides are necessary. As usual, there is simply too much Federal bureaucracy.

But in all fairness, we have also made many achievements.

We were able to give more schools the ability to go schoolwide by lowering the poverty
rates to 60 percent in the first year and 50 percent thereafter. This allows almost twice the number of schools the ability to combine funds from all ESEA programs and benefit the entire school and raise achievement for all students.

There are waiver provisions that give schools more flexibility in operating ESEA programs.

There are standards and assessment provisions in title I that are designed to raise academic standards for title I children.

Additionally, there were several significant changes to the education impact aid program. This program is vital to school districts like those in San Diego that are heavily impacted by Federal property.

Most importantly to California: In the past 13 years, California has had to operate title I programs based on funds from the 1980 census from 1980 to 1990 my State had a 38 percent increase in poor children. Educationally disadvantaged children who are supposed to be served under the title I program were being shortchanged.

Throughout this reauthorization, one of my top priorities has been to update census data more frequently so these shortchanges would never happen again, in any state.

In this bill we have finally achieved those updates.

Under the title I formula—California finally gets its fair share.

These are not insignificant gains. Title I will provide $720 million to California school next year.

The new title I formula is responsive to the reality and needs of California school districts and those in San Diego County. It will increase overall funding, target money to students and districts with the highest need while addressing the needs of poverty in our suburban districts as well.

Because of the updating of decennial census poverty data and the gains for the State of California—I rise in support of the conference report.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, since the Eisenhower Program is one I put in a long time ago and it got all messed up in this particular piece of legislation, I often wonder why I was not singing its praises.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT], a member of the committee.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking member, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 6 because it contains too many new programs and new bureaucrat demands on school districts. So much for change in education.

This bill contains 20 new programs—including 1 to get the Federal Government into the business of building schools. So much for local control of education.

It dictates to schools that they must use 1 percent of their chapter I funds for parental involvement. So much for local control of education—we cannot even trust the school boards to use 1 percent of chapter I money.

It dictates that 10 percent of chapter I funds over 2 years be used for professional development. So much for local control of education.

It creates an entirely different Eisenhower Science and Math Program, totally focused on professional development. So much for local control of education.

Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that instead of making changes for the better—to give schools more flexibility to address their own needs—the conference report maintains business as usual. More mandates, more mandates, and more mandates.

So much for local control of education.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Virgin Islands [Mr. DE LUCCO].

Mr. DE LUCCO. Mr. Speaker, I yield in support of the conference report for H.R. 6, the Improving America's Schools Act.

H.R. 6 is the culmination of months and months of hard work. Committee members and staff have invested many long hours in this bill. I commend our chairman, BILLY FORD, and subcommittee chairman, DAVE KILDEE, for their outstanding leadership on H.R. 6.

In many ways H.R. 6 is one of the most important pieces of legislation this House will consider this session. H.R. 6 will provide assistance to our schools; assistance our schools need to provide a solid education to this country's future—our children. If our children do not receive the tools they need now, not only will they suffer, but this country will suffer.

H.R. 6 provides $11 billion in education aid annually for 12,000 local school districts. Without this bill, this money will not be available for our schools.

H.R. 6 provides funding for the disadvantaged in this country. Without this bill, these children will not receive the help they need. H.R. 6 provides a professional development program, continues the chapter 2 block grant program, includes a safe and drug-free schools provision, and does much more.

Unless we support H.R. 6 today and vote "no" on the motion to recommit, none of this assistance will reach our schools. And our schools cannot afford for this bill to fail.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" for education, "yes" for H.R. 6 and "no" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], a member of the committee.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring two points to the attention of the House. No. 1, we have just approved a rule that says we are considering 1,200 pages of legislation that most of us do not have the opportunity to read, and we know at the grassroot level nobody has had the opportunity to see what is in the bill.

There is a different way to do it. In the next Congress, when we have a new set of rules, we will make this information available on the information superhighway, so that not only will the Members of Congress have the opportunity to read legislation, but citizens all over the country will actually finally be able to see what goes on in this House of Representatives, and what is actually contained in the legislation that we are debating. The light will shine.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about another piece of specific action in this program today, great intent. We "reauthorize" that which works really well.

So we authorized the workplace technology skills development act. We did it by unanimous consent by our Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Speaker, reading this, we would get the sense that the mentioned workplace activities so praised and approved to, we would actually believe that they were legal. Let me say, this is not the case in the vast majority of circumstances. The kinds of programs authorized by the Workplace Technology Skill Development Act are in many, and in perhaps most cases, illegal under current interpretations of our arcane labor laws.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, title V, section 541 of the bill assumes that these ideals can only be achieved if we spend money on them and we create a new government program, so it authorizes grants to nonprofit organizations to disseminate workplace technical assistance, conduct research, develop training programs to achieve a high-skilled, highly involved workforce.

Where has the Committee on Education and Labor been? Businesses all around the country have been doing this kind of work. They are moving in this direction. They do not have to be told to do this by the Federal Government.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, we in Washington are behind the curve. We are not even in the wake of what is going on in the American workplace. There is something that the Government can do. We can achieve high involvement workplace by getting out of the way. The source of the problem is a little-known provision in the National Labor Relations Act. It prohibits employers from dominating labor organizations.

Mr. Speaker, what we need to do is, we need to go back and we need to address our labor laws. We need to stop
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putting these kinds of programs, these kinds of dollars, into another educational program. Congressional action here ignores the problem. We are the problem. Let us amend the NLRA.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I thank the chairman of the subcommittee who brought this piece of legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to enthusiastically support the conference report, and to thank the gentleman from Michigan, BILL FORD.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAWYER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, not to be confrontational, but for my own information, I would like to engage in some serious information-getting here on my part as it regards the prayer in school amendment that I voted for, and it passed this House on two or three occasions, the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] indeed did vote for the language that we accepted. And that was represented to us by the Senators in the conference.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that was after the Helms amendment was defeated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio controls time and must yield time.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, all I want is for my own edification here, I do not mean to draw any individuals into this debate. I just want to make sure that whatever takes place, if this bill becomes law, that we are going to have the constitutional prayer amendment in the legislation.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, the answer to the gentleman’s question is absolutely yes.

Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

Mr. HEFNER. Sure. I just wanted that information.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] yield back to me for a moment?

Mr. SAWYER. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Michigan. Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the subcommittee, I reiterate what the gentleman from North Carolina has told the gentleman from North Carolina. He is absolutely correct.

I would also say this on a personal note. I have prayed every day of my life since I was 3 years old, every day. That included prayers when I was a public school teacher privately in the public school. I would say a prayer before every classroom and that was constitutionally protected and will be protected under this. That was in my private prayer. That prayer is always constitutionally protected and this bill does that. I did that as a teacher and I do not want anyone to be deprived of their constitutional rights to pray on their own in a public school.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I particularly want to take a moment to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] who really did an extraordinary job on this piece of legislation. He was there when the historic measure that underlies all of this was passed in 1965 and he has this year presided over the most fundamental progressive reform since it was first enacted. The principal thrust of this realigned amendment is what we believe to be the most deeply about education, that it will rise the achievement levels of educationally disadvantaged students. This bill assumes that disadvantaged students can excel provided that they are exposed to a rigorous curriculum and well-trained teachers. We have heard any number of people talk about the provisions of the bill, the ability to target funds more precise over time, to respond to changes in population, and to be more exact about where those populations lie. That kind of change will benefit school districts all over the country. It provides for an enhanced professional development program. It is modeled on the high success in math and science teacher training programs of recent years and expands them into all of the core subject areas. It provides for technology in the classroom, where the technology levels in the American classroom lag behind the fast-food industry in some uses of information technology.

For the first time since 1965, this bill reflects the reality that the old chief modalities of teaching and learning, the teacher, the classroom, the book, are being superseded by a world of information that can break the logjam of pupil-teacher ratios and overcome the isolation of classrooms. This measure is a major step forward.

The gentleman from Michigan suggested earlier that somehow this was in conflict with the goals of American business. I have received just a moment ago a letter from the National Alliance of Business, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the Committee for Economic Development, and the American Business Conference, all in strong support of H.R. 6 and call for its immediate enactment. The work that has been done among the religious community is every bit as compelling. The letter that we just received from the Baptist Joint Committee representing a broad range of Baptist denominations in the United States, commenting that they have followed the debate on H.R. 6 and particularly the Duncan-Johnson amendment concerning prayer in the public schools. We opposed that amendment because it was unnecessary and would have forced school administrators and teachers to become constitutional scholars and would have potentially encouraged violations of the Constitution. It is our position that the Kassebaum amendment contained in the conference report solves many of these problems and is the better approach.

In short, let me just suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the work that has been done on this bill reflects this bill represents the right change in the right full circle, the passing to another generation of the kind of leadership that we have seen from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] and carried on by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] that will move now into another generation of students who will benefit enormously. 
Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 6, the Improving American Schools Act of 1994 and to offer my tribute to the distinguished chairman of our committee, BILL FORD, who will leave this institution at the end of this year with many significant accomplishments. This generous gentleman has none with greater importance to our Nation than the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. I should point out to my colleagues who are not privileged to serve on the committee that BILL FORD served on the Education and Labor Committee when this generally historic measure was signed by President Johnson and will leave after presiding over the most fundamental and optimistic re-design of its entire mission since it was enacted.

The principal thrust of this measure is to help schools raise the achievement levels of educationally disadvantaged children. That has not changed. What has changed is the assumption that disadvantaged children cannot perform to the same high academic standards that other children do. They can. Children with well-trained teachers with access to rigorous and innovative curriculum can excel.

I would like to take a minute to point out several important changes in the bill. First, we will be able to target assistance to educationally disadvantaged children under title I more precisely because the distribution of funds will be based on poverty data which are updated every ten years. This Census Bureau measure poverty below the national level every ten years. But throughout the decade between censuses, the incidence of poverty is changing and shifting among States and communities. By measuring poverty every 2 years, first at the county and then at the school district level, we can ensure that title I dollars flow continuously to the children that need the most help, while avoiding the disruptive effects of huge shifts in funding allocations after each decennial census.

H.R. 6 also contains important new tools for teachers and students. Title II of the bill establishes a new teacher training program modeled on the highly successful Eisenhower Math and Science Professional Development Program. This new program provides national leadership and resources but grants absolute freedom to classroom teachers to design their own plans for professional development activities based on local needs. A one size fits all approach to teacher training will not work. The new Eisenhower Professional Development Program recognizes that teachers are the single most important factor in opening the world of learning to students at the same time that it acknowledges that the most effective teacher training programs are locally designed by classroom teachers.

But make no mistake about it, if students are going to meet the growing requirements of the information age, they need the appropriate tools. We cannot allow American education to lag behind the fast food industry in the use of information technology. For the first time, this enactment will reflect the reality that the days when the chief modalities of teaching and learning are a chalkboard and a book are over. This conference report authorizes $200 million for grants to create partnerships with local schools, private industry, colleges, libraries and others to integrate educational technology into classroom. Again, the central recognition here is there is no one right way to pursue this goal.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my subcommittee chairman, DALE KLINDEE, and my full committee chairman, BILL FORD, for their forceful leadership. You both should feel a great deal of pride. Finally, I want to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle for the prodigious effort that this measure represents.

I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter of September 30, 1994, from the National Alliance of Business, Committee on Education and Labor, the letter of September 30, 1994, from the Baptist Joint Committee, as follows:

BUSINESS SUPPORT FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT


HON. WILLIAM D. FORD, Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FORD AND CONGRESSMAN GOODLING: The undersigned business organizations urge all members of the House to give the Improving America's Schools Act, H.R. 6, their full support. We believe the enactment of this reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is essential before Congress adjourns. Additionally, we believe the successful implementation of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the development of a globally competitive workforce is contingent on the passage of ESEA.

Although we recognize that individual members may have concerns with specific provisions, including the Title I formula, we believe that on balance H.R. 6 makes a significant contribution to supporting systemic education reform efforts across the country. The alignment of ESEA with Goals 2000 provides this country with a real opportunity to implement comprehensive systemic education reform in every state and local community by requiring to the fullest extent possible the participation and resources for states and communities to adopt the principles contained in Goals 2000—high standards for all students, first-rate professional development, and unprecedented flexibility to design and operate educational programs.

Enacting ESEA in a timely manner will ensure that all students, even the most disadvantaged, are held to the same high standards encompassed in Goals 2000. Without the enactment of ESEA there will be unnecessary delay in all communities being able to fully participate in Goals 2000 efforts as poorer districts and states struggle to assemble the resources necessary to implement reforms. In sum, passage of ESEA will help ensure that the objectives of Goals 2000 become a reality.

ESEA passage will guarantee that for the first time in this nation's history there will be a comprehensive framework and the appropriate funding to support widespread systemic reform efforts. As the recently released 1994 National Goals Panel Report indicates, this country can not afford any longer to divert the efforts without risking significant setbacks in educational progress. We urge you to put partisan differences aside and pass ESEA to help support the long term educational progress and economic security of our nation's future workforce.

We commend the House Committee on Education and Labor for its leadership and persistence in the development and passage of the ESEA, and we urge its swift passage.

Sincerely,


BAPTIST JOINT COMMITTEE.


DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Baptist Joint Committee serves the below listed Baptist bodies on religious liberty and church-state issues.

We have followed the debate on HR 6 and particularly the Duncan-Johnson amendments concerning prayer in the public schools. We opposed that amendment because it was unnecessary, would have forced school administrators and teachers to become constitutional scholars, and would have potentially encouraged violations of the constitution. It is our position that the New Federalism approach to education reform is the better approach.

Accordingly, we urge the conference report with regard to the prayer issue and oppose a motion to recommit.

Yours very truly,

J. BRENT WALKER, General Counsel.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARNEY].

Mr. ARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, when Congress tells you a bill is going to make Federal education programs better, less bureaucratic, more the right and increase the involvement of parents, as opposed to merely helping the teachers' unions—I would advise you to read the fine print.

And when the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, at the last minute, produces an alarming letter from the Education Department claiming that all Federal education funding will simply end at midnight tonight if you don't vote 'yes' on an authorization bill today, a bill which has been rushed to the floor with hair-curling haste—I would advise you to watch your wallet.

Lack of authorization has never stopped us from funding anything before. Why would it stop us now? The truth of the matter is the world will not end if we do not pass this bad bill. Slowing down this high-speed train would merely give members and their constituents more time to find out what is really in this bill. Which may explain its authors' sense of urgency.

There are abundant reasons to oppose this bill, but for time's sake, let me point out just one. The bill says that if you want to protect your child's right to pray voluntarily in a public school, you have to go to court not once but
twice to vindicate your child's first amendment right.

First, you must get a court order against the school district. And then you must go back to court to prove the school district 'willfully' violated the original court order. This is a burden of proof on you, the parent, to prove your rights are being violated.

But with obscene art, it is just the opposite. A law we passed in 1991 says that if an artist creates obscene art with your tax dollars, the burden is not on the artist, but on the Government to prove the artist has abused taxpayer money.

Now I ask you, which deserves more protection—a schoolchild's right to pray, or an artist's right to offend us with our own money?

Incidentally, we are being told it is OK to vote against this motion to recommit because Senator HELMS voted for the prayer language in the bill. Well, I have here in my hand a copy of a letter from Senator HELMS, dated today, which makes it absolutely clear that Senator HELMS strongly opposes the language in the bill. The Senator voted for the so-called Kassebaum language only because his own much stronger language was already in the bill and superseded Kassebaum's. When the conference committee removed the Helms language, that changed everything. So to repeat, Senator HELMS does not support this language. He vigorously opposes it. And so, I might add, should the 360 Members of this House who have voted for the Helms-Duncan-Johnson language on not one, not two, but three separate occasions this year. I will insert Senator HELMS' letter in the RECORD following my remarks.

If some Members' votes on school prayer today do not square with their previous three votes, I would love to be there when those Members have to explain to their constituents why school prayer mattered so much to them that they violated the law.
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Mr. Speaker, up until a minute ago I certainly expected to support this legislation. A printout has just now come which would make that very, very difficult for me, and that is a tragedy. As I said, we spent a year and a half, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], myself, and all of the Members of the committee writing what I thought was good legislation, assisted by an outstanding staff man. I do not know who the encyclopedia is going to be when Mr. Jennings leaves, because he has 30 years of history to tell it the way it is. He never confuses us with 30 years of history. So we certainly are going to miss Jack.

But, as I said, we worked awfully hard to put together a bill and the staff worked even harder. I think we probably should have quit at the staff level. Maybe we never should have gone to the Member's conference and we should have stopped at that point.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON].

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have discussed this and I have read this and I cannot believe that we have voted 3 times on it and the last vote being 369 to 55, that we have conferences who cannot carry out the will of the House. Here is a list of all of them, including some of our leadership who has voted against it.

This is no protection for prayer in school. In fact, it provides hurdles. 

The Christian Coalition says the language currently in the report replaces such hurdles on aggrieved individuals who seek constitutional rights. School prayer has been tinkered. For all intents and purposes it is meaningless. It means that someone has to take a case to court twice in order to protect the privilege of the voluntary right to pray in school.

I want to reiterate our First Amendment to the Constitution: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." We are prohibiting it really by the language in the bill today making them go to court. I would also like to share a letter from an 11-year old girl in my district, Erin Small. She said, "A topic that I've always had on my mind was that topic of prayer in schools. It has always bothered me that on our dollar bills and coins it says 'In God we trust' but in our schools we are not allowed to pray.'

There are many organizations that support the House language as did the House, the Christian Coalition, American Family Association Foundation, Concerned Women of America, Eagle Forum, Family Research Council, Traditional Values Coalition, just to name a few.

The real issues here, what are they? Free speech or offensive language? In the case of obscenity, moral influence may once again be legally acceptable during our school children's days requiring open and honest discourse between people of differing backgrounds.

I believe that we in America need to protect prayer in school. I ask Members to support the motion to recommit.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, up until 10 minutes ago I certainly expected to support this legislation. A printout has just now come which would make that very, very difficult for me, and that is a tragedy. As I said, we spent a year and a half, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], myself, and all of the Members of the committee writing what I thought was good legislation, assisted by an outstanding staff man. I do not know who the encyclopedia is going to be when Mr. Jennings leaves, because he has 30 years of history to tell it the way it is. He never confuses us with 30 years of history. So we certainly are going to miss Jack.

But, as I said, we worked awfully hard to put together a bill and the staff worked even harder. I think we probably should have quit at the staff level. Maybe we never should have gone to the Member's conference and we should have stopped at that point.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at least once today I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman about the great and professional work that we have had the benefit of for so many years with John Jennings, Jack Jennings as we know him,
who is clearly one of the most professional staffers that I have ever worked with. I agree with everything the gentleman has said about him.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the problem I now find myself in is a printout has now come to us showing what will happen in 1999. My poorest district, the poorest district I have has 25 percent poverty. They have never been able to get a concentration grant because it goes to the county, not to the local district. In our bill, when it left the floor here, we moved to the LEA's in 1996 which would have given them an opportunity to get into that new concentration money block.

Looking at the printout now, in 1999 if we take current law, and then take this law that we are now passing, they will lose $59,000, a 25 percent poverty district will lose $59,000.

One might say well, what would they lose under the formula as it left in H.R. 6? The formula in H.R. 6 when it left the floor here, takes us down to the local education agency in 1996, which means that they pick up that concentration grant money.

So as I indicated, my whole problem has been why did we have to rush and not be able to give all Members an indication of what is it they do get in those last 3 years?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], a member of the committee.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, we spent 18 months working on this piece of legislation in the subcommittee and full committee, and I want to congratulate those on both sides of the aisle who have spent a lot of effort, a lot of time trying to put this legislation together.

But as I look at the bill, I think it is the wrong direction. It is just more of the same. It has not worked for 20 years. Why do we think that adding more programs, more of the same kind of restrictions will work? We were going to give schools more flexibility and they ended up with less flexibility. Why do we think this is going to help our schools? It is not.

It is time to reject this model. It is time to start over, and it is time to begin to understand how we can help American schools, not hurt them.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1/4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHlers].

Mr. EHlers. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the issue of racial adoption which has been added to this bill by the Senate. It is an issue we had some difficulty with in the State of Michigan, and eventually ended up in court because we had the provision similar to what is in this bill before us, and it was interpreted by the State agencies, particularly the Department of Social Services and their social workers, to imply that race adopted top priority, and that if a couple of one race wanted to adopt a child of a different race that that was automatically denied unless they were really desperate in terms of a placement.
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The net result of all of this is that a number of children spent as much as 2 or 3 years in foster care waiting for adoption when, in fact, there was a family waiting and able to adopt and would have made wonderful parents.

I have a serious concern about the language as it is contained in the conference report, the language prepared by the Senate. I am concerned about the Johnson language is constitutional. Voluntary prayer in schools is a first amendment right. The language provides for Federal or court referees have replaced it with the weaker Senate language.

This is not only outrageous, it is unconstitutional. Voluntary prayer in school is a first amendment right. The House has voted three times by overwhelming margins to protect voluntary school prayer. Nonetheless, the conference report has been replaced with the weaker Senate language.

Some would have you believe that the Johnson language gives control to the Federal Government of the courts. This is simply not true. The Johnson language provides for Federal or court involvement only if the local school boards and State education agencies fail to act and correct the problem.

In addition, the Johnson language is far less burdensome than the Senate language. The Senate language requires a person to go before the courts...
twice, and prove that the school will fully violate their constitutional right to voluntary school prayer.

Vote yes on the motion to recommit to protect our children's constitutional right to voluntary prayer.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6 and against the motion to recommit.

As I mentioned when I spoke on the rule, I was a conference on this bill. In my 6 years in Congress, I hardly knew of another bill where more diligent work was put into it, long hours in the subcommittee level, the committee level. I was a conference.

Education policy ought to be bipartisan. Every attempt was made to put together a bipartisan bill, a good bill for America, a good bill for America's children. That is what this is all about, educating America's children.

This final version is very, very close to the House version that we initially passed, much more so than the Senate version or the President's bill. Members on both sides of the aisle voted for the House version of this bill.

People who want an excuse to vote against a bill will wiggle around and find any kind of excuses. The bottom line is these formulas were crafted carefully. Everything was done carefully.

This is a good bill, a bipartisan bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say I know the gentlewoman did not mean to fully violate their constitutional rights. Everything was done carefully. Everything was done carefully.

I must again say that by not knowing what this is all about, educating America's children.

This legislation is one of the most extraordinary contributions. She, who also worked diligently. My hat is off to the chairman who is being honored in this legislation by having a portion of it named after him.

Mr. Speaker, if at all, let me say I know the gentleman who did not mean to lose funds under the formula, because, of course, schools will lose funds under the formula, some schools less than 2 percent of funds. People will eventually lose all of their funds. So there is that possibility.

People who want an excuse to vote against a bill will wiggle around and find any kind of excuses. The bottom line is these formulas were crafted carefully. Everything was done carefully.

This is a good bill, a bipartisan bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say I know the gentlewoman did not mean to fully violate their constitutional rights. Everything was done carefully. Everything was done carefully.

I must again say that by not knowing what this is all about, educating America's children.

This legislation is one of the most extraordinary contributions. She, who also worked diligently. My hat is off to the chairman who is being honored in this legislation by having a portion of it named after him.

Mr. Speaker, if at all, let me say I know the gentleman who did not mean to lose funds under the formula, because, of course, schools will lose funds under the formula, some schools less than 2 percent of funds. People will eventually lose all of their funds. So there is that possibility.

People who want an excuse to vote against a bill will wiggle around and find any kind of excuses. The bottom line is these formulas were crafted carefully. Everything was done carefully.

This is a good bill, a bipartisan bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 6. This legislation contains a provision entitled "The Multietnic Placement Act." The original purpose of this act was to end the discrimination which prevents many minority children from being adopted, especially out of the foster care system. Currently, minority children are entering the foster care system in unprecedented numbers, and they are waiting years longer than white children for families.

However, when the bill came to be considered in conference, the administration insisted on amendments that would undermine the fundamental purpose of the bill.

Now the bill requires something called diligent recruitment of face-matching families and there are serious questions about whether this language could be used to deny placements across racial lines.

The administration amendments gut the original bill, defeat its purpose, and would make it even more difficult for minority children to find families.

The Multietnic Placement Act is clearly not in the best interest of the children in foster care who are waiting for loving homes. As an adoptive mother, I urge you to vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

As we are on the floor at this moment, a longtime staffer of the Committee on Education and Labor is being interred in Arlington Cemetery, and many of us had expected to be at the memorial service at 1 o'clock. Because we could not go, I wanted to put the remarks that I have here in the RECORD to recognize the many years under the direction of Carl Perkins that he gave to this country and to the original construction of this law and its improvement over the years.

Hartwell D. "Jack" Reed of Kentucky was the predecessor to John Jennings, whom we have been talking about. But Jack was one of the great people who have served with the greatest chairman the Committee on Education and Labor ever had, Carl Perkins.

Consequently, I urge all members to support H.R. 6. It is a bill which will truly help America's children.

This legislation is one of the most carefully crafted bills which have come out of the Committee on Education and Labor. The members deserve credit for all their work, but I also want to thank the staff members for their extraor dinary contributions.

Diane Stark worked night and day on this bill and applied her keen intelligence to make it such a fine piece of legislation which will improve education for many children. Her wonderful personality combined with her intelligence and experience guarantee her a fine future.

Omer Waddles is cut from the same cloth as Diane. His dedication combined with his intelligence and willingness to work long hours makes him one of the best professionals we have ever had on the committee.

Toni Painter has been the person behind the scenes who keeps us all on course. Her good humor and sharp wit make us all proud. We will miss her when she retires from the Committee this year.

Kris Gilbert, Alan Lovesee, and June Harris have all contributed to improving the programs contained in this bill. These abilities are recognized by all the various education groups they deal with.

Other people I want to commend are the staff members of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education. Susan Wilhelm, the staff director has mastered in a surprisingly short period of time the intricacies of the laws under her responsibility. Jeff McFarland and Mary Cassell have also earned the respect of all of us. And Bessie Taylor helps to hold this whole operation together by her diligence and nice personality.

DALE KILDEE, as subcommittee chairman, has assembled a fine staff, and our committee will benefit for years from their expertise.

The last person I want to thank is Rosemary Gallagher, the legislative counsel for the bill. She, too, worked long hours and deserves great credit for the quality of the final bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against any motions to recommit the bill and to vote for final passage of H.R. 6, the Improving America's Schools Act.

Every member of the House receives Federal aid for his or her school district under this bill. We are dealing with $11 billion of vital aid every year to 15,000 school districts in the country.

The Secretary of Education has said that his lawyers tell him that he cannot disburse this $111 billion for these programs unless this bill passes. Chairman Garamendi of the Appropriations Committee confirms this opinion and says that the money in the Labor-HHS-Education appropriation bill cannot be sent out to school districts unless we pass this authorization.

Motion to reconsider this bill will kill it because we do not have enough time in the remaining few days of this Congress to reconvene the conference, report a new bill, face another motion to recommit, and then face a filibuster in the Senate.

If you want your school districts to receive money under more than 40 education programs, you have to vote against any motion to recommit and vote for the bill. Some examples of the funds which will be lost include:

Title I grants to schools districts .... $6,995,356,000
Migrant education .................. 305,475,000
Elisehower Voc. and Drug-Free Schools ........... 320,288,000
Chapter 2 .......................... 347,250,000
Safe and Drug-Free Schools ............... 481,992,000

Some opponents of this bill have been sowing confusion among the members by saying that the conference report is unfair to rural areas. Those assertions are simply not true.

September 30, 1994

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

26907
congressional record—house

September 30, 1994

the conference report treats rural areas even better than the bill which passed the House last March. We looked at 40 rural areas spread throughout the country and in reviewing every county in those districts we found that the conference report did better than the bill we passed 6 months ago.

I am especially concerned about the misinformation which is being given about rural areas because the people who are distributing it are the ones who are the prime sponsors of the formula we wrote in committee last spring. Those members thought that the formula was fair to rural areas and supported it in committee and then on the floor. Now they are asserting the conference report is unfair when it treats rural areas better than the formula they themselves wrote.

The last point I want to make is that there is going to be a lot of confusion spread about the social amendments we had to deal with in this conference. Let me make some facts crystal clear. First, both bills required school districts to permit constitutionally protected prayer. The House bill had the Secretary of Education determine what is permitted by the Constitution. Then, he could cut off a school district's funds if they disobeyed him. The Senate bill adopted the Kassebaum amendment, supported by Senator Helms, which placed the authority in the courts for determining what is constitutionally protected prayer and then it penalizes a school district for violating a court order.

The conference committee adopted the Kassebaum amendment. This means that no school district can forbid constitutionally-protected prayer as determined by a court or that it can place restrictions on prayer and penalize them. School districts in my congressional district which are impacted by this new provision are making the effort to keep the school district's financial aid reauthorization.

On the sex issues, we passed amendments in both the House and the Senate and have put them together into a provision which will bar for the first time the use of Federal education money—No. 1, to promote any sexual activity—heterosexual or homosexual; No. 2, to disseminate obscene material to minors on school premises; No. 3, to purchase contraceptives or No. 4, to fund sex education programs unless they stress the benefits of abstinence.

The conference report, in adopting all these prohibitions for the first time at the Federal level, also respects local control of curriculum by forbidding the U.S. Secretary of Education from directing or controlling local control of education.

My personal view is that we should not have any provisions in Federal law dealing with school prayer or sexual activities but that was not the will of the House or the Senate. Therefore, in conference we fashioned agreements that contain restrictions on prayer and sexual activities, but respect local decisions.

One last note is that at the very time we are debating H.R. 6, amending and extending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, a man who made a vital and important contribution to that legislation is being interred at Arlington Cemetery. Mortwell D. "Jack" Read retired in 1984. He had served the Committee on Education and Labor for 23 years.

He made a vital and impressive contribution to all the important social legislation of that era. The Economic Opportunity Act, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, and vocational education; all of these he worked on. He had a detailed knowledge of the substantive aspects of all this legislation. He was an imaginative and extraordinarily good drafter. His name is "good sense" cause to most members of the Committee to seek his advice and counsel.

Jack drafted many of the amendments to our committee rules that marked the liberalization and the democratization of the Committee process in the 60's and 70's. As his ashes are interred in Arlington, there are many of us who miss him. He was a professional; he contributed much to the legislative process.

1950

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), my leader on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PORTER. I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding, and I rise in very strong support of the conference report. My ranking Democrat and ranking Republican members of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report contains a provision which I helped to write to compensate heavily federally-impacted school districts with very high tax districts. Good. It is an effort to help Representatives GOODLING, KILDEE, and FORD and their staffs for working with me on and adopting this provision which is so critical to the North Chicago Community School District in my congressional district. In addition, I want particularly to thank Lynn Selmsner and Jeff McFarland, the committee staff who worked so hard on many of the arcane provisions of the Impact Aid reauthorization.

The Impact Aid Program compensates school districts for the cost of educating federally-connected children, many of them children of military personnel, whose parents live and work on Federal property and therefore pay no property taxes to support the local schools. I have three school districts in my congressional district which are impacted by military presence in their communities. While these communities have welcomed the military families which contribute greatly to the local culture and particularly the schools, they have right­fully asked the Federal Government to provide adequate support to the local schools to compensate for the most property tax revenues resulting from Federal ownership of local housing.

As the first Federal education program enacted in the 1950's Impact Aid was fully funded by the Congress during the first two decades of its existence. However, as Congress dramatically expanded the number and breadth of Federal education programs in the 1960's and 1970's Impact Aid began to compete for increasingly scarce Federal dollars.

Over the last decade, Impact Aid has increasingly been funded below the so-called entitlement level—the amount of revenue all schools forego due to Federal ownership of local housing. As a result, school districts, like North Chicago, have increasingly been called upon to subsidize the education of federal­ly-connected children. While many schools must provide either a relatively small subsidy or are able to compensate because of the large tax bases, many schools have been driven literally to the brink of bankruptcy.

In particular, school districts in Highland Park and North Chicago in my congressional district are now providing annual multimillion dollar subsidies to the Federal Government through uncompensated education for federally-­connected children. In the case of North Chicago, the school district, which serves over 4,000 students, recently was forced to file for dissolution and nearly ceased operation in midschool year. At the last minute, the State legislature passed emergency legislation to keep the school district afloat for another year.

Now they are as­signed to do the same. This means that no funding will be provided within the budget caps. In addition, it does not comprise a Federal hand-out to the school district; it is simply reducing the subsidy the school district provides to the Federal Government. In other words, the enactment of this new provision will ensure that the Federal Government does a better—though not complete—job of meeting its obligation to heavily-impacted school districts.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank my Appropriation Chairman NEAL SMITH and Senators HARKIN and SPECKER for agreeing to accept my proposal to provide $40 million in 1995 to fund the new so-called section (l) provision for heavily impacted schools. This funding will ensure that the former 3(d)(2) schools and heavily impacted schools like North Chicago will be more adequately compensated for the cost of educating military dependents.

In the future, I hope the Appropriations Committee will continue to fully fund the Impact Aid Program thereby eliminating the need for section (l) funding. But in the interim, I am pleased that the Congress has recognized the plight of very heavily impacted schools and has taken this important action.

Mr. KILDEE, Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I thank the gentleman, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 6.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 6, the Improving America's Schools Act. Education of our children must be our highest priority, and this is what H.R. 6 is all about—providing our local schools with desperately needed Federal assistance to improve educational opportunities for all children.

Twenty-nine years ago I was privileged to serve as a member of the Education and Labor Committee and had a part in the passage of the first Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, along with my good friend and colleague, Chair BILL FORD. The final bill before us today is evidence of how
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our commitment to education has grown over the years, and I am proud to have had a hand in reporting this bill once again.

H.R. 6 will provide $1 billion of Federal aid to over 13,000 school districts around the country for programs that have stood the test of time, like the Chapter 1 Program for disadvantaged children, Impact Aid, and Bilingual Education Programs to meet the changing needs of America's schools, like educational technology, coordinated health and social services, and school repair and renovation funds.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most exciting aspects of H.R. 6 is that it includes a comprehensive package geared towards assuring that girls and young women have equitable educational opportunities, known as the Gender Equity in Education Act.

The Gender Equity in Education Act is a package of nine bills developed by the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues to address the educational inequities girls and women face in our education system.

The Caucus developed this legislation in response to the increasing evidence that despite the fact that Title IX prohibits sex discrimination in our schools, many inequities in our schools continue to prevent girls from achieving their full academic, social, and economic potential.

Studies have shown that the inequities are often not obvious or purposeful, but are deeply imbedded in school practices, even where discriminatory policies have been abolished. The results are that girls get less attention from their teachers; girls are not encouraged to take math and science courses; girls lack female role models in those academic areas which will lead to the high-skilled, high paying jobs; sexual harassment is not taken seriously and on the rise; tests continue to be gender-biased; and the needs of pregnant and parenting teens are not met.

The Gender Equity in Education Act was developed through the Caucus Task Force on Economic and Educational Equity, of which I chair. We worked closely with the co-chairs of the Caucus, Pat Schroeder and Olympia Snowe, and other Caucus members, and the other projects in the package. The Senate sponsors who helped guide these provisions through the Senate and conference committee are Senators Tom Harkin, Paul Simon, Carol Moseley-Braun, Barbara Mikulski, Barbara Boxer, and Diane Feinstein.

Through the hard work of the Caucus and the Members of the Education and Labor Committee, I am proud to say that we were able to include a piece of every single bill within the Gender Equity in Education Act.

The cornerstone of the gender equity provisions included in H.R. 6 is the reauthorization of the Women's Educational Equity Act. I authored the Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA) in 1974 to assist schools in complying with title 9, which had been enacted in 1972.

This program which funds research, development, and dissemination of curricular materials, teacher training programs, guidance and counseling, along with the other projects in the remote educational equity for women and girls.

For over a decade WEEA has been severely neglected, enduring severe budget cuts from the Reagan administration. In 1980 the program received $10 million, but by 1992 the program had been whittled down to just $500,000. The conference report brings the funding back up to $5 million, which has already been provided by the Appropriations Committees.

In addition, the bill seeks to recapture the original intent of women's Educational Equity Act by retaining the current WEEA grant program to develop and disseminate model programs, curricula, and materials to advance educational equity. But more importantly, the bill also establishes an implementation grant program to provide funds to school districts, community organizations and other entities to implement gender equity programs within local school systems.

Many model equity programs have been developed over the last 15 years and now is the time to assist schools and school districts in actually integrating these programs into their educational systems.

Reform within the educational system begins at the local level. And as we seek to eliminate discrimination, inequities and barriers that continue to prevent girls from achieving educational, economic and social parity in this society, we must assure that schools all across the country implement and integrate into their curriculum, policies, goals, programs and activities, initiatives to achieve educational equity for women and girls.

Along these lines, the bill also establishes within the Department of Education a Special Assistant for Gender Equity to promote, coordinate and evaluate gender equity programs in all education programs, including the Women's Educational Equity Act. Currently gender equity programs of varying sizes exist through the Department of Education, however, there is no mechanism to ensure communication and evaluate progress among all gender equity programs.

The Special Assistant to the Secretary for Gender Equity would help assure the program implementation, and evaluation of gender equity Act activities within the Department of Education and work with other Federal agencies with jurisdiction over Federal education programs.

Other provisions have been incorporated throughout the programs of the bill to specially address the areas of teacher training, math and science, pregnant and parenting teens, sexual harassment and abuse, coordinated health and social services, and data collection.

The bill includes provisions to promote professional development strategies, methods, and techniques which meet the needs of female and minority students in the Title I Program and the new Eisenhower Professional Development Program. The bill also encourages the recruitment of female and minority teachers in subject areas in which they are underrepresented, such as math and science.

Pregnancy is the most common reason girls give for dropping out of school and almost half of teen mothers who drop out never complete high school. H.R. 6 includes dropout programs targeted to address the needs of pregnant and parenting teens so that they will stay in school.

A fundamental prerequisite for an effective learning environment is that it be free from harassment, discrimination, and other barriers that continue to prevent girls and women from achieving their full potential. A hungry, sick, worried child will not learn well; her basic needs must be met before she can turn full attention to schooling.

Under this provision schools and school districts can use up to 6 percent of their funds received under the Elementary and Secondary Education Programs to finance the coordination of services.

The bill also provides funds under the Safe and Drug Free Schools Act and Title V of the Improvement of Education (IEF) be used for the development of curricula related to child abuse prevention and training of personnel to teach child abuse education and prevention to elementary and secondary school children.

H.R. 6 also expands data collection requirements for Chapter 1 and all major Federal education programs in order to better assess the achievement and participation rates of males, females, minority and ethnic populations, and the disadvantaged.

Research and data collection are vital components of any attempt to eliminate gender inequity in education. Unfortunately, current Department of Education data collection activities provide insufficient information on gender issues.

And finally, the bill includes the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act, which requires all institutions of Higher Education participating in Federal aid programs to disclose certain information on their men's and women's athletics teams.

This provision was included in the Senate version by Senator Carol Moseley-Braun and authored in the House by Congresswoman Cardiss Collins. It is essential in providing information to young women about the strength of women's athletics at a particular institution to give the general public and the Department of Education a more comprehensive picture of whether schools are complying with title 9 in relation to their athletic programs.

Mr. Speaker, the Gender Equity in Education Act was the first comprehensive educational initiative put forth by the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues. It is the culmination of over 2 years of work, and I am pleased that we were able to include virtually the entire package in this bill. Importantly, I want to mention a provision that did not make it into the final bill...
The Educational Opportunity Demonstration Program, sponsored by Senator John Danforth and included in the Senate version was overwhelmingly rejected by the conference committee.

This program would have allowed the Secretary of Education to waive title 9 of the Educational Rights of Children Act of 1972 in order to institute single sex classes or schools.

This proposal would have set a dangerous precedent which would have allowed for the first time the waiver of a fundamental civil rights law. There is no doubt that it had serious legal ramifications that would have weakened civil rights protections and reduced educational equity for girls.

Title IX was enacted in 1972 to address the long history of discrimination in sex segregated educational settings. History, as well as recent experiments in this area have proven that once you begin segregating students by sex, it is the girls that always lose. It was not too many years ago, when girls continued to be forced to take home-making while boys took technical training classes which gave them skills they could easily translate into the marketplace.

The Danforth proposal would have allowed schools to travel back down the path of separate but equal, which has never proved to benefit minorities, girls or any other group that has been historically discriminated against in our schools system.

The conference committee rightfully rejected the Danforth proposal with Members on both sides of the aisle voting against the proposal.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 6 is the fine product of many hours of hard work by Members and staff. I commend our Chair, Bill Ford for his hard work on this bill and many other initiatives in his 30 years of service to this institution. It has been a real pleasure to serve with Bill Ford, and to call him a friend. This bill is truly an example of his fine leadership and his commitment to the education of our children.

I hope that all my colleagues will join me in supporting the conference report on H.R. 6, the Improving America’s Schools Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. Unsoeld].

Mrs. Unsoeld. Mr. Speaker. I thank the gentleman for yielding time, and I rise in support of the conference report and against any motion to recommit.

Mr. Kildee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a portion of a letter from the Committee on Appropriations:

That means until H.R. 6 is signed, even though the fiscal year 1995 Appropriations Act for the Department of Education has been signed, the Department will not be able to obligate those funds for those programs until H.R. 6 becomes law.

The letter referred to is as follows:

Committee on Appropriations,

Hon. William Ford
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman, I want to confirm your understanding that funds in Titles I, II, III, IV, V, VII, VIII, IX, and XV included in the Fiscal Year 1995 appropriations bill for the Department of Education are available to carry out activities authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Improving America’s Schools Act as enacted into law.

That means until H.R. 6 is signed, even though the Fiscal Year 1995 Appropriations Act for the Department of Education has been signed, the Department will not be able to obligate those funds under those programs unless H.R. 6 becomes law.

Sincerely,
Joyce G. McCray,
Executive Director.

Mr. Kildee. Also, a letter from the U.S. Catholic Conference, Department of Education:

When the House considers the Elementary and Secondary Education Act conference report for the closing days of the 103rd Congress will jeopardize continuance and funding of ESEA programs affecting millions of students.

CAPE is the coalition of 14 national elementary and secondary private school associations, which are listed below. Our schools‘ policy of non-discrimination in their admissions.

CAPE member organizations represent about 70 percent of the 5 million children enrolled in 384,000 teachers in private schools. There are 30 state CAPE affiliates which extend the coalition throughout the country.

We strongly support the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and feel its programs have been beneficial to all the nation’s students and teachers—in both private and public schools. The fabric of American education has been strengthened by this Act since its inception in 1965. A driving principle for many years has been that the law seeks to address the needs of all students, regardless of what kind of school they attend.

Therefore, we are concerned that efforts may be made to recommit the bill to conference in the closing days of the session. Consideration of the reauthorization has been underway formally since December 1992, with extensive review, deliberations, and public hearings. While CAPE could take issue with certain provisions of this comprehensive bill which affect our schools, we recognize the legislative process requires good faith toward enactment of H.R. 6. Therefore, CAPE urges the House to move expeditiously to consider and final passage of the conference report to H.R. 6 before the end of the 103rd Congress.

Sincerely,
Mr. Clay. I rise in support of the H.R. 6 conference report reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

While there are many legitimate reasons for supporting this conference report, the most important is that further delay in implementing ESEA will adversely impact the children who benefit most from the programs funded in this bill.

Given the problems encountered in bringing this bill to fruition, once again the perception given the public is that the Congress is unable to deal with the critical and basic issues facing this Nation. We seem eager to respond to minute and frivolous matters of little consequence to most Americans but when it comes to the welfare of our children, we seem to be unable to do what is necessary to ensure their future.
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The people's agenda includes economic development, crime abatement, education, and health reform.

The conference committee has tried to be responsive. Those who would thwart such efforts appear to have a different agenda which speaks to special interests like baseball, hockey, term limits, and bogus election year contracts.

H.R. 6, the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 extends through 1999 almost all of the major Federal elementary and secondary education programs.

Since its inception in 1965, this act has provided a vital and crucial link in helping to provide high-quality education to economically disadvantaged children, particularly in the areas of reading and mathematics as well as in the development of critical thinking skills.

The move toward excellence and inclusiveness which began so nobly in 1965 when then President Lyndon Baines Johnson signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act into law, must be permitted to move forward.

The Dwight D. Eisenhower professional development report on school desegregation, issued in December 1993 by Gary Orfield states: "For the first time since the Supreme Court declared school segregation in the south unconstitutional in 1954, the public schools in the region have turned back toward greater desegregation." Clearly, in reauthorizing the Magnet Schools Assistance Program we can demonstrate our continuing commitment to school desegregation in compliance with the 1954 Supreme Court decision in Brown versus Board of Education.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunity-to-learn standards provisions included in this legislation clearly provides for content and performance standards as well as assessments that would be established or used for title I programs. Content standards indicate what children should know and be able to do; performance standards determine whether children are learning. I fully support both content and performance standards. I strongly support the components of standards as Teachers, staff, and administrators.

The Magnet Schools Assistance Program helps school districts fulfill the Federal commitment to school desegregation. The report on school desegregation, issued in December 1993 by Gary Orfield states: "For the first time since the Supreme Court declared school segregation in the south unconstitutional in 1954, the public schools in the region have turned back toward greater desegregation." Clearly, in reauthorizing the Magnet Schools Assistance Program we can demonstrate our continuing commitment to school desegregation in compliance with the 1954 Supreme Court decision in Brown versus Board of Education.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunity-to-learn standards provisions included in this legislation clearly provides for content and performance standards as well as assessments that would be established or used for title I programs. Content standards indicate what children should know and be able to do; performance standards determine whether children are learning. I fully support both content and performance standards. I strongly support the components of standards as Teachers, staff, and administrators.

The Magnet Schools Assistance Program helps school districts fulfill the Federal commitment to school desegregation. The report on school desegregation, issued in December 1993 by Gary Orfield states: "For the first time since the Supreme Court declared school segregation in the south unconstitutional in 1954, the public schools in the region have turned back toward greater desegregation." Clearly, in reauthorizing the Magnet Schools Assistance Program we can demonstrate our continuing commitment to school desegregation in compliance with the 1954 Supreme Court decision in Brown versus Board of Education.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunity-to-learn standards provisions included in this legislation clearly provides for content and performance standards as well as assessments that would be established or used for title I programs. Content standards indicate what children should know and be able to do; performance standards determine whether children are learning. I fully support both content and performance standards. I strongly support the components of standards as Teachers, staff, and administrators.

The Magnet Schools Assistance Program helps school districts fulfill the Federal commitment to school desegregation. The report on school desegregation, issued in December 1993 by Gary Orfield states: "For the first time since the Supreme Court declared school segregation in the south unconstitutional in 1954, the public schools in the region have turned back toward greater desegregation." Clearly, in reauthorizing the Magnet Schools Assistance Program we can demonstrate our continuing commitment to school desegregation in compliance with the 1954 Supreme Court decision in Brown versus Board of Education.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunity-to-learn standards provisions included in this legislation clearly provides for content and performance standards as well as assessments that would be established or used for title I programs. Content standards indicate what children should know and be able to do; performance standards determine whether children are learning. I fully support both content and performance standards. I strongly support the components of standards as Teachers, staff, and administrators.

The Magnet Schools Assistance Program helps school districts fulfill the Federal commitment to school desegregation. The report on school desegregation, issued in December 1993 by Gary Orfield states: "For the first time since the Supreme Court declared school segregation in the south unconstitutional in 1954, the public schools in the region have turned back toward greater desegregation." Clearly, in reauthorizing the Magnet Schools Assistance Program we can demonstrate our continuing commitment to school desegregation in compliance with the 1954 Supreme Court decision in Brown versus Board of Education.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunity-to-learn standards provisions included in this legislation clearly provides for content and performance standards as well as assessments that would be established or used for title I programs. Content standards indicate what children should know and be able to do; performance standards determine whether children are learning. I fully support both content and performance standards. I strongly support the components of standards as Teachers, staff, and administrators.

The Magnet Schools Assistance Program helps school districts fulfill the Federal commitment to school desegregation. The report on school desegregation, issued in December 1993 by Gary Orfield states: "For the first time since the Supreme Court declared school segregation in the south unconstitutional in 1954, the public schools in the region have turned back toward greater desegregation." Clearly, in reauthorizing the Magnet Schools Assistance Program we can demonstrate our continuing commitment to school desegregation in compliance with the 1954 Supreme Court decision in Brown versus Board of Education.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunity-to-learn standards provisions included in this legislation clearly provides for content and performance standards as well as assessments that would be established or used for title I programs. Content standards indicate what children should know and be able to do; performance standards determine whether children are learning. I fully support both content and performance standards. I strongly support the components of standards as Teachers, staff, and administrators.

The Magnet Schools Assistance Program helps school districts fulfill the Federal commitment to school desegregation. The report on school desegregation, issued in December 1993 by Gary Orfield states: "For the first time since the Supreme Court declared school segregation in the south unconstitutional in 1954, the public schools in the region have turned back toward greater desegregation." Clearly, in reauthorizing the Magnet Schools Assistance Program we can demonstrate our continuing commitment to school desegregation in compliance with the 1954 Supreme Court decision in Brown versus Board of Education.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunity-to-learn standards provisions included in this legislation clearly provides for content and performance standards as well as assessments that would be established or used for title I programs. Content standards indicate what children should know and be able to do; performance standards determine whether children are learning. I fully support both content and performance standards. I strongly support the components of standards as Teachers, staff, and administrators.

The Magnet Schools Assistance Program helps school districts fulfill the Federal commitment to school desegregation. The report on school desegregation, issued in December 1993 by Gary Orfield states: "For the first time since the Supreme Court declared school segregation in the south unconstitutional in 1954, the public schools in the region have turned back toward greater desegregation." Clearly, in reauthorizing the Magnet Schools Assistance Program we can demonstrate our continuing commitment to school desegregation in compliance with the 1954 Supreme Court decision in Brown versus Board of Education.
Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my fellow members to support H.R. 6, Improving America's Schools Act. Few Federal priorities can be as important as education. As a former school teacher, school administrator, and the mother of two school-age daughters, I am particularly proud to participate in today's debate to reauthorize for 5 years more of the Federal assistance for elementary and secondary education programs.

I would like to thank Chairman FORD for all of his diligent work on this important legislation, so crucial to America's children. I would also like to mention the efforts of two of my fellow New Yorkers, ELIOT ENGEL and MAJOR OWENS, and to thank them for protecting the interests of our city and State.

Of all of this legislation's many important programs, it is perhaps the title I Compensatory Education Program which provides the most direct and dramatic assistance to schoolchildren in New York and throughout the country. This important program provides economically and educationally disadvantaged children the concentrated extra help they need.

In addition to title I funding for fiscal year 1995 and such sums as may be necessary for the remaining 4 years, in New York City over half of our schools receive title I funding—668 schools out of a total of 1,105, with an estimated 237,000 students receiving benefits. As impressive as that may seem, that number is unfortunately only a little over half of those eligible.

This is the main reason why I supported President Clinton's original formula, which would have targeted more of the available resources toward the Nation's poorest schools. In New York City, a school must have 62 percent of its students in poverty to receive title I funds, in contrast to the national average of only 25 percent. Although the President's formula was not adopted, I do believe that the final formula represents a step in the right direction. The three New York boroughs that I represent—Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Queens—will receive an additional $22.6 million in fiscal year 1995 as a result of the new formula for a total of over $313 million.

Mr. Speaker, there are other important features of this legislation. For instance title IV authorizes $655 million in fiscal year 1995 for drug and violence prevention programs in an effort to ensure that more children are prepared so crucial to the academic environment. Title V funds magnet schools, which have a magnificent track record in my district for promoting innovative educational programs and cultural diversity. Title II includes the Eisenhower Professional Development Program to sustain and intensify teacher training opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this huge investment in our children's future. It's a good bill for New York and for our Nation. Let's not play politics with our children—let's pass this bill now.

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, today we are being asked to recommit the elementary and secondary education conference report due to its language regarding school prayer, which is not the language program of us in the House supported.

I have consistently advocated a moment of silence in schools. But while I support my colleagues who are fighting for the House language, I cannot dismiss a bill that many have worked so hard to pass and that will provide much needed funding to our States' education programs.

The elementary and secondary education bill does not, in any way, jeopardize the use of prayer in schools. The Senate language, which was included in the conference report, will withhold Federal funds from any school district which fails to allow to add a constitutionally protected voluntary prayer in school. This measure will go a long way to protect school prayer, as ESEA will go a long way to improve America's schools.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that my colleagues join me in voting "no" on the motion to recommit the conference report on H.R. 6. It is my hope this body will join together in support of the elementary and secondary education bill.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the motion to be offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON] to recommit the conference report to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act offered by my colleague from Texas. Frankly, I find it unbelievable that we are here today debating this motion to recommit because last week the House easily passed the motion to instruct conferees to accept the House-passed language to H.R. 6 regarding school prayer offered by Mr. GUNDERSON. The House sent a strong message to members of the conference committee to accept the House-passed language. We have sent this same message to the other body on numerous occasions.

While there are provisions in this bill I strongly support, I must object to the conference committee's blatant rejection of the strong message sent by the House on the issue of school prayer. As passed by the House on March 24 by a convincing vote of 289-128, H.R. 6 included language denying funds to any State or local educational agency which has a policy of denying or preventing participation in constitutionally protected school prayer. The bill also stipulated that the Federal Government cannot require any person to participate in school prayer.

The Senate language would make schools judged by a Federal court to have willfully violated a Federal court order mandating that it correct violations of constitutionally protected school prayer, ineligible for funds until they comply with the court order. The bill also states that funds are not reimbursable for the period during which schools were in willful noncompliance. This language is not acceptable.

The House language does not mandate school prayer or require schools to write any particular prayer. Under this language, a school is not required to do anything in favor of voluntary prayer. It simply must refrain from instituting policies prohibiting voluntary student prayer.

One of the many liberties our forefathers founded this great Nation upon was freedom of religion; a freedom to pray to the god we want, when we want, and where we want. Unfortunately, this freedom has been eroded by the Supreme Court over the last few decades. I firmly believe that no one should be forced to pray, especially if a certain prayer is contrary to an individual's beliefs. But, there can be no question that every American citizen has the right to pray voluntarily whenever and wherever he or she chooses, and that includes children under the age of 18 protected under the first amendment; "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." It is that second part that I ask you to consider when you vote today.

As President Reagan so eloquently stated in 1982, "the first amendment of the Constitution was not written to protect the people of this country from religious values; it was written to protect religious values from Government tyranny."

This language has overwhelmingly passed the House on several occasions and based on that fact, the motion to recommit should also pass overwhelmingly. I urge an affirmative vote on the Johnson motion to recommit H.R. 6 to support the House-passed language.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this conference report contains an unfortunate provision that could seriously inhibit the placement of minority race children in adoptive homes.

According to the National Council for Adoption, there are currently about 200,000 children available for adoption. Black children make up about 40 percent of this pool and that percentage could increase if this legislation is enacted in its current form.

The Multiethnic Placement Act was originally introduced to mitigate practices which often prevent minority children from being placed in adoptive homes for many years. Too often, social workers decline to place children for adoption along racial or ethnic lines in order to preserve the children's "cultural identity." This causes children to linger in foster care for years and years, often going from one home to another. The sad result is that these children fail to form a family identity and a sense of security that comes from having loving parents and a stable home environment.

At the insistence of the Clinton administration, language was added to this bill which requires "diligent recruitment" of race-matched families. Bureaucrats at the Department of Health and Human Services [HHS] will have the authority to micromanage adoption placement practices in all 50 States. A legislative remedy that had the support of the National Council for Adoption, Jesse Jackson's Rainbow Coalition and the Children's Defense Fund has been turned virtuously inside out in this legislation. The effect of codifying and expanding an ill-advised practice will likely be that fewer black children will be placed for adoption, and those that are will not be placed until they are older and more insecure after years of lingering in orphanages or foster homes.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the Multiethnic Placement Act allow agencies to "* * * consider the race, color or national origin of a child as a factor * * *" However, that carefully considered legislation does not allow social workers to endlessly delay the placement of a child who desperately needs a stable home and loving parents. I urge Members to vote to recommit this conference report and address adoption policies in a manner that puts the well-being of our Nation's children first.
Mr. FAWEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6, the Improving America's Schools Act. I supported the House-version of H.R. 6, but am unable to vote for the conference report.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act currently consists of 46 programs. When President Clinton submitted his recommendations for this reauthorization, he suggested that we eliminate unnecessary programs and consolidate others into the bulk of Federal education dollars could be focused in the programs with broad support and proven records of effectiveness. While I did not agree with all of the President's recommendations, I did support the concept of consolidation and streamlining. Regrettably, this conference report takes a step in the opposite direction. Rather than eliminating and consolidating programs, this bill eliminates few programs and creates many new ones. The conference report includes 15 more programs than the House-passed version, 63 programs in all, and more than double the number of programs that the President recommended.

I am also concerned about the possible effects of changes in the title I formula on school districts. The House is considering this legislation without providing Members of Congress the requisite 3 days for reviewing the legislation which is over 1,200 pages long. No Member of Congress has read the entire bill, and no one really knows what the effect of the formula will be.

In addition, I am opposed to the version of the Multiethnic Placement Act which has been included in the conference report. Denying adoption of black children by white families effectively sentences these children to unnecessary years of going from one home to another without having a chance to emotionally bond with permanent adoptive parents. This is tragic and avoidable. Senator HOWARD METZENBAUM's original legislation would correct this situation by denying any Federal foster care and adoption assistance money to adoption agencies which deny or delay the placement of a child based solely on the race, color, or national origin of the adoptive parents.

Under the Metzenbaum proposal, social workers could select parents of the same race over equally qualified candidates of another race if they believed doing so was in the best interest of the child. The legislation makes an exception for the adoption of a child by qualified adoptive parents of any color is not in the child's best interest and is prohibited.

As a House conference on this provision, I worked with the National Council For Adoption and other Members of Congress to eliminate the roadblocks to transracial adoption. Regrettably, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services [HHS], which runs Federal adoption programs, has insisted on major changes which will have the effect of permitting agencies to discriminate on the basis of race. Among the changes sought by HHS are the expansion of a "permissible consideration" provision which would allow an agency to consider a child's cultural, ethnic, or racial background of the child, and the capacity of the prospective foster or adoptive parents to meet those needs as one of a number of factors used to determine the best interests of a child. In addition, HHS recommended changing the enforcement mechanism from mandatory to discretionary enforcement. Unfortunately, the majority party of Congress agreed to acquiesce to the HHS recommendations, and the conference report would require that racially coordinated adoptions are strongly preferred and that delays and denials for this purpose will be permissible.

Mr. Speaker, supporters of H.R. 6 have argued that Federal education funding will not be given to the schools this year if we do not pass this legislation. This simply is not so. The House and Senate have already approved H.R. 4606, with my support, which provides funding of Federal education programs for the next year. If we do not pass H.R. 6, funds will be allocated according to existing law.

In the 104th Congress, I believe that Congress can come up with a better product than H.R. 6, and urge Members to vote "no" on the conference report.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on H.R. 6 and against the motion to recommit. We have heard a lot about the formula for the chapter 1 program. We have heard a lot about the adoption of black children by white families. We have not heard about is the kids that these Federal funds will help.

The bill contains provisions to help keep pregnant and parenting teenagers in school and off the welfare rolls. The bill also contains provisions to make it easier for homeless children to attend school. And the bill contains a wonderful program to help Head Start and Even Start kids make the transitions from preschool to the elementary school setting so that they can successfully stay in school. Without these programs, these are children and youth who will fall through the cracks of our society.

Finally, this bill emphasizes the importance of local control over education decisions by minimizing the Federal role in curriculum decisions. In the conference committee, we fought long and hard to keep decisions where they belong—at the local level.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sincere appreciation and gratitude to the conference committee, we fought against a substantial change in the formula for the chapter 1 program. After Missouri's reassessment, Winona's application for Federal funding in 1985 was denied. Missouri's reassessment caused the effective tax rate to be increased by $2.09 per $100 in assessed valuation, and the tax burden remained the same.

As far as Winona's school construction application was concerned, however, the statewide reassessment caused the effective tax burden to be more than double. This is because the Federal aid school construction legislation requires each applicant school district to demonstrate a substantial local effort toward the building of the school. The Department of Education considers a reasonable tax effort to be 10 percent of the district's assessed valuation. When Winona applied for the school construction funds, it fully expected to contribute this reasonable tax effort—or roughly $247,000—of its own funding toward the construction project. After Missouri's reassessment, the Department of Education stated that it would require Winona to pay $598,000 up front before it would agree to fund Winona's new school.

At this point, Winona was faced with a decision. If the school district could not come up with the $596,000, it would be forced to forfeit the Federal school construction funding. Winona opted to go forward and was able to borrow the $598,000 at interest rates much higher than it would have on its own. Winona, however, heard about the formula for the chapter 1 program. After Missouri's reassessment, Winona's application for Federal funding in 1985 was denied. Missouri's reassessment caused the effective tax rate to be increased by $2.09 per $100 in assessed valuation, and the tax burden remained the same.

Now, Winona is saddled with a $598,000 private debt. It has paid the debt now than it did in 1987, when it was forced to come up with the money. The people are no wealthier, and the federally and State owned property still fails to produce tax revenue. To complicate matters further, Missouri State law forbids any local school district from finishing the school year in deficit. Thus, when Winona cannot afford to both buy textbooks and service its debt, State law requires that the district service its debt. As one can well imagine, this mandated decision contributes little to education in Winona.

Today, I am pleased to report that the conference report for H.R. 6 contains a legislative remedy for Winona, similar to the bill I introduced for years. It is very simple, and it consists of a grand total of 10 lines. As a result of the passage of this bill, Winona will be required to contribute a fair and reasonable
local effort—$200,000—toward the school construction. However, the school district will be relieved of the excess $398,000 that the Department of Education previously required of it.

I am pleased that the Congress has recognized the hardship faced by Winona and has taken this corrective action. Again, I want to thank everyone involved in this effort. I also want to commend the persistent efforts of Winona’s superintendent, Michael Greene. Michaei has been dogged in his pursuit to resolve this matter. Now Mr. Greene will be able to turn his attention where it should have been all along—to the children of Winona.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. PETERSON of Florida.) All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

THERE WAS NO OBJECTION.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND OFFERED BY MR. SAM JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. In its present form, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 6 to the House to disagree to section 1413 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, relating to school prayer, as proposed to be added by title I of the conference substitute recommended by the committee of conference and insist on section 9513 of the 1965, relating to protected prayer, as proposed to be added by title I of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

THERE WAS NO OBJECTION.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. The motion was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the same appeared to have it.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 191, nays 215, not voting 36, as follows:

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote: Mr. CAVERLY for, with Mr. ACKERMAN against.

Mr. GRANES for, with Mr. BERNAN against.

Mr. QUILLEN for, with Mr. MINETA against.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon for, with Mr. WHEAT against.

Mr. HORN and Mr. SISISKY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea." So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. PETERSON of Florida.) The question is on the conference report.

The motion was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KLIDDE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—a yes 262, noes 132, not voting 41, as follows:
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Berman for, with Mr. Ackerman against.
Mr. Mineta for, with Mr. Solomon against.
Mr. Clay for, with Mr. Grams against.
Mr. Wheat for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Mr. GILLMOR changed his vote from "no" to "aye." So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably not present for the votes today on the conference report to H.R. 6, Improving American Schools Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the rule, "aye" on the motion to reconsider, and "nay" on final passage.
such organizations, and to require Fed­
eral banking agencies to take such as­
sessments into account in considering ap­
plications by foreign banks under the
Bank Holding Act of 1956 and the Bank
Holding Company Act of
1956, with Mr. BARLOW in the chair.
The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule,
the bill is considered as having been
read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from
Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], Mr.
Chairman, I yield such time as he may
consume to the gentleman from New
York [Mr. SCHUMER], the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, let me
begin by expressing my sincere thanks
to my coauthor, the gentleman from
Iowa [Mr. LEACH], to the gentleman from
Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], and the
staff of the Committee on Banking, Fi­
nance and Urban Affairs, and especially
to the gentleman from Massachusetts
[Mr. FRANK], and the staff of his Sub­
committee on International Develop­
ment, Finance, Trade and Monetary
Policy, who worked exceptionally hard
to shepherd this legislation through the
process today to the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, I am most pleased that this
measure is before the full House for consid­
eration today. I would urge all my colleagues
to cast an affirmative vote for a bill that ad­
dress­es an important issue for the U.S. financial
services industry, which accounts for fully 6
percent of our GNP and for America's posi­
tion in the global econ­
yomy. I have long been
involved in efforts to assure a level playing field for financial services worldwide by trying
to open foreign markets still closed to U.S.
banks, securities firms, and insurance compa­

nies. The National Treatment in Banking
Act of 1994 represents a positive, concrete step in this
direction by clearly establishing American
insistence on the consistent application of the
national treatment principle for banking organiza­
tions worldwide.

Simply put, the objective of H.R. 4926 is
to provide an effective tool to en­
courage nations around the world to grant U.S. banking organizations and,
by extension, to all foreign banks the same
due process in their respective markets as they do in
their domestic banks. So what this bill

does, Mr. Chairman, is very simple. It
expands the notion of financial serv­
ices. It is not a protectionist measure but quite the opposite. It provides our
government tools to open up foreign markets that have not been fair to us.

National treatment, as everyone
knows, means that our banks have to
be treated like other banks. And it is a
principle, I think, we all can agree
upon.

It is particularly important at this
time, in light of the urgent need to ne­
gotiate a satisfactory agreement on fi­
nancial services as part of the GATT.
It is designed, as I say, to open up for­

eign markets, not close American mar­

kets. It would establish a level play­ing field that permits open, fair com­

petition. It has the support of the ad­

ministration and bipartisan support.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH],
the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BE­
REUTER], and others have been strong
advocates from the other side of the
aisle.

For these and many other reasons, I
urge my colleagues to vote yes and strike a blow for the kind of fair and
open rules of competition that create wealth and prosperity, not only for the
United States but for the global com­

munity of nations.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to begin by ex­
pressing my sincere thanks to my coauthor,
Mr. LEACH, to Chairman GONZALEZ and the
Banking Committee staff, and especially
to Chairman BARNEY FRANK and the staff of his
Subcommittee on International Develop­
ment, Finance, and Foreign Affairs, who
have worked so closely with myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am most pleased that this
measure is before the full House for consider­
eration today. I would urge all my colleagues
to cast an affirmative vote for a bill that ad­

dresses an important issue for the U.S. financial
services industry, which accounts for fully 6 percent of our GNP and for America's posi­
tion in the global economy. I have long been
involved in efforts to assure a level playing field for financial services worldwide by trying
to open foreign markets still closed to U.S.
banks, securities firms, and insurance compa­
nies. The National Treatment in Banking
Act of 1994 represents a positive, concrete step in this
direction by clearly establishing American
insistence on the consistent application of the
national treatment principle for banking organiza­
tions worldwide. It would amend U.S. bank­ing
laws to: (1) require the Secretary of the
Treasury to identify countries that deny na­

tional treatment, with significant adverse ef­

fects, to U.S. banks; (2) authorize the
Treasury Secretary to publish such assessment; and (3) require U.S. banking regulators to take
steps to ensure that foreign banks seeking to est­

ablish new entities in the United States. The
bill would not affect foreign banking offices al­
ready established and operating in the United
States.

Simply put, the objective of H.R. 4926 is
to provide an effective tool to encourage nations around the world to grant U.S. banking organiza­
tions and, by extension, to all foreign banks the same
due process in their respective markets as they do in
their domestic banks. So what this bill

does, Mr. Chairman, is very simple. It
expands the notion of financial serv­
ices. It is not a protectionist measure but quite the opposite. It provides our
government tools to open up foreign markets that have not been fair to us.

National treatment, as everyone
knows, means that our banks have to
be treated like other banks. And it is a
principle, I think, we all can agree
upon.

It is particularly important at this
time, in light of the urgent need to ne­
gotiate a satisfactory agreement on fi­
nancial services as part of the GATT.
It is designed, as I say, to open up for­
eign markets, not close American mar­
kets. It would establish a level play­ing field that permits open, fair com­
petition. It has the support of the ad­
mnistration and bipartisan support.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH],
the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BE­
REUTER], and others have been strong
advocates from the other side of the
aisle.

For these and many other reasons, I
urge my colleagues to vote yes and strike a blow for the kind of fair and
open rules of competition that create wealth and prosperity, not only for the
United States but for the global com­
munity of nations.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to begin by ex­
pressing my sincere thanks to my coauthor,
Mr. LEACH, to Chairman GONZALEZ and the
Banking Committee staff, and especially
to Chairman BARNEY FRANK and the staff of his
Subcommittee on International Develop­
ment, Finance, and Foreign Affairs, who
have worked so closely with myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am most pleased that this
measure is before the full House for consider­
eration today. I would urge all my colleagues
to cast an affirmative vote for a bill that ad­

dresses an important issue for the U.S. financial
services industry, which accounts for fully 6 percent of our GNP and for America's posi­
tion in the global economy. I have long been
involved in efforts to assure a level playing field for financial services worldwide by trying
to open foreign markets still closed to U.S.
banks, securities firms, and insurance compa­
nies. The National Treatment in Banking
Act of 1994 represents a positive, concrete step in this
direction by clearly establishing American
insistence on the consistent application of the
national treatment principle for banking organiza­
tions worldwide. It would amend U.S. bank­ing
laws to: (1) require the Secretary of the
Treasury to identify countries that deny na­
tional treatment, with significant adverse ef­

ects, to U.S. banks; (2) authorize the
Treasury Secretary to publish such assessment; and (3) require U.S. banking regulators to take
steps to ensure that foreign banks seeking to est­

ablish new entities in the United States. The
bill would not affect foreign banking offices al­
ready established and operating in the United
States.

Simply put, the objective of H.R. 4926 is
to provide an effective tool to encourage nations around the world to grant U.S. banking organiza­
tions and, by extension, to all foreign banks the same
due process in their respective markets as they do in
their domestic banks. So what this bill

does, Mr. Chairman, is very simple. It
expands the notion of financial serv­
ices. It is not a protectionist measure but quite the opposite. It provides our
government tools to open up foreign markets that have not been fair to us.

National treatment, as everyone
knows, means that our banks have to
be treated like other banks. And it is a
principle, I think, we all can agree
upon.

It is particularly important at this
time, in light of the urgent need to ne­
any other industry. They involve em-
ployment. They involve a great deal of
labour-intensive effort. But unlike other
industries, financial services are the
price of virtually everything else.
That is what credit extension is all about.

So this particular industry is par-
ticularly important. It is one that we
lead the world in. It is one that we
should not shy away from making clear
that we expect equal competitive laws
being adopted.

Finally, let me just express particu-
lar thanks to the leadership of the gen-
tleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER],
and the gentleman from Massachusetts
[Mr. FRANK], as well as the gentleman
from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUER], on our
side of the aisle. I would say in this re-
gard that if it were not for the insist­
ence of the gentleman from Massachu-
setts [Mr. FRANK], that this issue not be
ducked, we would not be dealing with it late in this Congress. So for
him in particular, this Member would
like to express great admiration.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance
of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr.
Chairman, I yield such time as he may
consume to the gentleman from Texas
[Mr. GONZALEZ], who I must say has
helped the Committee on Banking, Fi-
nance and Urban Affairs compile in
housing and interstate banking, et
cetera, a very impressive legislative
record this year.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise
in strong support. I want to com-
plement the gentleman from Massa-
chusetts [Mr. FRANK], the gentleman
from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], the
minority leader and his associates on the
minority side, the gentleman from
Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

Mr. Chairman, the National Treatment in
Banking Act was adopted unanimously in the
Banking Committee. This
piece of legislation is not a complex bill. It di-
 rects the Treasury Department conduct an
annual survey and determine if other nations
provide national treatment, that is, do these
foreign countries treat U.S. banks the same way
they treat their own domestic financial in-
situtions?

This policy of national treatment has been
the official position of the United States for
over a generation since the passage of the

The timelier end of the bill says that if foreign
countries do not provide U.S. firms with na-
tional treatment, we reserve the right to pos-
sibly deny applications from banks in these
countries that seek to open or extend busi-
ness activities in the United States.

This legislation should not be controversial;
it is not a trade agreement nor will it, under
any circumstances, precipitate retaliation
measures.

It commonplace, almost-tide, reversal of
the United States all-too-offen role of being
the patsy of the international financial markets.

Fortunately, most of the important members
of the world financial community provide U.S.

firms with national treatment and access to
their domestic markets. Nothing in this bill af-
certs our relationships with these countries or
our international treaties.

There are notable exceptions where coun-
tries actively ban in the United States but deny, either by law or regu-
lation, business opportunities for our firms
in their country. It is simply unfair that they
can have it both ways. Their one-way street
policy leaves our firms competing with their
firms in the United States, even without the
opportunity to enter the domestic market of
the foreign country.

The Banking Committee believes enough is
enough. It is time for a realistic policy because
at stake are U.S. jobs and economic opportu-
nities for U.S. firms. Very simply, the issue is
fairness.

I commend Chairman FRANK for his leader-
ship for bringing this bill to the floor and I ap-
plaud the two sponsors of the bill, Congress-
man CHUCK SCHUMER and Congressman JIM
LEACH for putting together the bipartisan
coalition who will today pass this legislation.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3
minutes to the gentleman from Ne-
braska [Mr. BEREUER], whose leader-
ship on this issue has been so impres-
sive.

Mr. BEREUER. Mr. Chairman, this
Member rises in strong support of the
National Treatment in Banking Act of
1994, H.R. 4926, and this Member would
like to commend the gentleman from
Texas, the chairman of the committee,
Mr. GONZALEZ, the gentleman from
Iowa, the ranking minority member,
Mr. LEACH, particularly the gentleman
from Massachusetts, the chairman of
the Subcommittee on International De-
velopment, Finance, Trade and Mone-
ty policy, Mr. FRANK for his innova-
tive approach which is the basis of this
legislation, and the gentleman from
New York, the legislation's sponsor,
Mr. SCHUMER, for their hard work in
bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, the National Treat-
ment in Banking Act of 1994 is impor-
tant legislation which will help open
foreign financial service markets to
United States banks.

First, this legislation requires the
Secretary of the Treasury to identify
foreign countries which unfairly deny
national treatment to U.S. banks or
simply treat U.S. banks differently
than domestic banks.

Second, this legislation requires the
Secretary of the Treasury to assess
whether a foreign country’s denial of
national treatment is having an ad-
verse impact on U.S. banking organiza-
tions.

Third, this legislation requires that
Federal banking agencies consider the
Secretary of the Treasury’s finding when
evaluating applications for over-
seas financial firms wishing to conduct
business here in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, in nearly every serv-
vice and industrial sector the United
States is, perhaps, the most open mar-
ket in the world. Since World War II,
the United States vast and lucrative
market has been the world’s engine of
growth for the war-torn countries of
Europe and Japan. More recently, the
United States market has stimulated
the economic development of coun-
tries like Korea, Taiwan, Singapore,
Thailand, and now China.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the
United States past policy to stimulate
foreign economies by encouraging
exports has perhaps, worked too well. Now the
United States is faced with chronic trade defi-
cits—like July's whopping $11 billion
trade deficit in goods and services.

What then, Mr. Chairman, should the
United States do to remedy our chronic
trade deficits? There are those who say, we must erect barriers imme-
 diately to stem the flow of foreign
goods; however, Mr. Chairman, this
simple response is not the answer. Un-
fortunately, the United States is the
first country to learn that philosophy in the Smoot-Hawley
legislation of the 1930's and it only
precipitated a serious depression and
financial disaster for the country.

No, Mr. Chairman, we must attempt
to open the United States market to for-
ers a level playing field by attempting
to lower barriers to foreign markets
rather than by raising our own. Of
course, retaliation against foreign
countries in the form of higher tariffs
and denied market access must always
be a last-resort possibility, but first we
must attempt to encourage foreign
countries to open their markets to U.S.
goods and services.

Mr. Chairman, in many sectors and
industries, United States trade officials
have long enjoyed the use of trade reme-
dies which enable them to persuade
foreign countries to open their mar-
kets. For example, trade officials have
recently used section 301 of the Trade
Agreement Act of 1974 to open foreign
markets for U.S. goods and service exports covered under bi-
lateral and multilateral trade agree-
ments. Additionally, U.S. trade offi-
cials have another tool, special 301
trade legislation, to require that for-
ign countries respect the intellectual
property rights of U.S. patent and
copyright holders.

But unfortunately, Mr. Chairman,
U.S. trade officials and negotiators
have not been given the appropriate
tools—or crowbars as Secretary of the
Treasury, Lloyd Bentsen puts it—to
pay open foreign markets for the U.S.
financial services industry.

Mr. Chairman, the National Treat-
ment in Banking Act strikes the
appropriate balance in attempting
to open up overseas financial markets
to U.S. banking organizations. While it
does not automatically sanction for-
ereign economies for restricting access
to U.S. banking organizations, it ap-
proximately requires that Federal fi-
nancial regulatory agencies consider
the foreign treatment of U.S. banks
when evaluating applications for overseas financial firms wishing to conduct business here in the United States. The Chairman, Mr. Frank, is very disappointed that U.S. trade officials failed to reach a successful agreement on trade in financial services during the last stages of negotiations of the Uruguay Round. Nevertheless, by prospectively applying this national treatment policy to foreign banks wishing to enter or expand in the United States, U.S. negotiators—who have long sought a level playing field for U.S. financial institutions in world markets—should finally have the tools and negotiating leverage to accomplish this important task.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, this legislation is long overdue. Action on the issue has been delayed, in part, by committee jurisdictional disputes. One of the results is that, despite their worldwide recognition as innovative leaders, U.S. banks have fallen completely off the list of the world's largest 20 banks in the last 10 years. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, it is not too late; by passing this legislation, we can help ensure that U.S. financial institutions are treated fairly in competing for markets in foreign countries. Therefore, this Member strongly urges his colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I think it vital that, before we adjourn, we pass H.R. 4926, the National Treatment in Banking Act, in order to insure that American banks receive fair access to overseas markets. However, before we vote, I want to make my colleagues aware of several provisions contained in the recently passed Regle-Neal interstate banking bill that may cause American banks to have problems overseas. I refer to the fact that there are several provisions contained in this bill that will make it significantly more difficult for foreign banks operating in this country to expand their operations. We need to address these problems in the next Congress.

In the interstate bill, we adopted the basic philosophy that foreign banks should be treated no differently than domestic banks. Unfortunately, the interstate bill does not recognize that most foreign banking organizations operating in the United States are fundamentally different than domestic banks. The interstate bill overlooks a fundamental difference between these two types of institutions: Foreign branches do not take insured retail deposits, whereas domestic branches do. And I'm not just speculating about industry practice. Rather, I'm talking about three fundamental legal distinctions contained in the 1991 Foreign Bank Supervision Enhancement Act and in the interstate bill. First, foreign banks cannot operate FDIC-insured retail branches. Second, foreign banks cannot carry Federal deposit insurance. Third, the interstate bill provides that foreign banks cannot accept deposits of less than $100,000 unless the total amount of such deposits does not exceed 1 percent of the average deposits in the branch.

So, foreign bank branches are institutions which deal only in wholesale activities. Their customer base is not retail depositors, but rather industries involved in the provision of export financing. An excellent example was provided by Florida's senior U.S. Senator, Bob Graham, in his August 11, 1994, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page S 12781. I was recently in a conversation with an American business person who is involved in the sale of agricultural products, primarily in the Caribbean and Latin America, and that individual told me that the typical transaction...for the sale of an American agricultural product to Argentina is to have an Argentine bank in the United States provide the letters of credit and other export financing which are the essential ingredients to making the transaction viable. Without ready access to these foreign banks and their branches, it makes that transaction a more difficult one.

In the Miami area alone, there are over 70 offices of foreign banks. These banks have been an important component of our State's ability to enhance export opportunities. They've also been equally important in California, New York, Illinois, Texas, and Washington State.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that because of these limitations, foreign banks who are so important to the export financing of U.S.-made products and services, will not be able to expand. Today, States make their own determinations about how they want to treat foreign banks. Unfortunately, the interstate bill prevents States from making that determination. We need to change Federal law in a way which recognizes the basic differences between wholesale activities of foreign banks and retail activities of domestic banks, so that all States may be able to take advantage of the export-enhancing operations of foreign banks.

Mr. Chairman, as we consider the National Treatment in Banking Act, to encourage countries to allow U.S. banks greater market access, we must realize that we are passing laws that enact impediments to banks from other countries which wish to operate on a national basis here. This is not so much a foreign bank issue as it is an issue related to the effective marketing and exporting of American products.

Next year, I hope that Congress will give serious attention to legislation which returns to the States their ability to allow entry by foreign banks. In addition, I hope that the Banking Committee will look more closely at this issue and its impact on American exports.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4926, the National Treatment in Banking Act.

I want to commend the authors of this legislation, our Banking Committee colleague from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, and our own ranking member, Mr. LEACH, for their strong and persistent support for the equalization of treatment for U.S. banks who operate in foreign nations.

I also want to commend our colleague, Mr. FRANK, for his efforts as the chairman of our International Development and Financial Institutions Subcommittee to fashion a bill which addresses the concerns of the Banking Committee while not treading on the jurisdiction of several other committees with jurisdiction over international trade issues. H.R. 4926 directs the Treasury Secretary, in consultation with Federal banking agencies, to identify foreign banks that deny national treatment, such as equal access to competitive markets, to U.S. banking companies and to require information from them when considering applications and notices filed by foreign banks.

This is good legislation which helps provide important and equal treatment for our banks operating abroad.

The passage of this legislation, Mr. ROTH, Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, H.R. 4926, the National Treatment in Banking Act of 1994, is worth enacting even though it is a mere shadow of its former self. It is better than nothing, however, and so I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this limited trade-related legislation.

This legislation would direct the Treasury Secretary to identify those countries that do not provide U.S. banks national treatment—that is, the same competitive opportunities that are provided a foreign country's own domestic banks.

Thus the Secretary would be directed to determine whether this abuse were having a significant adverse effect on the affected U.S. banks.

His determination would have to be published in the Federal Register.

The bill would also require that if foreign bank were to make an application to do business in the United States under the International Banking Act or Bank Holding Company Act.,

Federal bank regulators would then be required to take into account whether a foreign bank's host country had been cited in the Federal Register for no providing national treatment.

The regulators would be given the power to reject the foreigner's banking application.

The facts are, witnesses told our committee earlier this year, some foreign governments are making Uncle Sam and the rest of us look like saps.

"Our U.S. financial services sector is one of the world's most innovative and competitive, yet we face many foreign barriers that limit our ability to penetrate markets abroad," said Marc E. Lackritz, president of the Securities Industry Association.

Foreign financial services providers, taking advantage of a captive customer base to their benefit, have stepped in to provide the financial services our long-standing customers need overseas.

At the same time, these same foreigners have entered the U.S. capital markets where tremendous opportunities for expansion are joined with the open regulatory environment that does not exist elsewhere.

Thus, our foreign competitors have exploited a structural advantage: Protection at home, unfettered opportunity in the United States.

The President wants this bill passed this year because he hopes it will be in time to influence the outcome of the GATT Uruguay round of trade talks on financial services.

It is certainly true that the GATT talks will deeply involve conditions under which banks and other services will operate in foreign lands.
As presented to the Congress, the GATT accord would not open up financial services to U.S. banks, insurers, or securities firms. This is because the issue addressed by this legislation—opening up foreign markets to U.S. financial services companies—particularly in the emerging financial markets in Asia and Latin America.

In fact, all that GATT would do for financial services, when and if approved by the Congress, would be to set a 2-year timeframe for continued negotiations on financial services.

Our goal in this legislation today is simple: To ensure that U.S. banks are treated by other countries the same way foreign financial companies are treated in the U.S. market. That is called national treatment—and that concept was resisted strongly in the GATT talks.

As originally drafted, this legislation would have closed the American market to foreign financial companies if their home country does not grant equal access to U.S. financial firms. In other words, this version, and there was strong bipartisan support for it. After all, overseas banking generated $5.4 billion in income for U.S. financial companies in 1992, and generated a $2 billion trade surplus for the United States.

It should be plain to anyone to see why it is so important to the United States that GATT rules be extended to services. In 1992, we had an $84 billion deficit in merchandise trade. But our services sector generated a $60 billion surplus—offsetting three-fourths of our merchandise deficit.

Last year, 1993, our merchandise deficit shot up to $116 billion—and our services trade again generated a $60 billion surplus.

The message is clear—services is an area where the United States is able to win in foreign markets.

So, we are going to insist that our services firms have access to foreign markets, or GATT will have a very shaky future in the U.S. Congress.

The course of events in the GATT talks on financial services will be a factor in how we ultimately act and operate under the GATT accord. If there continues to be a stonewall against our services companies in foreign markets, there is a risk that this broader version, and this legislation—even though it is limited only to banks and not to securities and insurance companies.


But, 16 years later, some foreign countries still do not provide national treatment for our banks.

I am talking about such countries as Brazil, Korea, India, Taiwan, and Japan—all of whom still being relatively closed to United States banks and other financial services despite more than a decade of bilateral negotiations on market access.

Clearly, more arrows are needed in our quiver of trade weapons if we are to obtain significantly greater access for financial services.

This bill would be such an additional weapon. I favor this measure because in today's world of emerging democracies our financial services industry could provide the financial fuel and leadership for these new, struggling economies.

American financial institutions, risking life and limb of their people as well as their money and credit in unlikely places, deserve this helping hand from their government.

The Committee on Banking, on which I serve, approved a broader bill, H.R. 3248, the Fair Trade in Financial Services Act, by voice vote on March 9, 1994.

The Senate has passed similar legislation several times. But we cannot get a vote on this in the House.

While the bill before us today applies only to banking, the earlier measure covered the securities and insurance industries as well.

That earlier bill had more teeth in it too: It would have authorized the Treasury Secretary—not the Secretary of State or the U.S. Trade Representative—to negotiate directly with foreign countries to provide more competitive opportunities of suffer being closed out of the U.S. market.

But the bill stalled because the Ways and Means Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee objected to it as an intragovernmental treaty. For these same reasons, we were unwilling in our efforts to incorporate the earlier bill in the omnibus banking bill, H.R. 3474, the Community Development Financial Institutions Act. That bill became law on September 23, 1994, as Public Law 103-325.

So we are left with this scaled-back version. And we have no idea about what the other body would do if we sent this version over to them.

There is one feature that I do like about this bill: The Congressional Budget Office says enactment of H.R. 4926 would result in no significant costs to the taxpayers.

This measure deserves our attention and considered action at this time. I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for the National Treatment in Banking Act designed to help our government open foreign markets for U.S. banking organizations.

First, let me commend my colleagues on the Banking Committee, Subcommittee Chairman BARRY FRANK and Full Committee Chairman GONZALEZ, for their hard work on this important legislation.

Briefly, Mr. Chairman, the problem we are trying to address with this legislation is that some foreign countries do not provide U.S. banks with the same treatment as they provide to their own domestic banks. This is referred to as "national treatment." This legislation directs the Secretary of the Treasury to identify foreign countries where U.S. banking organizations are adversely affected by a denial of national treatment. The bill then amends various banking statutes to require the Federal banking agencies to take into account the Treasury's evaluation of a foreign bank's home country when they act on the foreign bank's application to enter or to expand activities in the U.S. market.

Ultimately, this bill will create pressure that will help open foreign markets for U.S. banks. Since our banks are generally considered to provide national treatment to foreign banks, it is only reasonable to expect that U.S. banks seeking to operate in other nations receive the same treatment.

I join my colleagues from the Banking Committee in supporting this bill.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered under the 5-minute rule by sections and each section shall be considered as read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

H.R. 4926

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Treatment in Banking Act of 1994".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

No. The Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. FAILURE TO ACCORD NATIONAL TREATMENT TO UNITED STATES BANKING ORGANIZATIONS.

1. IDENTIFYING COUNTRIES THAT MAY BE DENYING NATIONAL TREATMENT TO UNITED STATES BANKING ORGANIZATIONS.—

(a) IDENTIFYING COUNTRIES THAT MAY BE DENYING NATIONAL TREATMENT TO UNITED STATES BANKING ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall identify, after consultation with the Federal banking agencies, the extent to which foreign countries may be denying national treatment to United States banking organizations—

(1) based on information relating to banking in the most recent report under section 3002 of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (or the most recent update of such report); or

(2) based on more recent information that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(b) ASSESSING WHETHER UNITED STATES BANKING ORGANIZATIONS HAVE BEEN RUDELY TREATED.—

(1) IDENTIFYING COUNTRIES THAT MAY BE DENYING NATIONAL TREATMENT TO UNITED STATES BANKING ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary shall identify, after consultation with the Federal banking agencies, the extent to which foreign countries may be denying national treatment to United States banking organizations—

(A) the extent to which the foreign country denies national treatment to United States banking organizations (B) the importance of operations by United States banking organizations in the foreign country relative to the operations of such foreign country's banking organizations (C) the extent to which the foreign country appears to be taking the treatment afforded to United States banking organizations into account in extending or expanding operations in the foreign country.

The text of section 2 is as follows:
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The text of section 2 is as follows:
cerned with any prospect that barriers will be imposed on trade in banking services, at least the goal of this legislation is to promote the opening of foreign markets to more free trade.

I was concerned that the failure to extend fast-track authority to the administration as part of the Uruguay Round Agreement implementing legislation had upset the balance of this proposal by denying the administration the tools needed to negotiate financial services national treatment agreements. We would be left with a stick but no carrot.

During fast-track negotiations for the Uruguay round legislation, administration representatives repeatedly argued that extension of fast-track is critical to completing new trade agreements. One of the negotiating touted by the administration was in the area of financial services. The case was made that when the administration's fast-track authority was in place, the negotiation of the legislation implementing the Uruguay Round Agreement, trade negotiations, including those dealing with banking and financial services, would be left in a state of suspended animation.

My response to this apparent loss of negotiating authority was to prepare an amendment to delay implementation of this bill until fast-track authority is extended to the administration for financial service negotiations. However, when I discussed this amendment with representatives of the Treasury Department, I was told that they believe that they had the authority to negotiate national treatment in banking agreements without fast-track authority. It appears that at least in the area of financial services, fast-track authority is not as pressing a concern as some might have thought.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the chairman of the subcommittee in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], is it his understanding that while the administration would have preferred to have fast-track authority for the completion of the Uruguay round financial services negotiations, they believe that they have adequate authority to successfully complete these negotiations without the fast-track procedures?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, that is the understanding. The administration does believe it has adequate authority to agree to the financial services negotiations under the Uruguay round. They point to section 135 of the implementing bill, which does set up negotiating objectives for continued talks and financial services.

They also know that the statement of administrative action establishes procedures for consulting with interested parties and for consultation with both Congress and industry throughout the negotiation period.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman. Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa, the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, the explanation the gentleman has given is similar to the views of this gentleman. I would simply stress that it is my view that the administration has not given near high enough priority to date to the financial services issue and that, quite frankly, it is something that must be done.

This bill partly moves in the direction of expressing congressional concern, but I think it should be understood as critical that GATT also include financial services. I would simply hope that that message be conveyed to the administration conducting negotiations on behalf of the United States at this time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, that happens to be our goal here.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will designate section 3. The text of section 3 is as follows:


(a) APPLICATIONS UNDER THE INTERNATIONAL BANKING ACT OF 1978. Section 7(d) of the International Banking Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3105(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(g) ADDITIONAL STANDARD.—In acting on any application under paragraph (1), the Board shall take into account whether the Secretary of the Treasury has published a notice, in accordance with paragraph (c), expressing congressional concern, but I think it should be understood as critical that GATT also include financial services. I would simply hope that that message be conveyed to the administration conducting negotiations on behalf of the United States at this time.
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SEC. 4. CONSISTENCY WITH BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL AGREEMENTS.

No authority under this Act or any amend­
ment made by this Act to any other law may be
used to take any action with respect to a for­
alien or multilateral agreement that there is a
foreign country which is inconsistent with
such action.

Mr. DREIER (during the reading). Mr. Chair­
man, I seek unanimous con­

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, a free-
trade agreement is a very complex,
multifaceted agreement that reduces
barriers to trade in a wide range of
goods and services. Banking and finan­
cial services are generally an impor­
tant part, but only one part, of such an
agreement.

The purpose of my amendment is to en­
sure that countries which have enter­
ered free-trade agreements with the
United States that include banking are not
subject to the enforcement process in this
bill.

For example, Mr. Chairman, less
than a year ago we passed the North
American Free-Trade Agreement. In
that we agreed to the general principle
of national treatment in financial ser­
dices, but throughout the agreement
there are exceptions to the principle of
free trade. In a complex trade agree­
ment, it is possible that U.S. nego­
itators would agree to provide some ex­
ceptions or reservations for our trading
partner in the area of banking in ex­
change for U.S. exceptions in another
area.

I do not believe that the national
trade review authority provided to the
Treasury by this Act to look at any
should override or call into question
those negotiated agreements. In some
cases, the United States may have
agreed to less than full national treat­
ment. In other cases, if a trade agree­
ment provides for full national treat­
ment in banking services, and that
treatment is not provided, the U.S.
Government should first use the dis­
pute resolution process contained in
such agreement, not resort to unilateral
action.

Again, Mr. Chairman, to use NAFTA
as an example, if Canada or Mexico
were not meeting their commitments in
the area of banking services, the ap­
propriate course of action would be to
first initiate action through the
NAFTA dispute resolution process.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distin­
guished gentleman from Massachusetts
(Mr. FRANK), chairman of the sub­
committee.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr.
Chairman, if the gentleman will con­
continue to yield, I think it is a wonderful
amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on
the amendment offered by the gen­
tleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any fur­
ter amendments to the bill? If not,
the question is on the committee amend­
ment in the nature of a sub­
stitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in
the nature of a substitute, as amended,
was agreed to.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose,
and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.
SCOTT) having assumed the chair, Mr.
BARLOW, chairman of the Committee
of the Whole House on the State of the
Union, reported that that Committee,
having had under consideration the bill
(H.R. 4926) to require the Secretary of
the Treasury to identify foreign coun­
tries which may be denying national
trade to U.S. banking organiza­
tions, to assess whether any such
denial may be having a significant ad­
verse effect on such organizations, and
to require Federal banking agencies
to take such assessments into account in
considering applications by foreign
banks under the International Bank­
ing Act of 1978 and the Bank Holding
Company Act of 1956, pursuant to House
Resolution 543, he reported the bill
back to the House with an amendment
adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under
the rule, the previous question is or­
dered.

For a separate vote demanded on the
amendment to the committee amend­
ment in the nature of a substitute
adopted by the Committee of the Whole?
Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 555 is the rule providing for the consideration of conference report on H.R. 4299, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1995.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The request of the Chairman of the Intelligence Committee for the waivers of points of order that might lie against the conference report, was agreed to by the ranking minority member, and appear to have widespread bipartisan support.

For my colleagues' information, the waivers deal almost entirely with matters of scope. No waiver of the 3-day layover rule, which is often so controversial, was required since the conference report was filed in time to comply with the layover rule.

The conference report does contain several provisions which exceed the scope of the conference. The chairman testified that all of these provisions were included to respond to events which occurred after the House and Senate bills had either been reported or passed.

For example, section 504 limits the reach of a section in the 1995 defense authorization act for fiscal year 1998 which, is not addressed, would undermine the National Security Act's requirement that spending on intelligence programs be specifically authorized.

Section 602 responds to the controversy surrounding the National Reconnaissance Office's headquarters facility by establishing a requirement to clearly delineate intelligence community construction projects with a cost in excess of $750,000.

In addition, the conference report contains an authorization, contained in the classified schedule of authorizations, for an arms control treaty monitoring activity which the administration did not request until last month.

The chairman testified that these provisions, and other out-of-scope items adopted in conference, address important issues that the conference felt could not wait to be included in the fiscal year 1996 authorization bill. If the House is to consider these matters this year, the points of order that would otherwise lie against them must be waived.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report of H.R. 4299, authorizes funds for all the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, and against its consideration are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. BEIENSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BEIENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary one-half hour to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goetz], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.
year's bill, will hinder the ability of the intelligence agencies to respond to essential intelligence requirements.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good rule, and I urge my colleagues to approve it so that we may proceed with consideration of this important conference report today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is quite straightforward—in fact, as we work our way through the myriad of conference reports in these closing days of the 103rd session, Members should be getting used to seeing such blanket waivers of points of order. Although it is understandable that technical waivers of scope and genuineness may be necessary to ease consideration of these mammoth bills, I do believe it is worthwhile to proceed with the exercise of specifying exactly which waivers are necessary on each conference report and for what reason. Again I wish to remind my colleagues that we generally get in trouble around here when, in a rush to move a bill through, we waive the rules, expedite consideration and end up voting on legislation containing unexpected surprises. It is always a pleasure to have the folks at Lamar University in Texas still smarting over the spate of undeserved negative publicity that was generated by one such "surprise" item inserted into the recent crime bill conference report, that did for Lamar University what the Edsel did for the Ford Motor Co.

For that reason, I was very glad that Chairman GLICKMAN and ranking member COMBEST were able to complete work on the intelligence authorization conference report in concert with the House schedule to allow Members the customary 3 days' time to review this important bill before today's vote. For the record, I commend Chairman GLICKMAN and ranking member COMBEST for coming to the Rules Committee fully prepared to discuss the specific rules waivers needed and the reasons for those waivers. I certainly hope this trend will continue and expand to all committee chairmen in the 104th Congress.

Regarding the underlying conference report for H.R. 4299, I understand the difficult choices the members of the committee had to make in a somewhat hostile environment of public and official scrutiny and media malevolence toward our Nation's intelligence programs. I remain concerned about the ongoing efforts to scale back some of those capabilities by those who harbor the misguided view that somehow the threat to United States security and world stability has disappeared with the Soviet Union. Clearly, that is not the case—but just as clearly our policymakers have, it seems, and the Clinton Administration in particular, begun to make this case to the American people and those in control of the purse strings regarding the enormous contribution and continued need for accurate, timely, and effective intelligence. I am pleased that this bill provides for a new Commission to review our Nation's intelligence capabilities, a review that should highlight the continuing importance of quality intelligence operations. But I hope that effort will be a cooperative mission to generate productive reforms for the CIA and other intelligence components and, not a slash-and-burn attempt to further weaken our intelligence capabilities. Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me express my disappointment that, despite the hard work and support of ranking member COMBEST, a provision that had been added to the House bill requiring Members of Congress to sign their oath or affirmation of eligibility for their treatment of classified material, was once again deleted by the conference. I remain absolutely convinced that Members of Congress need to raise their awareness of the responsibility to protect the confidentiality of classified material and I view a simple secrecy oath as a painless but effective means to accomplish that goal. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, let me express my congratulations to the chairman and ranking member for their hard work and express my support for this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion and to repeat, this rule waives all points of order against the conference report on the authorization bill and against its consideration. I remind my colleagues that these waivers were fully supported by the ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and received unanimous approval of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I want to take this time to congratulate my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN], the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], the ranking minority member, for their excellent work on issues that are extremely important and often very difficult to deal with. They have again brought us a good piece of legislation. I again urge my colleagues to vote for the rule so that we may consider the conference report on the bill today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.
A second major provision of the conference agreement requires the executive branch to bring physical searches conducted for intelligence purposes under the court order procedure of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. Currently, these searches are undertaken only on the basis of Attorney General approval, without judicial review of any kind. Although an argument can be made that these national security searches are constitutional, there is no authoritative Supreme Court decision on the question. Had the Ames case gone to trial, the legality of the searches of his home, authorized by the Attorney General but without a judicial warrant, certainty would have been litigated. If the search were to have been illegal, it is likely the entire prosecution would have been thwarted, and Al­ drich Ames would have walked away free. There was thus broad—although not universal—support for taking action on this legis­ lation, requested by the administration, to ensure better judicial and congressional over­ site of these searches.

The conference took steps to improve the Senate version of the physical search legisla­ tion, with respect to the residences of U.S. persons. The conference agreed that the Attorney General, as part of an application for a court order, should state what investigative techniques had been previously utilized to acquire the foreign intel­ ligence information concerned. In addition, the conference provided authority for the court to release more information to the subject of a search during court proceedings challenging the legality of the search. Furthermore, the conference directed the Attorney General to give notice of a search to its subject if at any time after the search the Attorney General de­ termines there is no national security interest in continuing to maintain its secrecy.

A third major provision of the conference report addresses the problems of coordination of counterintelligence activities which has had a long and sorry history. The agreement re­ quires the establishment of a counterintelli­ gence policy board to develop policies and procedures to ensure that the President is apprised of the President's new policy on the conduct of counterintelligence activities.

The provision requires the heads of Federal departments and agencies to report, imme­ diately to the Federal Bureau of Investigation any information, regardless of its origin, that indicates classified information may have been disclosed in an unauthorized fashion to a for­ eign power. The efforts the President has made to improve the workings of the bureau­ cacy, and this provision in law, should ensure that coordination problems do not persist in the future.

Additionally, the conference report repeals the limitation on U.S. intelligence cooperation with the government of South Africa. Although this provision was not included in the House­ bill, or in the Senate bill, the subject of a letter I sent before the Subcommittee on Legislation. The conference was convinced that the repeal was appro­ priate now that the people of South Africa have freely elected a new government.

Finally, the conference agreement requires the establishment of a 17-member commis­ sion to undertake a comprehensive assess­ ment of the roles and capabilities of the intel­ ligence community in the post-cold war global environment. The charter for this commission is far-reaching, and its conclusions could be extremely useful in setting intelligence policy for the next century.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the conference agreement does not include the provision which would have established in statute the offices of the inspectors general at the de­ fense intelligence Agency and the National se­ curity Agency. The original agreement was revised to include in a provision that has improved the effectiveness of these offices to a considerable degree, but concerns raised by the Department of Defense led the conference to put the provision aside. Certainly, this issue should be addressed again next year so that these inspectors general have the tools they need to perform their mission.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is a good agree­ ment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Evaluation.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to place in the RECORD two documents that give an accurate picture regarding the NRO Westfield Facility. The first document details what the Senate conferees provided authority for the court to establish and the second shows how the SSC not only supported but actually added $30 million to accelerate the project. Sen­ ators and staff, some of whom are still serving on the committee, were given detailed briefings about the NRO project by top NRO officials, including the director of the NRO, Martin Faga. I am disappointed by the current SSC leadership in their efforts to cre­ ate the impression that they knew lit­ tle or nothing about this project. I also am including a statement by the Director of Central Intelligence and the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

The National Reconnaissance Office failed to follow Intelligence Community guidelines for presenting new initiatives in its Congres­ sional Budget Justification Books.

In response to Congressional requests, the National Reconnaissance Office provided con­ ducted of the NRO budget in a fashion that did not present in a consistent fashion and did not include the same level of detail as compar­ able military construction requests.

In addition, the NRO failed to respond to Congressional requests for other information and provided details on site selection, commercial cover to protect NRO's classified status, and overall project details.

The Director of Central Intelligence and the Deputy Secretary of Defense have ap­ proved the conference report that, in consultation with the Congress, the National Reconnaissance Office should en­ sure that future budget submissions con­ form to Intelligence Community guidelines and meet Congressional needs.

The review team found that the construc­ tion costs per square foot for the head­ quarters facility are reasonable based on comparable military facilities and that the National Reconnaissance Office's stream­ lined execution of the project is working well.

The team determined that, when judged by General Services Administration standards, the recommended facility can be justifi­ cated when completed and can house at least 500 and as many as 1,000 persons in addition to the approximately 2,900 NRO personnel currently planned. The team concluded that this underutilization was the result of faulty initial assumption about space requirements and that the project was perpetuated by the absence of fur­ ther internal or an external review.

Consistent with the team's recommenda­ tions, the Director of Central Intelligence and the Deputy Secretary of Defense in­ structed the Director of the National Recon­ naisance Office, working with the Inte­ lligence Community Management Staff, to present to the Director of Central Intel­ ligence for approval a plan for accommodat­ ing between 500 and 750 additional personnel in the facility, which is scheduled for occu­ pancy in January 1996. This reallocation of additional personnel would bring the building within the normal occupancy range for GSA builds which is 50% to 70% occupancy, and requires no significant change in con­ struction.

For major NRO infrastructure construc­ tion projects in the future, the Director of Central Intelligence and the Deputy Sec­ retary of Defense will name appropriate re­ presentatives to review and validate the facili­ ty requirements from the outset and at each major milestone.

The review team concluded that declas­ sification of the NRO's ownership and use of the facility will permit significant tax sav­ ings because United States Government facili­ ties are not subject to state and local tax­ ation.

The team determined, and the NRO agreed, that the NRO's budget for furniture and support equipment could be reduced by at least $1 million. As a result, the $5.5 million identified for communications-related items that need further review. As recommended by the team, the Director of Central Intelligence and the Deputy Secretary of Defense have instructed the Direc­ tor of the NRO to conduct a review before expend­ ing funds for these items.

Source: Senate Supplement to Report No. 101-73.

Date: 1989
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Content: NRO Reorganization (FY90 $30.0M) ** 

The Committee believes that the best approach to insuring a robust national reconnaissance program is to reorganize the NRO in a way which facilitates greater communication, cross-system and cross-program fertilization, modernizes its recruiting and administrative practices. Thus, the Committee directs that, unless an alternative plan approved by the Secretary of Defense is submitted prior to November 1, 1989, the NRO begin, no later than November 1, 1989, a reorganization according to the plan outlined in a letter to the Intelligence Committees dated November 21, 1988 by then Secretary of the Air Force Edward C. Alridge, Jr.

(a) Location of remaining activities in a central facility in the Washington, D.C. area, and ** the Alridge Plan ** Ultimately, circa 1991-1992, the plan called for the location of the CIA, Air Force, and Navy program offices in a new facility in Northern Virginia. The Committee believes these goals and the timetable are realistic. Moreover, additional realignment of program office functions are made feasible by the location of the Department of Defense, stay, and appropriate centralized support functions in the new facility strategy as part of its overall restructure process. The facilities include a ** permanent facility. The NRO plans to acquire the permanent facility to accommodate additional collocation decisions and, in a budgetary sense, protects for any other approach.


Total: 195.4 ** 

Content: This letter provides formal notification of the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) intent to purchase a parcel of land in support of the permanent facility collocation activities of the NRO restructure efforts. This action is consistent with our overall facility strategy and the NRO Restructure Report published in January 1990. The third phase of the facility support plan, the subject of this letter, involves the acquisition of property and facilities that provide a permanent solution for our collocation activities. Our intent is to be able to accommodate all of the permanent facilities and all the activities previously located. ** In addition, the permanent facility site will allow for additional colocation up to and including all of the NRO and some of our supporting contractors. ** The actual land purchase agreement will be executed between the land owner and our facility support contractor. Title to the property will be notionally held in the name of our facility support contractor, thus supporting our covert and security. ** This will then be converted to pass-through arrangements between the facility support contractor and the United States Government. A similar arrangement will be used during the building construction phase. There will be a total of 20 contracts per phase. ** The master plan has been structured by definition as a three-phase development program. Phase one provides for the construction of approximately 500,000 square feet. ** Phase two would add an additional 400,000 square feet. Phase three would provide an additional 400,000 square feet. Flexibility is inherent in the master plan to allow phase two and three to be sized differently as the need arises. We plan to proceed with phase one construction only at this time. Further, when the Director decides, based on compelling reasons, that certain sub-elements of the master plan to allow phase two and three to be sized differently as the need arises. We plan to proceed with phase one construction only at this time. Further, when the Director decides, based on compelling reasons, that certain sub-elements of the master plan will be executed between the land owner and the committee directs that, unless an alternative plan approved by the Secretary of Defense is submitted prior to November 1, 1989, the NRO begin, no later than November 1, 1989, a reorganization according to the plan outlined in a letter to the Intelligence Committees dated November 21, 1988 by then Secretary of the Air Force Edward C. Alridge, Jr.

(a) Location of remaining activities in a central facility in the Washington, D.C. area, and ** the Alridge Plan ** Ultimately, circa 1991-1992, the plan called for the location of the CIA, Air Force, and Navy program offices in a new facility in Northern Virginia. The Committee believes these goals and the timetable are realistic. Moreover, additional realignment of program office functions are made feasible by the location of the Department of Defense, stay, and appropriate centralized support functions in the new facility strategy as part of its overall restructure process. The facilities include a ** permanent facility. The NRO plans to acquire the permanent facility to accommodate additional collocation decisions and, in a budgetary sense, protects for any other approach.


Total: 195.4 ** 


Source: Joint Letter from the DCI and the Chief, Office of Illusions, for expansion capability to accommodate additional collocated activities as required.

Source: Excerpts from the FY 1993 Congressional Budget Justification Book, submitted to all appropriate authorization and appropriation committees.

Date: Early 1991.

Date: Early 1992.

Content: Further, to support the permanent restructuring of the NRO, the Committee directs that, unless an alternative plan approved by the Secretary of Defense is submitted prior to November 1, 1989, the NRO begin, no later than November 1, 1989, a reorganization according to the plan outlined in a letter to the Intelligence Committees dated November 21, 1988 by then Secretary of the Air Force Edward C. Alridge, Jr.

(a) Location of remaining activities in a central facility in the Washington, D.C. area, and ** the Alridge Plan ** Ultimately, circa 1991-1992, the plan called for the location of the CIA, Air Force, and Navy program offices in a new facility in Northern Virginia. The Committee believes these goals and the timetable are realistic. Moreover, additional realignment of program office functions are made feasible by the location of the Department of Defense, stay, and appropriate centralized support functions in the new facility strategy as part of its overall restructure process. The facilities include a ** permanent facility. The NRO plans to acquire the permanent facility to accommodate additional collocation decisions and, in a budgetary sense, protects for any other approach.


Total: 195.4 ** 


Source: Joint Letter from the DCI and the Chief, Office of Illusions, for expansion capability to accommodate additional collocated activities as required.

Source: Excerpts from the FY 1993 Congressional Budget Justification Book, submitted to all appropriate authorization and appropriation committees.

Date: Early 1991.

Date: Early 1992.
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Content: The NRO is using a phased strategy for the facility restructuring process. The facilities include a ** final facility. ** In FY 1991, the NRO acquired a parcel of land sufficient to provide the option of a future building site. The total FY 1991 budget will be located in western Fairfax, Virginia, approximately 70 acres. The facility master plan allows for six buildings to accommodate all functions currently located at ** * as well as collocation of some program office elements. The current construction plan and budget provide for three buildings to accommodate all functions currently located at ** * as well as collocation of program office elements. The current construction plan and budget provide for three buildings to accommodate all functions currently located at ** * as well as collocation of some program office elements. The current construction plan and budget provide for three buildings to accommodate all functions currently located at ** * as well as collocation of some program office elements. The current construction plan and budget provide for three buildings to accommodate all functions currently located at ** * as well as collocation of some program office elements.

Source: Senate Select Committee on Intelligence—Question on the Collocation Project.

Date: May 19, 1992.

Content: Question 3. Please provide a budget breakout for NRO facilities construction for each year FY93-FY95.

Response: The additional cost for full collocation will be supported with the FY92 and FY93 budget for the permanent facility and what is the cost to complete the permanent facility. The current budget for the permanent facility development activities is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Cost (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>$51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Letter to The Honorable David Boren, Chairman Senate Select Committee on Intelligence from DNRO Faga.

Date: October 16, 1992.

Content: I am writing to request approval to reallocate $22 million of FY 1992 ** * funds within the National Reconnaissance Program (NRP) ** *

The panel recommends reallocation into several directorates. ** * and approval of major NRO elements as expeditiously as possible. This recommendation was approved by the DCI, the Secretary of Defense, and the President.

Our Congressional Oversight Committees have been encouraging collocation for several years and the FY 1993 Appropriations Conference report specifically permits us to proceed. ** *

The $22 million will be used for design and construction activities related to increasing the size of the permanent facility, approved by Congress in FY 1991 ** *

Source: Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1993 for Intelligence.

Date: December 1992.

Benefits
Strengths Technical Capability of Organization
Improves Decision Making
Facilitates Functional Organization Structure
Allows Merging of Similar Functions—Minimize Redundancy
Promotes Closer, More Active, Interfaces with Customers
Improves Ability to Develop More Integrated

Architect: Martin C. Faga

Source: Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1993 for Intelligence.

Date: November 16, 1992.

FACILITY BUDGET

Westfields—Design/construction and support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Cost (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$114.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>187.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>138.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>108.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>100.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Includes $22.04 million reallocation.

Source: Letter to DNRO Faga from David L. Boren, Chairman and Frank H. Murkowski, Vice Chairman, SSCI.

Date: November 13, 1992.

Content: The letter is in response to your October 16, 1992 request to reallocate $22 million of fiscal year 1993 ** * to accelerate the NRO's consolidation plan.

The Committee does not object to the expenditure of funds for the purpose specified.

** * Source: Excerpts from the FY 1994-1995 Congressional Budget Justification Book, submitted to all appropriate authorization and appropriation committees.

Date: Early 1993.

Content: ** * includes the facilities to support the NRO reorganization.

The Restructure Plan approved by the SSCI provided for full collocation of the NRO to a single location as soon as possible. ** *

Full collocation will be supported with the occupancy of the NRO Westfields facility. In 1996 ** * final NRO facility headquarters will be located in western Fairfax, Virginia on approximately 70 acres. ** * The current construction plan and budget provide for four buildings to accommodate all functions currently located ** * general site development, site security, and the basic infrastructure support for additional buildings. ** *

Total construction is approximately 1,000,000 gross square feet.

Source: Excerpts from the FY 1994-1995 Congressional Budget Justification Book, submitted to all appropriate authorization and appropriation committees.

Date: Early 1993.

Content: This element of the Mission Support expenditure center includes the facilities.

The Restructure Plan approved by the SecDef and the DCO included the facilities.
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NRO to the East Coast as soon as possible. Full funding for the Westfields complex will provide for the occupancy of the NRO Westfields facility in 1995 **.** The final NRO facility headquarters will be located in western Fairfax County, Virginia on approximately 90 acres **.**

The current construction plan and budget provide for an initial schedule of funding to accommodate all functions currently located at **.** The conference report is still 2 percent below both the budget request and the total amount appropriated in fiscal year 1994. I believe this result accurately reflects a judgment by a majority of the House Intelligence Committee that, while we need to keep pressure on the intelligence agencies to reduce spending, we need to do so in a way that does not jeopardize the ability of those agencies to perform their critical missions in addressing threats posed by international terrorists, narcotics traffickers, and those who would make weapons of mass destruction more readily available. I do not believe that any budgetary action recommended by the conference committee will have any impact on any essential capability within the intelligence community. In fact, speaking now only for myself, I believe we could have made more significant cuts in some areas without affecting anything essential but that is an argument for another day.

I have frequently compared intelligence to an insurance policy. Neither administration since the end of the cold war has clearly understood how much coverage is necessary under that policy and why. As a result, Congress has focused largely on the premiums, with a general sense that they were too high but with a reluctance to trim them too much without being certain of the consequences. This has been a frustrating process and one which I do not believe is sustainable for much longer. It is for that reason that I supported the inclusion in the conference report of a provision establishing a commission to conduct a bottom-up review of intelligence. Such a review is desperately needed, in fact, it is several years overdue. This commission can function effectively if it is unsure of what it is supposed to be doing and how it fits within the larger structure of which it is a part. The intelligence community needs well-defined roles and missions for the post-cold-war world, and I have concluded that they are going to have to be imposed from outside rather than adopted from within. The committee will continue to do what it can in this regard, but we will welcome the assistance of those who will serve on the commission.

While Mr. Coleman, the chairman of our Subcommittee on Legislation, will explain the legislative provisions of the bill in detail, there are several on which I want to comment. The committee has operated for most of this year against the backdrop of the unfolding Ames espionage case. On this issue, I strongly disagree with Mr. glossary of Central Intelligence and the inspector general of the Central Intelligence Agency to discuss the inspector general's report on the CIA's handling of the case. The report provides a thorough and critical analysis of this affair and I want to compliment Inspector General Hitz and his staff for a very effective job. The report, however, only confirmed what most of us had already concluded: The Ames case was an unqualified disaster. The full extent of the damage done by Ames' spying will not be known for some time, if ever, but it was clearly an unprecedented scale.

The committee has reviewed the report and I expect we will be meeting again with the inspector general to discuss it in more detail. We have our own inquiry underway, however, and while we will make full use of the work of the inspector general, we will be reaching our own conclusions and will have our own recommendations to make. There is no substitute, however, for the comprehensive review of an independent body as appropriate to the institutional deficiencies which exist or the individual failures which occurred.

The conference report contains a number of provisions which constitute a legislative response to the Ames case. Most are designed to deter people from committing espionage or make it easier to catch them if they do. Chief among these is section 802 which will require executive branch employees to exchange for being granted access to classified information, to consent to the disclosure of their records held by financial institutions, credit bureaus, and commercial travel entities to their employing agencies or authorized investigative agencies.

I support all of the counterintelligence provisions in the conference report, but I do not believe that any of them would have been necessary to short-circuit the espionage career of Aldrich Ames. That could have been done if managers at the CIA had been sufficiently attentive to numerous warning signs not only about Ames' financial status, but about his problems as an employee. Legislation was not necessary to prevent Mr. Ames from being placed in jobs which were perfect places from which to conduct espionage, even after he was rated as, at best, a below average employee. The failures in the Ames case were not the result of a lack of legislation. They were the result of grievous mistakes made by a number of individuals at the CIA, and I believe that the conclusion is inescapable that Ames flourished as a spy as a result.

I expect that the report based on the committee's inquiry will make some judgments about whether the right people were disciplined for those mistakes and whether the discipline was commensurate with the gravity of their conduct. If there has been for too long a period of unmerited indulgence on the part of the CIA and I believe there has been, it is
imperative that the disposition of this case be seen to be directed at ending it. That cannot be accomplished if the level of accountability for the Ames affair is not set high enough.

Director Woolsey is uniquely situated to make sure that occurs. He bears no responsibility for the years in which little attention was paid by senior managers to the hunt for a "mole" within the CIA, and yet history will fairly criticize him if he does not effectively displace the responsibility he does have to ensure that Harry Truman's famous axiom "The buck stops here" applies in the Ames case. The people who ran the CIA from 1985 through 1992—the Directors of Central Intelligence and the Deputy Directors for Operations—must bear ultimate responsibility for what went wrong in this case. If they did not direct that the pursuit of a spy at the heart of the CIA be made the highest priority of the Agency, we need to know why.

In that regard, one of the most significant issues addressed in the conference report is section 811 which requires that the Federal Bureau of Investigation be immediately advised of information that indicates classified information is being disclosed in an unauthorized manner to a foreign power. Espionage is a crime and it should be chiefly investigated by law enforcement officials.

In the Ames case, even after the likelihood that there had been a human penetration of the Agency was clear, the investigation was chiefly directed by the CIA. If this case teaches any clear lesson, it is that spies are not good cops. I believe that there would have been a faster, more efficient investigation of this matter if trained police officers, the FBI, had been in charge. The FBI should determine when an espionage investigation is to be undertaken and how it is to be pursued. The agency whose employees may be involved in the commission of the crime may be able to provide valuable assistance, but that should be the FBI's decision. There can only be one entity in charge of a criminal investigation and that should be a law enforcement entity. Section 811 is intended to make clear the division of responsibility in the conduct of espionage investigations.

Before leaving the subject of counterintelligence, I want to note section 807 which provides a court order process for certain physical searches undertaken for foreign intelligence purposes. Currently, such searches are conducted pursuant to a so-called national security letter signed by the Attorney General. Section 807 will require a judicial determination before the search is conducted in a manner similar to that to which wiretaps under Title III are subject for foreign intelligence purposes. While I understand the concerns of those who believe that a search of a residence should only be conducted pursuant to a warrant which meets fourth amendment standards, I believe that the rights of a potential criminal suspect are already adequately protected under the procedure established by section 807 than by the current procedure which allows executive branch officials to authorize a search which their employees will conduct.

After the Ames case, the intelligence story most in the news this year related to the construction of the National Reconnaissance Office headquarters facility. As I stated on the House floor last month, the Intelligence Committee was aware of this project. The degree of knowledge about the specifics of the project varied between members of the committee and the committee staff, but I suspect that is not unusual. The point is, the building did not arise in northern Virginia without the committee knowing about it. Having said that, this episode did highlight the fact that budget submissions from intelligence agencies, NRO, are not always as detailed as they should be. The conference report therefore contains a provision requiring that future intelligence community construction projects in excess of $750,000 be specifically identified in the President's budget submission and separately authorized by Congress. In addition, the conference report requires that a greater degree of detail be used to describe the budget category known as "real property" that can no longer be what it has been—a catch-all, miscellaneous category in which to aggregate funds used in the acquisition not only of pencils, paper clips, and cleaning supplies, but multimillion dollar office buildings as well.

I began by discussing spending on intelligence activities and I want to close in a similar vein. The intelligence agencies, like all organizations which handle sensitive information, spend millions of dollars and employ hundreds of people to classify documents and ensure their security. In my judgment, far too much information is classified by our Government, for too long a time, and at too great an expense. This is due in part to an Executive order to be promulgated by the President's budget submission and separate consideration of non-budgetary terms. It is good legislation which deserves the support of the House. I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 4299 has a significance which, despite the important advances it makes in areas like imagery intelligence, will be measured largely in non-budgetary terms. It is good legislation which deserves the support of the House. I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished chairman and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], for the very fair way in which they looked at this question about the NRO facility in Virginia. I must tell my colleagues, and I am going to place in the record today the briefing material that we received from Mr. Woolsey and I also have a letter which the former Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. DORMAN, are joined by Mr. RICHARDSON on the Democratic side. Each of these members has made many valuable contributions to the committee's work and they will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 4299 has a significance which, despite the important advances it makes in areas like imagery intelligence, will be measured largely in non-budgetary terms. It is good legislation which deserves the support of the House. I urge its adoption.
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Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished chairman and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], for the very fair way in which they looked at this question about the NRO facility in Virginia. I must tell my colleagues, and I am going to place in the record today the briefing material that we received from Mr. Woolsey and I also have a letter which the former Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. DORMAN, are joined by Mr. RICHARDSON on the Democratic side. Each of these members has made many valuable contributions to the committee's work and they will be missed.
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presented in the record, which I am also going to place in the RECORD today. So I regret that there was confusion about this.

I want to support the chairman, because I have been fighting for several years to get the budget detail into the budget so that there would not be confusion about what is a new initiative and what is in the base.

I think it is wrong, I think what we did in reforming that is a major step in the right direction, and I want to say I was pleased to be one of the sponsors of that provision along with the chairman of the select committee on the other side. That may have been one of the few things in this conference we did agree about.

I regret very much there has been an aspersion made about the NRO. I feel they are one of the finest and most professional organizations that we have. There was no intent on their part to mislead the Congress, and that has been stated by everyone who has looked at this fairly and objectively.

As I said, not only did they put $30 million into the NRO project, they also supported it on an annual basis and were given information about its total cost.

I want to compliment the chairman. I think we have made a lot of progress on this in clarifying the budget detail and think we are in a stronger position for the future.

I am going to put it in the RECORD, so all of my colleagues who are interested in this subject can fairly assess what actually happened. I think when they do, fair-minded people will conclude our committee, of course, was correct in stating that the NRO gave us accurate information.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I re­serve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank our committee chairman, Mr. GLICKMAN, for continuing to lead our committee in a collegial manner and encouraging the honest sharing of views. I could not ask for more cooperation—on several issues we believe that he has been open to our working together to make some significant improvements over our original authorisation of June this year. I should also state that I found it refreshing to confer with the other body approached conference with a willingness to compromise on a number of outstanding issues.

This is a conference report of which we can all feel proud—though some of us may have different reasons than others. Let me first mention some budgetary issues.

**BUDGETARY ISSUES**

I and my colleagues in the minority are pleased that the conference has been more judicious in its efforts to limit intelligence spending. The conference report’s significant cuts to the requested budget are made with a logical rationale of judging programs by their merits and by their contributions to this Nation’s security. That is a process with which we agree.

The conference report fully funds counterintelligence lines which the President and the DCI, Jim Woolsey, have created to fund the new National Counterintelligence Center. Although we have some discomfort over a few of the cuts to intelligence collection and analysis, we believe that the conference report funds those capabilities which we strongly believe are essential to keep U.S. policy makers and military operators informed and, frankly, to protect national security. We note with satisfaction that the intelligence community will be able to move along with some long-term technical programs which will be of particular value to the military. We are particularly pleased that the conference report funds HUMINT—human collection or espionage activities—at a level allowing this critical part of the intelligence community to continue the process of modernisation and restructuring.

In this last regard I would like to draw your attention to some much neglected facts which do not get heard above the din surrounding the Ames affair. These relate to the fact that, despite the Ames incident and their having only a single digit percentage of the intelligence budget, the CIA’s Directorate of Operations and other HUMINT collectors provide a preponderant amount of our critical intelligence. Some recent studies have shown quite clearly that in the areas of tracking terrorism, narcotics activities, and weapons proliferation, HUMINT is without parallel. The same studies show that for following events in the Middle East, Europe, North Africa, and much of Asia it provides our most important insights. Anecdotes are hard to prove by revealing sources and methods, but I can tell you that even in the last couple of months HUMINT has saved lives and thousands of American jobs. Specifically, it has advertised planned terrorist attacks and protected U.S. businesses by salvaging billions of dollar trade deals from unfair and illegal trade practices by foreign Governments. We strongly support whatever it takes to fix what is broken from the ground up and elsewhere in the intelligence community but we will not stand by to see its critically important capabilities gutted.

**LEGISLATIVE ISSUES**

Legislatively, the conference report includes numerous items of significance.

We are particularly pleased with some of the counterintelligence legislation. I should also note my report full funding which gives the intelligence community much greater access to financial, credit, and travel information on U.S. employees with security clearances.

The conference report also includes provisions for criminal forfeiture for violations of espionage laws.

We are also cautiously optimistic about the report’s creation of what has been called a President’s Intelligence Advisory Board. This is to be a Presidential commission to study the roles and capabilities of the intelligence community and to make suggestions on changes which might improve its operation. We sincerely hope that the President will appoint to this commission objective experts who will think and act on the facts they review rather than on prejudices or political expediences. We hope the eight congressional designees will be similarly qualified. The Nation will be very poorly served should this commission be hijacked by partisans who want to use such a commission to validate their efforts to dismantle the intelligence community.

The conference report also improves the reporting requirements to Congress for requests for intelligence funds for construction purposes. We all remember the purported surprise of the other body’s Intelligence Committee about the National Reconnaissance Office’s headquarters building. This legislation should please everyone since, not only will it facilitate congressional oversight, but it will also protect the intelligence community from false accusations of withholding information from Congress. Beyond the topicality of the NRO issue, we in the minority strongly support any reasonable legislation enhancing congressional fiscal oversight.

**CLOSING**

In summary, as a realist I am pleased with this, the last conference report to be prepared in my 6-year tenure on this committee. I have enjoyed every last minute of my 2 years as the ranking member on the committee. For a committee that does most of its business behind closed doors and deals with the most secret activities of the Government, we have, nonetheless, managed to roll through a public rollercoaster ride. You would think that I would have grown used to it, but those of you who have had the privilege of working on the committee will understand my amazement at the activities of some of the most dedicated, hard working, creative, and loyal American Government employees manage so regularly to be portrayed negatively.

At the very top of this group is the DCI, Jim Woolsey. He is a loyal Democrat serving a Democrat administration, but even as a true-blue Republican I must confess my belief that he is the right man in the right job trying to do the right thing. Yet, he is, in my opinion much under-appreciated by some of his fellow Democrats. He deserves the respect and support of us all.
hours at desks in Washington and those risking their lives in the most dangerous corners of the world. Since I will never have occasion to speak to them collectively, I would like to say something to them now on the record in the hope that some of them may hear of it. They keep the faith. Your good works will never receive the attention of your mistakes—real and imagined. You will continue to suffer at the hands of those who do not know better. You will suffer body blows to your pride, your character may be assailed; your most fundamental value may be questioned. But we, who are fortunate enough to have the opportunity to see your work—and who have actually taken the effort to do so—know of your sacrifices and know of the profound satisfaction you have in doing the right thing even when it will remain unheralded or may be misconstrued. If there is a moral to the history of the United States it is that when the democratic system is allowed to operate freely it will—eventually—come to the right conclusion. Be proud of your work, be vigilant in your duty, and know that you are crucial to the life and liberty of us all.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHELI] under the normal terms of yielding for the purpose of discussing the schedule.

Mr. MICHELI. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the distinguished majority leader for the program, let me for just a moment compliment the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST] for serving these past 6 years as our ranking member on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. I appointed him thinking he was the best man for the job, and certainly he has given me every reason to be mighty proud of his stewardship during the course of these very critical years. His statement, which just preceded mine being acknowledged here attests to the diligence with which he has approached that very important position all through these years. I want to thank him especially for that fine job.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri, my distinguished colleague, Mr. GEPHARDT.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there will be no more votes today. There will be a schedule: On Monday October 3, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour, and the House will meet at noon for suspensions on 62 bills which the distinguished minority leader I believe has in front of him. I will not take the time of the body to read those, but they are available to both sides. The suspensions referred to are as follows:

2. H.R. 4247, to limit State taxation.
6. H.R. 4896, to grant the consent of Congress to the Kansas and Missouri metropolitan culture district compact.
9. H.R. 4778, to codify without substantive change recent laws related to transportation.
10. H.R. 5102, to amend title 18, U.S. Code, regarding crimes relating to medals of honor.
12. H.R. 3876, Outer Continental Shelf sand and gravel resources.
18. H.R. 4939, Frederick S. Green U.S. Courthouse.
29. H.R. 5103, to provide for an Executive Director of the GAO Personnel Appeals Board.
30. H.R. 5973, to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel.
31. H.R. 5139, reemployment of improperly separated Postal Service employees.
32. H.R. 5084, Census Address List Improvement Act.
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33. S. 1312, Pension Annuitants Protection Act.
34. S. Con. Res. 261, Correction in the enrollment of S. 1312.
37. H.R. 4615, applying the provisions of the Warren Act to the central Utah project.
40. H.R. 3612, to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.
41. H.R. 3613, the Kenai Natives Association Equity Act.
42. H.R. 734, to amend the extension of certain Federal assistance to the Pascua Yaqui Indians of Arizona.
43. S. 720, Indian Lands Open Dump Cleanup Act.
52. S. 1614, Better Nutrition and Health for Children Act.
54. H.R. 4922, to amend title 18, U.S. Code, regarding the interception of communications for law enforcement purposes.
55. S. 1457, to amend the Aleutian and Pribilof Islands Restitution Act.
57. H.R. , transfer of Naval vessels to foreign countries.
59. H. Res. , regarding prospect for peace in Northern Ireland.
61. S. Con. Res. 74, ban on the use of United States passports in Lebanon.
62. H.R. 2135, Native American Veterans' Memorial Establishment Act. I would also state to the gentleman that the votes would not begin until 5 p.m. on Monday so Members would have an opportunity to travel back here.
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There is also a possibility of some action needed on Monday with the D.C. appropriations bills. The gentleman knows negotiations are still going on in the other body. Maybe that bill can be carried on a roll call tonight without change, in which case it and all of the appropriations bills would then be on the President's desk before the end of the fiscal year. We all hope for that. But indeed if it does not happen, we may have to take action on Monday on the D.C. appropriations bill.

On Tuesday, October 4, and the balance of the week the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning business on Tuesday and then at noon on Tuesday, and meet at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday.

We will be taking a House Concurrent Resolution Sense of the Congress regarding entitlement spending, subject to a rule; H.R. 3800, Superfund Reform Act of 1994, subject to a rule; S. 455, Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act, subject to a rule; H.R. 5044, American Heritage Areas Partnership Program Act of 1994, subject to a rule; H.R. 5140, trade agreements concluded in the Uruguay round of multilateral trade negotiations, subject to a rule; House Joint Resolution 416, Limited Authorization for the United States-led force in Haiti, subject to a rule; and H.R. 3801, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1994, subject to a rule.

On Thursday the House will recess immediately and reconvene at approximately 11 a.m., to receive the President of the Republic of South Africa, Mr. Nelson Mandela, in a joint meeting.

Following the joint meeting, the House will reconvene for legislative business. Conference reports may be brought up at any time. Any further program will be announced later.

I would say to the gentleman as he understands it, Mr. Speaker, that I hope and intent to finish and adjourn sine die on Friday, October 7. It is impossible today to give Members a specific guarantee as to a time that that might be accomplished, but everyone knows that the House throughout the week on what matters may need to be brought up before we can reach that adjournment resolution. But it is our clear intent as early as possible on that day to be able to reach an adjournment sine die.

Finally, let me say that this may be the last time while the distinguished minority leader is minority leader, as he has announced his retirement, to carry on a dialog of this kind about the program for the next week.

Again I want to say to the distinguished minority leader how much respect and affection every Member of this body has for him and his family. I am sorry that we will not have these opportunities again. It has been a real joy to work with the gentleman. He has been a great legislator and a great patriot and a great American, and everyone here wishes him every good wish for his future plans.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I suspect, however, next week we will still have occasion to exchange a few thoughts with one another. As I have observed, windups of Congress over the years, why, that last week usually turns out to be quite hectic to the degree that we have had to keep our heads close together to make sure that it all does end on an orderly note.

If I might return the compliment, for me over these past many years, what a joy it has been to work with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, when we were both junior Members and as we have risen up through the ranks to become leaders in our respective parties. It has been one of those things we will never forget, probably cherish more than anything else in my tenure in this House, the relationships and friendships between individuals as distinguished from the kind of legislative prowess we may or may not have had on any später of other days. It is the real strength of this body, those kinds of friendships that are forged as we have come to know them over the years.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Before yielded, let me say that I have had the pleasure for the past 6 years in this committee of working with the gentleman from Nebraska. I think he is unequalled in members of that committee who have dedicated themselves to their part time, very silently but very methodically and judiciously. He is someone whom his constituents in Nebraska can feel very proud of the efforts he has made toward our national security.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. I want to begin by thanking my distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], for his very generous remarks and for the kind of very positive and open relationship he and I have had throughout our 6 years on the Intelligence Committee, where we sat side by side for those 6 years.

I want also to say it has been my privilege to serve under three exceptional ranking members, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. MCCURDY, and our current chairman, Mr. GLICKMAN are outstanding individuals. They provided exceptional leadership to the committee. They have been ably assisted by our ranking members, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. COMBEST during my tenure.

I would also say quite sincerely that I believe that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence's staff is, without any doubt whatsoever, the high-quality staff that operates in the House of Representatives. We are extremely well served by them because of their contributions, their dedication and their knowledge of our jurisdictional area. It is unparalleled, and we owe them a debt of gratitude that is often not expressed.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, quite sincerely I want to express regret that it is my sixth and, therefore, my last year as a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Since I am also a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, in part I would like to reflect on some of the difficulties the intelligence community faces in coming up with a post-cold-war intelligence program to meet recurrent congressional demands for a fresh, cost-efficient and effective strategy.

Intelligence officials do not make up the whole of the foreign policy world. They wish to court big trouble—but, rather, exist to support the Nation's established foreign and national security policies. When, as now, under the Clinton administration, America lacks a coherent foreign and national security policy, carefully formulated and appropriately enunciated, it is almost impossible to plan wisely. It is certainly difficult to properly shift financial and personnel resources within the limits of the appropriated funds.

The Clinton administration's ineptness and incoherence in foreign policy has become abundantly clear to nearly every careful observer in America and abroad. As a result, the administration has heaped from one foreign policy crisis to another, embarrassed by contradictions, unsupported threats, and revolts. The ship of state is, without a captain, in uncharted waters, even as the world and the American public look to U.S. leadership for guidance through a storm of uncertainty, instability, and violence. It is a crisis of time of momentous importance, but unfortunately the United States is having very little effect on the shape of things to come.

Given this erratic behavior, how can the U.S. intelligence community plan a strategy of support even through 1996? Given the dearth of direction and leadership and the potentially adverse public reaction to such ill-advised, hazardous efforts as we do undertake, how can U.S. intelligence properly assist in implementing U.S. foreign policy after 1996? Given the military's apparent inability to fight two major regional conflicts simultaneously because of budget cuts and the exigencies of the Clinton administration's ill-advised commitments of our military around the world, should the intelligence community seriously program
resources to support this two-major-regional defense policy? Given the White House's unwillingness or disinterest in supporting its Director of Central Intelligence—indeed, its disinterest in the advice of the intelligence community in general—the question is what budgets, programs or strategies are politically supportable for the intelligence community? Since U.S. policy is adrift, it follows logically that the efforts of the intelligence community seem to be adrift as well.

Uncertainties in planning have been exacerbated by the dissolution of the Soviet world empire. This is a violent, vengeful, dangerous time. Sorting out the East-West ideological rivalry was simple compared to divining the threats of terrorist groups and states and the personal and tribal vendettas and agendas within multiethnic States. Even in the more predictable past, it was difficult to foretell the next hot spot. This new multithreat and unstable environment is a good argument for attempting to maintain basic intelligence worldwide. That attempt, however, clashes with new budget realities. How should the intelligence community now decide which countries, regions or topics to write off?

With the changing circumstances at the end of the cold war, the intelligence community's priorities changed to reflect the increasing importance of the counterproliferation, counterterrorism missions. Additionally, the United States' increasing involvement in regional crises and peacekeeping activities places a growing burden on an intelligence community with declining resources.

At first, the bills were paid by drastically cutting our intelligence community's budget for collection and analysis conducted on the former Soviet Union. In part justified and in part done to show an insistent Congress that the Community had, indeed, adapted to new times, and in part it was done to show an insistent Congress that the Community had, indeed, adapted to new times.

Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, as I leave the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I want to remind Members of Congress and the administration that the success of the intelligence community in meeting demands placed upon it by our top policy leaders in the highly unstable and unpredictable post-cold-war environment will largely be determined by whether this administration and the next are able to articulate a coherent foreign policy and national security policy to guide the intelligence community again, can we do more—this much more—with less resources? That is apparently the demand.

If we want a new intelligence strategy, we need a foreign policy strategy on which to base it that creates a new Commission of the Roles and Capabilities of the U.S. intelligence community.
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Commanders can communicate in real time over sophisticated conferencing networks, at a fraction of the cost of traditional voice and voice breaks around the world. In the combat theater we are going to see how this works as the rioting builds to a fever pitch and the looting takes place at this very moment we speak on this House floor, with over 20,000 American men and women intermixed in all areas of the country in a very dangerous situation. How much human intelligence are we going to get fed back here to Washington and to our troops?

Other needs, such as the requirement for broad area search capabilities, these are being addressed through the unmanned aerial vehicle programs currently under development. Downlinking capabilities and better dissemination of imagery and other key intelligence information areas have also been improved. All of these improvements have continued and, God willing, will continue to improve, but it is going to require Investments of intelligence dollars.

While we have seen our budget shrink, frankly the result has not been all that bad. Smaller budgets have forced greater efficiencies. Fewer dollars have encouraged organizations to work smarter and to work much more efficiently. Interservice research and development and joint activities are becoming the order of the day. Finally.

We must be mindful of two things, though, as we look to the future expectations of intelligence budgets over the remainder of this decade. The first is keeping up with technological developments and executing well thought our decisions to modernize military intelligence systems. That is going to cost additional dollars. The development of new intelligence systems or even upgrading existing is always costly and will have to be reflected in future intelligence budget totals, and, Lord knows, it saves lives.

Second, in recent years we have watched the United States become involved in a number of low-level conflicts ranging from Yugoslavia to Haiti. Regardless of the degree to which the United States becomes involved, at all times intelligence support is going to be key, it must be supported. This often means additional maintenance costs and operational costs associated with every level of intelligence gathering. The establishment of communications lines, not only to support our U.S. needs or NATO treaty needs, but now the U.N., and the deployment of analysts and other intelligence support elements, including all those that are only known to the committees of the Senate and House. There are also moneys which must be reflected in the budget totals which Congress will evaluate in the years to come.

That is my written statement, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to conclude with a word to my colleagues that will be seeking to get an appointment to the committee, by the way, by the way, whichever party that may be, to be determined by an election in about 38 days, and by the minority leader, whichever party Member that may be, that from our leaders will select the people, and I exclude myself from this category, because I also want to say what a pleasure it was to serve with the two that I came on the committee with 2 years before last, Mr. [Mr. BERIEUTER], who has an intelligence background, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], who has dogged every step of our excellent chairman and made this the primary focus of his congressional duties, and all of those that will have been added since I have been here.

We have a great team on both sides, and with everybody being replaced, I do not know how many will be replaced on the other side, I hope our leaders take due diligence and forget politics when they pick the members to replace us. There is no question we want it. We want it to have had some approach me, that want desperately on this committee, let me tell them the bad side. You do not get day-to-day "hot" information on things happening around the globe. I find everybody on the committee, like me, tunes into CNN to watch the rioting down there in Haiti. Being on Intelligence, I have had no leg up on other information sources to find one shred of evidence that the young man who died in Haiti 4 days ago was in fact a suicide. During Mogadishu the attitude at the Pentagon was terrible, that they would not give anybody on our committee, even the leaders on either side, any shred of evidence. They were so psychod by the politics and the people in the suits, rather than the people in uniform in the Pentagon, and it is happening again in Haiti.

This is not the purpose of our committee. The purpose of our committee, even though I have an addiction now to the NID, National Intelligence Daily, that I will have a total break with 3 months, the best part of being on our committee is the long-range planning, the long-range objectives, and getting those hearing to find out whether organized crime does to high crime, where are terrorists located? Who is passing narcotics to whom? Who maybe is taking advantage of us illegally in the economic transactions of the world. We in this committee which oversee the intelligence community are trying to make sure the intelligence agencies can provide this information. While changes are going to happen, we should never lose sight of the fact that our goal is high quality information for America so we can continue to be the strongest and freest nation in the world.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. In closing, I would say this has been an extraordinarily difficult time for the intelligence community. Changes are in the offering. Great difficulties are occurring and will continue to occur. But with all the criticism that has flowed out of my mouth and others, and hopefully it has been constructive, the fact of the matter is that a strong America in the world depends upon access to good, solid information about what is happening. Where are they? Where are chemical and biological, nuclear weapons located? Who is passing narcotics to whom? Who maybe is taking advantage of us illegally in the economic transactions of the world. We in this committee which oversee the intelligence community are trying to make sure the intelligence agencies can provide this information. While changes are going to happen, we should never lose sight of the fact that our goal is high quality information for America so we can continue to be the strongest and freest nation in the world.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's staff is absolutely sensational, patriots all, and so is mine. I did not want to leave that out. Best staffs on the Hill.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, we agree on that.
The Armed Services Committee took a close look at this proposal and endorsed both the specifics of the proposal and my resolution. The U-2 program, contrary to the fiscal year 1996 budget process. For this reason, the effort by the intelligence community to encourage the administration’s proposal to fund the U-2 out of the tactical budget is a counterproductive development that directly undermines the ongoing effort to better structure the intelligence budget. Therefore, I oppose this provision of the report and urge the administration not to follow it given specific direction to the contrary already found in the Defense authorization and appropriations bills.

As my colleagues have already explained in some detail, the committee worked this issue through in good faith during our conference and arrived at a position that endorses the administration’s efforts to better rationalize how the intelligence budget is structured. The recommendation to fund the U-2 as a tactical program instead of a national asset makes perfect sense and ensures that this critical capability will continue to be responsive to the needs of our military commanders during a time of crisis.

However, by rejecting this recommendation, this conference report succeeds in sending the administration a confused and conflicting message from Congress at the same time we are pressing the intelligence community to restructure and find more efficient ways to make do with decreasing resources. We should instead find ways to send a consistent message of encouragement for ongoing efforts to better manage intelligence programs.

It is my hope that the administration will not place the work being done in this area and will continue to aggressively develop the Joint Military Intelligence Program (JMIP) as a means to better allocate and structure dwindling intelligence resources.

Mr. DELMUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report.

I have two main concerns: One, a longstanding opposition to the unnecessary level of secrecy in which the intelligence budget is cloaked; and two, the abrupt change in direction that the intelligence conference have taken in their report regarding two important intelligence programs.

First, I will state to my colleagues once again my belief that the foreign policy activities of this Nation, as represented by the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence, result from their joint review of NFIP and TIARA programs. We should be focusing on the interoperability of capabilities in support of military operations, ensuring essential improvements for imagery support, as well as developing a new U.S. intelligence program and budget structure to better reflect user needs and priorities, consistent with our changed strategic environment.

The blurring of national versus tactical intelligence was highlighted last year when the committee relied on its report on the fiscal year 1994 Defense Authorization bill. The committee then observed that over the years, the boundaries between TIARA and NFIP components of the intelligence budgets have become a source of confusion and contention. The committee was, and continues to be, concerned that the lack of clearly established definitions for NFIP and TIARA have led to the sometimes arbitrary assignment of intelligence programs and functions within these categories. As a consequence, the Armed Services Committee called for a formal, comprehensive report has yet to be provided.

In response to the committee’s urging, the Department of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence to review intelligence programs and activities and provide to Congress a report identifying those programs which support: First, primarily national purposes; second, primarily defensewide, theater activities, and the Unified Command; or three, primarily a single service or agency. The report was also to have identified those programs and activities that should no longer be included in the intelligence budget. Although we have seen fragments and/or bits and pieces of what appears to be a concerted effort to address this matter, a formal, comprehensive report has yet to be provided.

An important review was undertaken by the Department earlier this year to determine what, if any, programs or activities should be removed from TIARA. This effort was undertaken in response to the fiscal year 1994 budget process.
House Armed Services Committee language asking the Department to identify programs and activities that should no longer be included in the Joint Military Program. As a result, the Department determined that, indeed, there were certain programs that fell outside the definition of TIARA used by the congress and has subsequently proposed to delete these activities from the fiscal year 1994 TIARA Congressional Justification Book. These programs include, for example, Ballistic Missile Defense, the Defense Meteorological Support Program, Tanker Support to Reconnaissance, and the Navy's Mapping, Charting and Geodesy, to name a few. When added up, funding for these programs totaled more than a half billion dollars, in each of fiscal year 1994 and 1995.

Further, earlier this year, now-Deputy Secretary of Defense John Deutch notified officials within the Department of Defense and Congress that effective June 1, 1994, he was establishing the Joint Military Intelligence Program (JMIP) to provide initiatives, activities, and programs that pre-eminently provide intelligence information and support to multiple defense customers. The goal of the JMIP is to bridge existing programmatic divisions across national and service or departmental intelligence lines to provide more effective and coherent intelligence programmatic decision-making and, ultimately, to provide support to military intelligence consumers—policymakers, force modernization planners and warfighters. I concur with the administration in their intent to submit a Joint Military Intelligence Program (JMIP) budget request for fiscal year 1996 this January.

I intend to make the analysis of these and other intelligence-related issues a priority issue for the Armed Services Committee during our review in the next budget cycle.

Closing, Mr. Speaker, I join the calls for openness in the national debate on intelligence funding decisions and for the realignment of the programs I have stated above. As this conference report represents a departure from the JJS proposal, I will have to oppose it.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WATT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 4460, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1994

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation may have until 6 p.m., September 30, 1994, to file the committee report on H.R. 4460, the Water Resources Development Act 1994.

It is my understanding that this request has been cleared by both the minority leadership of the House and the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Mrs. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 185) to designate October 1994 as "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTIERREZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] who is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 311.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in proud support of my bill, House Joint Resolution 311 which designates October 1994 as National Breast Cancer Awareness Month. With the support of more than 200 of my colleagues, the generous donation of time and energy by Mr. Elmer Cerin who helped encourage co-sponsorships, and the assistant of Chairman CLAY who quickly brought this resolution to the floor is amply reflected that once again, October will be designated as "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month."

I regret that the need for this resolution is so great. The tragic facts, however, are that this year, more than 182,000 women are expected to be diagnosed with breast cancer and 46,000 women and 300 men will die from it. My State of Illinois, alone, will lose 2,200 women to the disease. Most tragic of all is the fact that the cause and cure of breast cancer remain unknown.

With increased funds earmarked especially for breast cancer research, I am hopeful that we will eventually be able to find the cause and a cure for this terrible disease and dramatically reduce the incidence and mortality rate of breast cancer in the United States. Until that time, however, we must use the tools we have available to use at this point. Early detection only through self-examination, examination by our doctor and mammograms—is our only real weapon in the battle against this dreaded disease. If breast cancer is detected early, it can be treated and lives can be saved. In fact, in my State of Illinois, it is estimated that 3,736 lives were saved during the last decade because of early detection.

In order to detect the cancer early and dramatically increase the numbers of survivors, however, we need to continually stress the importance of early detection. For the past seven years, National Breast Cancer Awareness Month has provided an opportunity for congressional offices, women's organizations, community groups, news programs, magazines, and newspapers to do so in meaningful ways.

Clearly, we have a long, tough road ahead of us until this disease is finally conquered. In the meantime, however, I hope that we can continue to work together to make National Breast Cancer Awareness Month a time of heightened awareness of the need for early detection by all women and those who love them.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution just agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 185, to designate October as Breast Cancer Awareness Month. Many of us stand together in support of this resolution each year, but its passage continues to be critical.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that in 1994, 234,700 women will die from breast cancer, and another 182,000 women will be diagnosed with the disease. Breast cancer is the leading cause of death for women between the ages of 35 and 64. Seventy-five percent of all breast cancers occur in women with no known risk factors. One out of eight women will be diagnosed with breast cancer sometime in their lifetime; in 1960, the number was 1 in 20 women.

Over the past several years, this commemorative resolution has been critical in bringing public attention to this epidemic and educating women about breast cancer. Mr. Speaker, we are moving in the right direction; funding for breast cancer has been substantially increased in the past several years. But we must be vigilant in keeping this momentum going by ensuring access for all women to appropriate levels of detection, treatment for breast cancer and by ensuring that
breast cancer research continues to be well funded.

Mr. Speaker, I recently participated in the Senate Caucus on Compensation and Employee Benefits, on which I serve as ranking Republican member, during which we discussed the need to expand the Federal Employee Benefits Program to cover high dose chemotherapy with autologous bone marrow transplants (HDC/ABMT), the treatment that has been effective for many women with very advanced stages of breast cancer, multiple myeloma, and epithelial ovarian cancer. I am pleased to announce that OPM has announced that every plan participating in FEHBP will soon be required to cover HDC/ABMT. I want to congratulate OPM Director, Jim King, and Curtis Smith of OPM, who were instrumental in this effort.

I commend the gentlewoman from Illinois for her sponsorship of this critical resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to lend my strong support for passage of Senate Joint Resolution 185, designating the month of October as Breast Cancer Awareness Month. I commend my friend and colleague, Representative COLLINS, for her continued commitment and leadership in this area.

In 1994 alone, 182,000 women will be diagnosed with breast cancer, and 48,000 women will die of this dreaded disease. The epidemic proportions of this disease affects not only women and their families but also costs this Nation over $56 billion in medical costs. It is the most common cancer among women in the United States and its incidence is on the rise.

National Breast Cancer Month can bring about changes in the way women receive health care in this country by increasing the public awareness of this dread disease, and by encouraging the practice of early detection techniques such as self-examination and mammography.

As a breast cancer survivor, I personally know of the value of early detection and the need to spread awareness of this disease. Until a cure for breast cancer is found, we must concentrate on prevention. Early detection does save lives.

Mrs. VUCANOVIĆ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with great pleasure to support Senate Joint Resolution 185 which designates October 1994 as National Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

During the last year, our Nation has seen a number of exciting changes in the area of breast cancer research. Promising developments in gene identification give hope to every mother who has had breast cancer. As a breast cancer survivor and a mother, grandmother, and great grandmother I pray for the day when there will be early identification and a cure for this dreaded disease.

Until that day, however, it is absolutely essential that women and men know the facts. Breast cancer can kill and early detection is the best means of survival. Women must perform a monthly basic self-examination, obtain a yearly breast examination by a health professional, and obtain a mammogram after the age of 40. Let October 1994 be a reminder to women and their families to use these tools to help prevent early death. Let it be a reminder to Congress that we have much more work to do in the fight against breast cancer.

Approximately 48,000 women are expected to die this year from this devastating disease and that is 46,000 too many. Congress must work together to make screening techniques more affordable and accessible to women.

Senate Joint Resolution 185 deserves your support and I know it will have mine. Knowledge is the key if we are to win the war against breast cancer.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 185 which designates October 1994 as "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month."

Mr. Speaker, I continually find the statistics on breast cancer, and the mortality rate from breast cancer highly distressing. An estimated 180,000 new cases of breast cancer among women were diagnosed in the United States during 1992. Approximately one of every nine women will develop breast cancer during her lifetime. Additionally, breast cancer occurs rarely in men. Moreover, breast cancer incidence rates have increased about 3 percent per year since 1980. Some of this increase is believed to be due to screening programs detecting tumors before they become clinically apparent.

In spite of these shocking statistics many women do not practice routine breast examination or utilize today's advanced mammography technology. I hope designating October as "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month" will reveal to all Americans the importance of prevention and early detection, because one in every five deaths from breast cancer could be avoided by early detection.

Educating the public on the warning signals of breast cancer is essential to combating this life-threatening disease. Breast changes that persist, such as a lump, thickening, swelling, dimpling, skin irritation, distortion, retraction, scaliness, pain, or tenderness of the nipple must be brought to the attention of a physician. Early detection and treatment can save lives.

Statistics show that women with early stages of breast cancer, when the disease is still localized, experience a 92-percent survival rate, while the survival rate for women with more advanced regional cancer is only 71 percent. Even more tragic is the fact that the survival rate for women with breast cancer which has advanced to more severe stages is only 18 percent.

Surely this is a disease for which an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. National Breast Cancer Awareness month can help get this message out and can actually save women's lives.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 185.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Senate Joint Resolution 185, which designates October as "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month." Greater recognition is necessary because we have no cure for breast cancer.

The medical profession can prolong lives, and if a woman survives breast cancer for 5 years, according to medical statistics, she is considered a survivor. Yet, one in eight women will be diagnosed with breast cancer in her lifetime. Breast cancer is expected to kill 46,000 women and affect another 182,000 women in 1994.

As cochair of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, I have worked diligently to the expansion of clinical research trials, to increase funding for basic and clinical research on breast cancer, and for women to have access to treatment and early detection services such as mammography. Through the efforts of the caucus and other breast cancer advocates, breast cancer research has increased. More of the National Cancer Institute's research funds are budgeted for breast cancer than any other type of cancer. And this has paid off. Just this month, there was an announcement of the discovery of a gene that causes breast cancer. Progress is being made.

But in fact, this discovery may only affect a small proportion of women, probably only 5 percent of all discovered breast cancers in women with a family history due to an inherited defective gene. What about all the other women? The mothers, sisters, and friends who are in the other 95 percent?

Mammography screening, coordinated with clinical breast examination and breast self-examination, is the most reliable tool for detection of breast cancer. Breast cancer treated at its earliest stages costs about $14,000 as contrasted with advanced stage treatment which costs more than $84,000, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, not to mention the potential for additional years of healthy living and the untold suffering and pain that could be avoided by taking simple preventive measures.

I urge my colleagues to support Senate Joint Resolution 185 which designates October "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month." Help spread the word that regular mammograms, self-examination, and examinations by health care providers increase the success of treatment and the survival rate. You will be saving lives.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 185

Whereas breast cancer will strike an estimated 182,000 women and 1,000 men in the United States in 1994; and

Whereas the risk of developing breast cancer increases as a woman grows older; and

Whereas breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death in women, and will kill an estimated 46,000 women and 300 men in 1994; and

Whereas the 5-year survival rate for localized breast cancer has risen from 78 percent in the 1940's to over 90 percent today; and

Whereas most breast cancers are detected by the woman herself; and

Whereas educating both the public and health care providers about the importance of early detection will result in reducing breast cancer mortality; and

Whereas appropriate use of screening mammography, in conjunction with clinical
Whereas data from controlled trials clearly demonstrate that deaths from breast cancer can result in the detection of many breast cancer cases; and
Whereas increased awareness about the importance of screening mammography will result in the procedure being regularly requested by the patient and recommended by the health care provider; and
Whereas it is projected that more women will use this life-saving test: as it becomes increasingly available and affordable: Now, therefore, be it:
Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 23, 1994 is designated as "Year of the Grandparent," and ask for its immediate consideration.
The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentle­woman from Virginia?
Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I would simply inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.
Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 198 which designates 1995 as the "Year of the Grandparent," and ask for its immediate consideration.
Mr. Speaker, in lieu of the ever-increasing breakdown of family values and lack of the parental presence, it is in the best interest of this Congress to promote and support the crucial role that grandparents play in our youth's develop­ment.
The steady increase in reported child abuse and neglect is one of the past decade's most troubling trends. More than 2.9 million children were reported abused or neglected in 1992.
Experts believe that increasing economic stress on families and crises caused by drugs and violence have fueled the rise in abuse and neglect.
Additionally, an increasing number of children are growing up in a home where both parents work. Children are spending more time in a day care setting, at an earlier age.
In many instances, grandparents have taken on the role of day care provider. Grandparents provide the nurturing support that grandparents need, as well as providing the support system for their own children.
Mr. Speaker, it is vital that we recognize the sacrificial and far-reaching impact that grandparents have made throughout our society.
Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to give grandparents the recognition they deserve, by declaring 1995 as the "Year of the Grandparent.
Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentle­woman from Virginia?
A World Population Awareness Week. Over 3,000 events around the world will be held in honor of this year's World Population Awareness Week, which will highlight the recent success of the United Nations Children's Fund and its population and development, otherwise known as the ICPD, held in Cairo, Egypt earlier this month.

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of traveling to Cairo to attend the ICPD as a congressional delegation and lend support to the Cairo World Population Awareness Week for focusing this year's events on prompt and meaningful follow-up to the conference. The Population Conference was one of the most critical meetings in world history. Delegates to this conference, representing over 160 countries, agreed, with very few exceptions, by unanimous consent to a program of action to slow population growth over the next 20 years. How well the world community implements that document will determine the quality of life for every person on earth well into the future.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the fine work of the U.S. delegation to the conference and our delegation's leaders. The U.S. delegation included representatives from the administration, Congress and a range of non-governmental organizations, garnered widespread praise for working toward genuine compromise and consensus. I would also like to acknowledge President Mubarak and the Egyptian people for hosting the conference and for their hospitality and warmth. Finally, I would like to thank the other governments, their leaders and non-governmental organizations from around the world who participated in the conference and helped make it a true success.

Approximately 5.5 billion people occupy the world today. As has been cited many times, if actions are not taken to slow the current rate of population growth, the world's population could reach 12.5 billion or more by the year 2050. Over 90 percent of this growth will take place in the developing world, where governments are already struggling to meet the basic needs of their people. If governments carry out the actions outlined in the Cairo document, global population will reach only 9.8 billion as opposed to 12.5 billion by the middle of the next century.

In mind, slowing this rate of growth is the most important challenge the world community faces and one where the United States must demonstrate international leadership. Rapid population growth is both the cause and result of economic growth, combined with widespread poverty and inadequate access to education. While the media focused almost entirely on the discord over abortion at the conference, the Cairo Conference was in fact characterized by an extraordinary degree of international agreement rivaled only by the Earth Summit held 22 years earlier. Given the sensitive nature of the issue, the degree of consensus at the Population Conference is unprecedented. Even the Vatican, which appeared determined to obstruct progress at the conference, in the end joined in consensus on general principles of the Cairo document, including the chapters on "Gender Equality" and the "Interrelationship between Population, Sustained Economic Growth, and Sustainable Development."

Mr. Speaker, the type of negotiation and agreement that prevailed both prior to and during the ICPD should serve as a model for dealing with other global issues that confront humanity and place demands on our shared planet. The majority of delegates, in partnership with non-governmental organizations, operated under the assumption that the interests of the human community cut across national and ideological boundaries. Only through this type of cooperation can we prepare for the future rather than letting the future overtake us.

It is imperative that the United States lead the world in implementing the program of action agreed to in Cairo. As a first step, it is very important that we declare the week of October 23d as World Population Awareness Week. I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 268.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] for comments on the World Population Awareness Week resolution.

The conference delegates overwhelmingly agreed, Mr. Speaker, that the inaccessibility of safe, affordable, and comprehensive reproductive health care and women's low status prevents millions of women from exercising the right to have control over their fertility. The International Planned Parenthood Foundation (IPPF) estimates that more than 500 million women lack access to safe and effective family planning. Even where these services are available, social, cultural and economic barriers may prevent them from using them.

In many parts of the world, women are denied education, secure livelihoods, and the full legal and social rights of citizenship, and as a result may depend on children as their only means of attaining status and security. Where many of the world's population are oriented to fertility, they not only have greater power to make decisions over their fertility, but they generally want to have fewer children in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, representatives from 180 countries reached a working framework including beliefs and political ideologies agreed in Cairo that enhancing educational, political, and economic opportunities for women is perhaps the surest way to curb further population growth. In many parts of the world, acknowledgment that gender equality is a laudable goal is absolutely radical. In this context, it is a near miracle that these 160 governments agreed to take concrete steps to eliminate legal and social barriers to gender equality within their borders.

While the media focused almost entirely on the discord over abortion at the conference, the Cairo Conference was in fact characterized by an extraordinary degree of international agreement rivaled only by the Earth Summit held 22 years earlier. Given the sensitive nature of the issue, the degree of consensus at the Population Conference is unprecedented. Even the Vatican, which appeared determined to obstruct progress at the conference, in the end joined in consensus on general principles of the Cairo document, including the chapters on "Gender Equality" and the "Interrelationship between Population, Sustained Economic Growth, and Sustainable Development."

Mr. Speaker, the type of negotiation and agreement that prevailed both prior to and during the ICPD should serve as a model for dealing with other global issues that confront humanity and place demands on our shared planet. The majority of delegates, in partnership with non-governmental organizations, operated under the assumption that the interests of the human community cut across national and ideological boundaries. Only through this type of cooperation can we prepare for the future rather than letting the future overtake us.

It is imperative that the United States lead the world in implementing the program of action agreed to in Cairo. As a first step, it is very important that we declare the week of October 23rd as World Population Awareness Week. I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 268.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] for comments on the World Population Awareness Week resolution.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the measure before us, Senate Joint Resolution 241, World Population Awareness Week. There is also the counterpart on the House side, H.J. Res. 268, that was introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELLENSON]. I think it is so important that we look at overpopulation and world population.

Overpopulation is an issue touching nearly every aspect of our lives, including unemployment, immigration, disease, hunger, and ecological degradation. The world's population is almost at the 5.6 billion mark and is expected to double by 2025. Ninety percent of this growth will occur in developing countries, those countries already hard-pressed to provide food, shelter, education, employment, and basic health and social services to their citizens. With 93 million people added to the planet last year, an increasing strain on environmental and economic resources is inevitable. These resources are consumed at greater rates.

The impact of human population growth, combined with widespread poverty, is evident in mounting signs of the world's crisis, particularly in tropical deforestation, extinction of arable land and watersheds, extinction of plant and animal species, global climate changes, waste management, and air and water pollution.

Earlier this year, the gentleman from California [Mr. BELLENSON] and I introduced the International Population Stabilization and Reproductive Health Act, and Senators BINGAMAN and SIMPSON introduced similar legislation in the Senate. This legislation will establish accessibility to family planning services and information as a principle objective of U.S. foreign policy. Of critical importance is the bill's emphasis on improving the health, social, and economic status of women as essential for any country's economic progress. It has been established that women who participate in the social, economic, and political affairs of their communities are more likely to exercise their choices about childbearing than those who do not. Indeed, it is important to note that the current rate of global population growth would decrease by 30 percent if women were able to have only the number of children they wanted.

Whether the Earth's population doubles or triples in the next century will be determined by actions we take during this decade. It is imperative that we improve access to family planning programs for all women who desire it.

Rapid population growth fuels tensions and instability, as hopelessness and desperation arise from rapid urbanization, lack of government services, unemployment, and declining public health standards. As early as 1980, the
National Security Council reported that "these factors add up to a growing potential for social unrest, political instability, mass migrations and international conflict."

Mr. Speaker, I finally just want to allow the time, because there has been a very successful International Conference on Population and Development that was held in Cairo. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] was there with me and the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the gentlemwoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON].

At that conference, we entered the conference with 92 percent of the plan of action already approved, so only 8 percent was considered in terms of possible changes. The conferences looked to the effect on the environment, migration, family responsibility, health care, and the education of women. Now it is up to us in Congress and in other bodies to move forward beyond the plan of action.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 135, which designates the week beginning October 23, 1994, as "World Population Awareness Week."

I commend my colleague, Congressman Beilen­son, for working so tirelessly to educate us on global population issues.

This is a vital international issue. This resolution seeks to educate Americans about overpopulation and the dramatic effects that global population will have on the world's future. Our world population today exceeds 5.7 billion, and increases at the rate of some 100 million per day.

Population growth is fast becoming one of the most critical issues impacting our society, and the world at this time. Population trends affect our lives in profound ways. Poverty and food supply, the international economy, the environment, and the health of children and women around the world are all influenced by population growth.

It is critical for us as policy-makers to understand population’s significant relationship to our global society.

This resolution comes at an appropriate time, as the United Nations has recently concluded its International Conference on Pop­ulation and Development. This Conference, which examined global population, child and maternal health, education of women and girls, development in Third World countries, and a host of other issues, brought worldwide attention to the issues related to rapid and unsustainable population growth.

Population and family planning are crucial matters for our environment, our economy, and our children's future. World Population Week serves as an important time for Americans to focus on these issues, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 135. I am honored to work with my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], to designate the week of October 23, 1994, as "World Population Awareness Week."

The purpose of this observance, which has already been approved by the Senate, is to increase understanding about overpopulation and the adverse effects that rapid global population growth will have on the world's future.

The rapid growth of the human population is the No. 1 problem facing our planet and, indeed, there is a general lack of awareness of how rapidly the world's population is growing and the fact that what we do this decade will significantly determine the kind of world we leave to future generations.

The world's population now exceeds 5.6 billion people, and it is growing by almost 100 million people every year. Every day every single day, there are 260,000 more people on the Earth than there were the day before. Day after day, inexorably, unendingly, relentlessly more than a quarter of a million people are added to the population: a quarter of a million more people to provide shelter, jobs, health care, and drinking water for, a quarter of a million more mouths to feed and children to educate.

Nearly 95 percent of this increase is occurring in developing countries, countries which cannot adequately take care of their existing populations, where there are already too few jobs, inadequate health care, inadequate amounts of food and, usually, very little, if any, individual freedom.

Population growth is the most humane, farsighted, and critical issue of our time.

A staggering total of 100 million people are added to the population every year, every day, inexorably, unendingly. The United Nations' high fertility populations indicate that even if the total fertility rate drops from the current world average of 3.2 children per woman to stabilize at 2.5 children per woman worldwide, the world's population could still grow to 12.5 billion by the year 2050. And, if effective action is not taken within this decade, as today's 1.6 billion children in the developing world under the age of 15 reach their child-bearing years, the Earth's population could nearly quadruple to over 19 billion people by the end of the next century.

This rapid growth underlies virtually every environmental, developmental, and national security problem facing the world today.

In much of the developing world, high birth rates, caused largely by the lack of access of women to basic reproductive health services and information, are contributing to intractable poverty, malnutrition, widespread unemployment, urban overcrowding, and the rapid spread of disease. Population growth is outstripping the capacity of many nations to make even modest gains in economic development, leading to political instability and neglecting other U.S. development efforts.

In the next 15 years, developing nations will need to create jobs for 700 million new workers, which is more than currently exist in all of the industrialized nations of the world combined.

Overpopulation, however, is not a problem for lesser developed countries only. In November 1993, the U.S. Census Bureau revised its domestic population estimates, projecting U.S. population to reach 392 million people by the year 2050, more than a 50 percent increase from the 1990 population. This is the equivalent of adding more than 38 cities the size of Los Angeles. But if current trends continue, Americans' population could double during the same time period; if this growth remains unchecked, it is easy to foresee a dramatically lower quality of life for our children.

Earlier this month, representatives of nearly 180 countries met in Cairo at the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) to forge a new international consensus on the importance of slowing population growth, and to reach a final agreement on a Program of Action that will help guide the pop¬ulation programs of the United Nations and national governments into the next century.

As a member of the U.S. delegation, I can report that the Cairo conference, was a remarkable success. In contrast to previous pop¬ulation conferences, and to the picture of con¬trovery portrayed by the media, there was an exceptional level of consensus among partici¬pating governments on such diverse issues as sustainable development, gender equity, re¬productive health, migration and funding re¬quirements.

The ICPD Plan of Action represents an his¬toric opportunity to adequately address the world's exponential population growth while placing an emphasis on individual choice and freedom. But to reap the benefits of this con¬ference, we are going to have to find a way to keep attention focused on the population problem. This is what we hope to achieve by passing this resolution.

This year, in recognition of World Population Awareness Week, events are being planned in every congressional district. Over 110 national and local organizations, including the National Wildlife Federation, the United Methodist Church, and the American Public Health Asso¬ciation, are involved in planning discussion groups, films, and other educational events to raise public awareness of this critical issue. In addition, many international organizations as diverse as the International Confederation of Midwives, the Catholic University of Lublin, Poland, and the Family Life Association of Swaziland are also observing the week.

Mr. Speaker, I believe World Population Awareness Week provides an important op¬portunity for Americans to learn more about the rapid growth of the world's population and its dire consequences for the environment, for the world's economies, for population and social stability, and for the well-being of people in this country and around the world. I am hopeful that as Americans learn more about this problem, they will recognize that slowing population growth is the most humane, farsighted, and economically effective effort this country and the international community can undertake to improve life on earth for generations to come.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I with¬draw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentle¬man from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolu¬tion, as follows:

S. J. Res. 135

Whereas the population of the world today exceeds 5.5 billion and increases at the rate of some 100 million per year;

Whereas more than 90 percent of world population growth occurs in the developing countries, those least able to provide even basic services for their citizens;

Whereas rapid population growth and over¬consumption are major deterrents to sus¬tainable development;

Resolved (S. J. Res. 135), that the Senate of the United States of America, while recognizing that United States nationals residing abroad should continue to serve as examples of American values and high standards of living in their countries of residence, respectfully urges the government of the United States to establish and implement an effectively coordinated international program aimed at reducing the world population to a level that can be supported by the total world environment and resources and that is consistent with improved quality of life and economic development.

It is hereby recommended that such a program be designed to:

1. Stimulate increased international awareness of the population-environment relationship.

2. Promote awareness of the role of reproductive health and reproductive choice in controlling population growth.

3. Support research and training programs in the fields of population, human resources, and the environment.

4. Promote improved environmental and population education in schools and adult education programs.

5. Encourage the development of decentralized family planning programs and contraceptive technology.

6. Foster international cooperation in areas where demographic, environmental, and economic factors contribute to population growth.

7. Encourage appropriate legislation by the United States Congress.

8. Encourage appropriate legislation by the state and local governments and communities.

It is hereby recommended that national and international governmental and non-governmental agencies cooperate in the implementation of the program established by this resolution.

Resolved (S. J. Res. 135), that the Senate of the United States of America, while recognizing that United States nationals residing abroad should continue to serve as examples of American values and high standards of living in their countries of residence, respectfully urges the government of the United States to establish and implement an effectively coordinated international program aimed at reducing the world population to a level that can be supported by the total world environment and resources and that is consistent with improved quality of life and economic development.

It is hereby recommended that such a program be designed to:

1. Stimulate increased international awareness of the population-environment relationship.

2. Promote awareness of the role of reproductive health and reproductive choice in controlling population growth.

3. Support research and training programs in the fields of population, human resources, and the environment.

4. Promote improved environmental and population education in schools and adult education programs.

5. Encourage the development of decentralized family planning programs and contraceptive technology.

6. Foster international cooperation in areas where demographic, environmental, and economic factors contribute to population growth.

7. Encourage appropriate legislation by the United States Congress.

8. Encourage appropriate legislation by the state and local governments and communities.

It is hereby recommended that national and international governmental and non-governmental agencies cooperate in the implementation of the program established by this resolution.
Whereas 40 countries with 40 percent of the population of the developing world are cur(cid:71)ing rapid population growth and are unable enough food for their inhabitants to meet average nutri-(cid:71)on requirements;

Whereas the global community has for more than 25 years recognized the basic right of individuals to voluntarily and responsibly determine the number and spacing of their children;

Whereas expanded accessibility to family planning has led to a world with 400 million fewer people than there might have been;

Whereas preparations are underway for the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) in Cairo, Egypt, focusing world attention on the integral linkage between population, sustained economic growth and sustainable development—more specifically, the importance of family planning in reducing the poverty of women, the effects of migration, the need for increased resources, and the devastation caused by AIDS:

WHEREAS: The United Nations has proclaimed January 16, 1992, as "Good Teen Day";

WHEREAS teenagers are the future of this great country; Now, therefore, be it--

Resolved by the Senate and House of Represent­atives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning October 23, 1992, is designated as "World Population Awareness Week," and the President is authorized and requested to declare a special week calling upon the people of the United States to observe such a week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BYRNE

Mrs. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. BYRNE: Page 2, line 3, strike "October 25, 1993" and insert "October 23, 1994"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment is agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MRS. BYRNE

Mrs. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the preamble.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. BYRNE to the Preamble: In the last whereas clause of the preamble—

(1) strike "preparations are underway for";

and

(2) strike "focusing" and insert "will focus".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Question is on the amendment to the preamble, to amende to the gentlemwoman from Virginia [Mrs. BYRNE].

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT TO THE TITLE OFFERED BY MRS. BYRNE

Mrs. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the title offered by Mrs. BYRNE: Amend the title so as to read: "Joint Resolution designating the week beginning October 23, 1994, as 'World Population Awareness Week'."

The amendment to the title was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

C 1600

NATIONAL GOOD TEEN DAY

Mrs. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 320) designating January 16, 1995, as "National Good Teen Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTIERREZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentlemwoman from Virginia?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 326, designating January 16, 1995, as "National Good Teen Day.

I introduced this bill earlier this year because I believe that a national day should be created to focus on the positive qualities in America's youth. For the past 2 years Presidents Clinton and Bush have signed this initiative into law, officially decreeing January 16, 1993, and January 16, 1994, as "National Good Teen Day." In fact, in his proclamation observing this important day, President Clinton remarked: "We are justifiably proud of American teens. They deserve our recognition and appreciation, and it is fitting to honor them."

Mr. Speaker, the concept of a "Good Teen Day" was created by Mr. Robert Viencek, an instructor of English at Salem (OH), High School in my congressional district. He selected January 16 as "Good Teen Day" because, in part, Abraham Lincoln, our 16th President, was quoted as saying, "When you look for the good in man, you'll always find it." Viencek also notes that the 16th of January is "... a special year in the lives of teenagers, as it is the age when many young people start to drive and start to work. It is also the middle date of the seven teen years—13 to 19.

Since 1992, the Salem City Schools, the city of Salem and the Ohio House of Representatives have all helped to expand Mr. Viencek's vision by declaring "Good Teen Day" on the local and state level. "National Good Teen" appropriately caps this steady progression.

Mr. Speaker, America's 24 million teenagers are the future of this great country and they deserve to be recognized. "National Good Teen Day" is a step in this direction.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemwoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 326

Whereas Salem City Schools in Salem, Ohio have proclaimed January 16, 1992, as "Good Teen Day";

Whereas both the United States Congress and the President of the United States have proclaimed January 16, 1992, and January 16, 1994, as "National Good Teen Day";

Whereas there are more than twenty-four million teenagers in the United States according to the 1990 census;

WHEREAS our Nation's teenager represent an important part of our society, and the many physical and emotional changes and character-building experiences which teenagers go through are an important concern;

WHEREAS it is easy to stereotype teenagers as either those who have problems or those who excel;

WHEREAS teenagers should not simply be recognized for their intelligence, abilities, skills and talents, but rather for the good which is inherent in all human beings;

WHEREAS teenagers are the future of this great country; Now, therefore, be it--

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That January 16, 1995, is designated "National Good Teen Day," and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such day by recognizing the teenagers of the United States and by participating in appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRISH-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mrs. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 401) designating the months of March 1995 and March 1996 as "Irish-American Heritage Month.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemwoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 401

WHEREAS the people of the United States have proclaimed January 16, 1995, and January 16, 1996, as "Good Teen Day";

WHEREAS the people of the United States have proclaimed January 16, 1995, and January 16, 1996, as "National Good Teen Day";

WHEREAS the people of the United States have proclaimed January 16, 1995, and January 16, 1996, as "Irish-American Heritage Month.

I am pleased that a majority of
my colleagues have joined me in sponsoring this important resolution. I would also like to thank Chairman CLAY for bringing this resolution to the floor.

On each consecutive year I have introduced this legislation in celebration of the over 40 million Americans of Irish descent. This resolution has particular significance because 1995 marks the 150th anniversary of the Great Hunger that devastated Ireland between 1845 and 1851. Within 5 years, the famine reduced a population of 8.1 million by almost half through death and mass-emigration of the Irish to the United States, Canada, and England.

These Irish immigrants of the mid-19th century and those who followed in later years dedicated themselves to helping build this Nation. According to the most recent census data, more than 44 million Americans are of Irish descent. I hope the Joint Resolution 401 is designed to celebrate the heritage of these Irish-Americans and complement the hundreds of parades and activities sponsored around the United States every March in honor of St. Patrick's Day.

Mr. Speaker, the idea for an Irish-American Heritage Month was first conceived by the late John W. O'Beirne, chairman of the American Foundation for Irish Heritage. The passage of this resolution will serve as a tribute to his hand work and dedication to increase the awareness of Irish-American heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to sponsor this resolution which remembers the millions of Irish who died or were forced to flee Ireland during the Great Potato Famine and pays tribute to their descendants in the United States who continue to contribute to all facets of American culture.

Again, I would like to thank my friend Mr. CLAY for bringing House Joint Resolution 401 to the floor today. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important resolution.

I am pleased and honored to join in support of this resolution to honor Irish-American heritage. I commend my colleagues from New York, Mr. MANTON, for his leadership and support for this resolution.

More than 40 million Americans trace their ancestral roots to Ireland, and are immensely proud of its rich heritage.

The contributions of Irish Americans and their heritage are an integral part of American history from the American Revolution through today.

It is little noted, but at one time our President, the Speaker of the House, and the Senate Majority Leader were all of Irish heritage. During the administration of John F. Kennedy, the Irish in America held the three highest elected offices in the land. In the modern era, former President Ronald Reagan proudly pointed to his Irish heritage and ancestral family links to Ballyporeen, County Tipperary, Ireland.

The Irish have given much to American politics, and also in the areas of sports, law enforcement, commerce, law, our armed services, the arts, and literature. The Irish have contributed to this great Nation's history and culture. A month honoring that heritage is a fitting tribute to the numerous significant contributions of those of Irish heritage in American society.

Yesterday, in Washington, we hosted Dick Spring, the Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of the Irish Republic. In addition, we are working to move OPIG legislation along in the Congress to facilitate the $60 million in loan guarantees to Ireland to help foster the current peace process, a process that presents the best chance in 25 years for peace in the North of Ireland.

This is an important and critical moment of America's relationship with Ireland. The Irish in America will play a crucial role in seeing that a lasting peace becomes a reality. I am gratified to report that Ireland is up front on America's agenda today.

I am pleased to rise in support of this important measure, and I urge my colleagues to join in support of this timely resolution.

Thank you.

Mr. PORTER, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

RESOLUTION
WHEREAS 150 years ago, the blight that struck Ireland's potato crop ("the single root that nourished the history of the world"); known as the Great Famine, caused 2,000,000 of Ireland's population to emigrate, mostly to America's shores;

WHEREAS 110 years ago, 25,000 Irish immigrants arrived in Boston;

WHEREAS by 1851, the end of the famine decade, 1,712 emigrant ships had sailed up the Narrows into New York harbor;

WHEREAS during the "Great Hunger" (1845-1861) more people left Ireland than had emigrated in the previous 200 years;

WHEREAS within a few years of their arrival in the United States, these Irish immigrants took jobs as laborers; built railroads, canals, and schools; dedicated themselves to help build this Nation, and this same legacy remains a part of today's American mainstream;

WHEREAS James Smith, George Taylor, Matthew Thornton, and Charles Thomson, 4 of the individuals who signed the Declaration of Independence were Irish born and 9 other signers were of Irish ancestry;

WHEREAS Irish-born James Hoban designed and supervised the building of the White House and its restoration after it was burned in 1814;

WHEREAS more than 200 Irish-Americans have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor;

WHEREAS 19 Presidents of the United States proudly claim Irish heritage, included among them, the first President, George Washington;

WHEREAS John W. O'Beirne, Founder of the American Foundation for Irish Heritage, first requested in 1900 that Congress designate March as "Irish-American Heritage Month"; and

WHEREAS the 44,000,000 Americans of Irish ancestry, like their forebearers, continue to enrich all aspects of life in the United States, in science, education, art, agriculture, business, industry, literature, music, athletics, military and governmental service; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the months of March 1896 and March 1896 are designated as "Irish-American Heritage Month".

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 389) to designate the second Sunday in October 1994 as 'National Children's Day.' The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. PORTER, Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, it seems that every time we turn on the television, every time we turn up the radio, every time we read a newspaper or magazine we see and hear yet another story about another young person lost to the endless and hopeless cycle of violence, poverty, drugs, and despair.

Yet we rarely take the time to focus on the American youth across our great Nation who are making strides, both large and small, toward improving their communities, crossing racial boundaries, beating back the plague of violence and dangerous behavior that sometimes threatens to overwhelm, and moving ahead toward knowledge, understanding, and achievement.

There are young people out there, children and teenagers, who are doing their part to create a safer and more successful future for themselves. They deserve our recognition and support. That is why this year, for the fifth consecutive year, I am introducing a bill to remember these children by celebrating them with National Children's Day 1994 on October 9, the second Sunday of October.

National Children's Day is a time to honor America's young people, celebrate their many triumphs, listen to their hopes and concerns, and reflect for a moment on the world they are living in and the world we are leaving them.

By establishing a National Children's Day, we will set aside 1 day a year, in the tradition of Mother's Day and Father's Day, on which we can honor our children. During this day all children will be held up for recognition because of their contributions to their family and their community and because we, as a nation, recognize that they are our greatest natural resource. Americans everywhere can take this day to spend time with their children. Those who don't have children of their own can go to a park or take a bike ride with a neighbor's kid, or a nephew or niece.

This is also a day for communities and cities and States to recognize the accomplishments of young people and their positive contributions to their families and communities.
of children. It is a time for us to take a closer look at how children are growing up in America. I have learned of a tale of hope—evidence of the genuine good being achieved right now by our youth—that I want to share.

A young girl from San Antonio, TX was a gang member by age 13 and rose to leadership in the gang. But constant violence and destruction drove her from being a gang leader to becoming a leader in her community, advocating peace and working actively through the gang peace summits to help people across the country understand urban hardships and the hope to overcome them. And she is not alone among American youth who are trying to protect their future.

The ultimate goal of National Children’s Day is to encourage celebratory activities in every community across the country. State and municipal governments, school groups, youth groups and national organizations like the Child Welfare League of America, the National Parent-Teacher Association, the 4-H clubs, and boys and girls clubs are planning and participating in events to celebrate this day. We commemorate National Children’s Day in the hope that every city and town will find its own way to honor its young people.

America’s youth look to us for leadership and strength, look to us for welcoming, look to us for support. To turn away from America’s children, to give up hope on America’s future. Please show your support by voting to continue our celebration with National Children’s Day.

In conclusion, let’s do our part to show our support for those who look to us for help. Let’s support the role of parents in the rearing of our own children, and other children in need. It is the responsibility of all Americans, thus everyone should celebrate the children of the United States, whose questions, laughter, and tears are important to the existence of the United States.

I am so proud to be a member of this committee by age 13 and rose to leadership in the gang. But constant violence and destruction drove her from being a gang leader to becoming a leader in her community, advocating peace and working actively through the gang peace summits to help people across the country understand urban hardships and the hope to overcome them. And she is not alone among American youth who are trying to protect their future.

 Whereas adults in the United States should...
Mr. Speaker, the Penny Lovers of America is a not-for-profit organization that promotes character, scholarship, and patriotism among America's youth by collecting penny donations to finance their educational pursuits. To celebrate their 10th anniversary they are conducting a penny recycling campaign.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution would mark the occasion. It designates the week of October 16, 1994, as "National Penny Charity Week." It urges Americans to empty their jars, dresser drawers, and piggy banks, and to give their pennies to their favorite charities, especially to direct service charities, to help the needy and the poor in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the gentleman from Missouri, BILL CLAY, and the gentleman from Indiana, JOHN MYERS, the chairman and ranking member, respectively, of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, are cosponsors with me on this resolution. Together, we have 200 other Members of the House. I commend the resolution to all Members.

Mr. Speaker, the individual penny, it is true, cannot buy much any more. However, combined with others, millions of others, it can do a lot of good for a lot of people. Mr. Speaker, I would urge all Americans to participate in this campaign, give their pennies to charities during the week of October 18 to October 22. It will mean a great deal to all of us in this country.

[1610]

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I commend the gentlewoman from Maryland for her great leadership on both the issue of breast cancer and certainly on population development. She is entitled to her excellent statement on both of those resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTIERREZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 415

Whereas Penny Lover's of America is a not-for-profit charitable organization that seeks to promote character, scholarship, and patriotism among America's youth by collecting penny donations to finance their educational pursuits;

Whereas Penny Lover's of America is celebrating its 10th anniversary this year by conducting a penny recycling campaign;

Whereas "National Penny Charity Week" coincides with Penny Lover's of America's "National Penny Campaign Recycling Project" both of which will assist in alleviating the penny shortage and raise funds for charitable and community causes; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of October 18, 1994, as "National Penny Charity Week" and to call on the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, including the donation of pennies to charities, particularly to those which provide direct services to the Nation's underprivileged and disadvantaged population, and to worthy community causes.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the several joint resolutions just considered and passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1994

Mrs. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mrs. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1994, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING MR. NELSON MANDELA, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Mrs. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Thursday, October 6, 1994, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting Mr. Nelson Mandela, President of the Republic of South Africa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF THE HONORABLE STENY H. HOYER TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH OCTOBER 3, 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, D.C.
September 30, 1994

I hereby designate the Honorable Steny H. Hoyer to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through October 3, 1994.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the designation is agreed to.

There was no objection.

DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY CONCERNING NONPROLIFERATION CONTROLS AND RESTRICTING PARTICIPATION IN WEAPONS PROLIFERATION ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 103-319)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)) and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1621), I hereby report to the Congress that I have exercised my statutory authority to declare a national emergency and to issue an Executive order, which directs the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules, regulations,
and amendments thereto, and to em­ploy such powers granted to the Presi­dent by, the International Emergency Econo­mies Act, as may be neces­sary to continue to regulate the ac­tivities of United States persons in order to prevent their participation in activities, which could contribute to the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, and the means of their delivery.

These actions are necessary in view of the danger posed to the national se­curity, foreign policy, and economy of the United States by the continued proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, and of the means of delivering such weapons, and in view of the need for more effective controls on activities sustaining such prolif­eration. In the absence of these actions, the participation of United States per­sons in activities contrary to U.S. non­proliferation objectives and policies, and which may not be adequately con­trolled, could take place without effect­ive control, posing an unusual and ex­traordinary threat to the national se­curity, foreign policy, and economy of the United States.

The countries and regions affected by this action would include those cur­rently identified in Supplements to Part 778 of Title 15 of the Code of Fed­eral Regulations, concerning non­proliferation controls, as well as such other countries as may be of concern from time to time due to their involve­ment in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or due to the risk of their being points of diversion to prolif­eration activities.

It is my intention to review the ap­propriateness of proposing legislation to provide standing authority for these controls, and thereafter to terminate the Executive order.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

CONTINUATION OF EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO HAITI—MES­SAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-280)
The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:
Section 202(d) of the National Emer­gencies Act (30 U.S.C. 1822(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a na­tional emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Reg­ister and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniver­sary date. In accordance with this pro­vision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Haitian emergency is to continue in effect beyond October 4, 1994, to the Federal Register for publi­cation.

Resolution of the crisis between the United States and Haiti is in sight as a result of the September 18 agreement reached in Port-au-Prince by the dele­gation led by former President Carter. Pursuant to that agreement I have an­nounced that all unilateral United States sanctions against Haiti will be sus­pended, with the exception of the block­ing of the assets of any persons subject to the blocking provisions of Executive Orders Nos. 12775, 12779, 12663, 12872, or 12914 and Haitian citi­zens who are members of the imme­diate family of any such person as identified by the Secretary of the Treasury.

At the same time, the United Nations Security Council, with our support, has decided that the sanctions established in Resolutions 811 and 917 should re­main in force, consistent with the pro­visions of Executive Orders 12775, 12779, and 12914, and the military leaders in Haiti relinquish power and President Aristide returns to Haiti. That may well not occur be­fore October 4, 1994. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to re­tain the authority to apply economic sanctions to ensure the restoration and security of the democratically elected Government of Haiti.

While certain Security Council sanc­tion remain in force and in order to enable the multinational forces to carry out their mission and to promote the betterment of the Haitian people in the interim, the military leaders in Haiti relinquish power and President Aristide returns to Haiti.

I have directed that steps be taken in accordance with Resolutions 917 and 940 to permit supplies and ser­vices to flow to Haiti to restore health care, water and electrical services, to provide construction materials for hu­manitarian programs, and to allow the shipment of communications, agricul­tural, and educational materials. This will allow the Haitian people to begin the process of reconciliation and re­building without delay.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu­nication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Trans­portation, which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION.
HEN. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Wash­ington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provi­sions of the Public Buildings Act of 1938, I am transmitting herewith the resolutions (originals plus one copy) approved today by the Committee on Public Works and Trans­portation.

Sincerely yours,
NORMAN Y. MINETA,
Chairman.

There was no objection.
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SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker announced policy of February 11, 1994, June 10, 1994, and under a previous order of the House, the following Mem­bers will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

INCREASING CONCERN WITH STRUCTURED NOTES IN BANK­ING INDUSTRY

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, at the time I was elected chairman of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs on the first occasion, which was January 1989, I came to the well and promised to keep the Members of the House in awe and to call questions, then agitating the minds not only of the Congress but of the whole country, and I did, and subsequent to that I have attempted to.

Today I rise in pursuance of that commitment in order to initiate what I hope to terminate next week, if we do adjourn a week from Friday sine die, in order to render an accounting in one of the most effective and yet very sub­stantial issues that have been con­fronted by the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Today I want to report letters I have written first to the Honorable Alan Greenspan, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. The reason for that is because I have expressed grave concern for several years, but particularly dur­ing the last 2 years, at the amount of risk involving our insured depository institutions such as commercial banks, credit unions, and savings and loans, and also putting at risk, tremendous risk to the taxpayer in the ongoing what is in our opinion and in simple words nothing less than gambling and high-risk ventures in high volume and in such global terms that it defeats ability to explain fully in any program such as this.

But in my letter to Chairman Green­s­pan I said I have become increasingly concerned about the use of structured notes. There is always a very, very great knock on the part of these enter­prising risk-takers to coin words, cre­ate terminology, a jargon. Structured notes is a fancy word for another form
of what today is agitating and causing great concern and great loss to such things as political entities, Charles County in Maryland, a junior college in Texas, a county in Minnesota, and others where they have placed tax funds and revenue funds in the hands of these gamblers and have lost everything and find it difficult to meet the obligations of their political dependencies. This so-called structured note is just one form in which I fear the commercial banks and the savings and loans and others are exposing to great risk.

So I continue and say I believe that the price volatility and the illiquidity of the many types of these derivatives, because that is what they are, call them structured notes or whatever, but they are so-called derivative, and I have called this global tremendous thing that denies even explanation and even my colleagues on the Banking Committee do not grasp the volume. I have become increasingly concerned about the performance of the insurance industry as I am speaking here right now today, what they use as terminology, "a nanosecond," which means the speed of light, you may have not billions but trillions of dollars being transferred electronically, megabytes. But what kind of money is that? It totals now even, according to the Wall Street Journal, this unbelievable $38 trillion, and it is gambling. It is not in order to carry on the world's commerce, or purchase of goods, manufacture of goods or trade. It is gambling on such things as currency rate fluctuations, the value of the dollar, which incidentally ought to be our biggest concern because it is approaching a dangerous point where it could be debauched.

What we have today compared to the baseline year of 1970 is a 10-cent dollar. This is why our constituents cannot explain why their dollars that they find it hard to earn nowadays cannot buy as much as they used to, and as I have constantly reminded the big panjandrum that govern these big things as the Federal Reserve, the big commercial bankers, groceries are costing more, utilities cost more, rent costs more. Where is inflation controlled?

In this gambling, which I am attracting the interest and I hope the attention of the leading regulators, beginning with the Federal Reserve Board, I am hopeful they will do something, at least something about it.

Mr. Speaker, I inclu...
This should include the steps you are taking to mitigate the risks they pose.

want to ensure that banks which purchase structured notes are capable of managing the risks they pose.

To assist the Committee, please provide an overview of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency's OCC experience in regulating bank transactions in structured notes. This should include factors around here to ensure that structured notes transactions are consistent with safe and sound banking practices. I also request that you provide the Committee with information on the number of OCC-regulated banks that have incurred losses caused by structured notes, as well as the amount of the loss at each institution.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation and attention to this request.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Chairman.

WE CANNOT ESCAPE HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and June 10, 1994, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 50 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

TRIBUTE TO OFFICER FLOYD HENSLEY ON HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, some important business about one of our excellent staffers around here in the uniformed side. One of our great Capitol Hill police officers, Floyd Hensley, is retiring after 25 years of service. He always seemed to pull the tougher shift in my memory, always at the majority or Speaker's side door, coming in here early in the morning, very early in the morning he was often heard to say, "Is it 3 o'clock yet?"

That was his break time. And some of the good folks around here would say, "Floyd, it is 3 o'clock." Now he can go play golf during his well-deserved retirement.

After 25½ loyal and hard-working years I hope Floyd finds a second career where he wants to go. I hope he may break his own golf score every time until he hits that magical score of 18 eagles, 18 on the score card. Nobody has ever done that.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday three of us shared three 5-minute special orders on Haiti. If I had to pick a title for my remarks this afternoon, and this is the end of our next-to-last week, next week is the last, I believe if we are in on Saturday it will be a 50-50 chance that we will be picked up, probably will be out about the time the roosters are crowing on the 8th. I think there is a good chance we will be out on the 7th, particularly if we do not debate the GATT bill, which I do not think we should because it appears to be on too fast a track. The Senate is definitely not going to take it up, so they are going to come back in a lame duck session when there may be many defeated Members from that chamber, and there is state of high dudgeon, and a state of what the Germans call angst, the Republicans will be picking their leadership for the new session in the Senate for, if there is mercy, a new rotating leadership. It is all up to the voters on November 8. But I believe that that lame duck session for the 95th Congress is as much chance of conducting any business as a snowball in hell. Therefore, what is the point of our taking hours and hours of contentious debate on a very important trade treaty, series of treaties, very consistent with the trade policy outlined by the President, not going to do anything, and it is going to have to be done all over again with a Congress composed of a totally different makeup, men and women from all of our 50 States.

So I would hope we would not do GATT. If we do not, we are out here on Friday, 1 week from today, or this evening.

If I had to put a title on my remarks this evening, Mr. Speaker, I would quote Aristide, he says, "We cannot escape history," and the current events of every day of our lives are creating history to be studied by young men and women in the future, and not just the young men and women of this country, but educated people all over the world.

This day, September 30, has brought about terrible rioting and looting in Haiti. It was supposed to be a day of parades and celebration, because it was 3 years ago today that a self-excommunicated and prior to that suspended by the Salesians of Don Bosco, priest was deposed, and only days before in a very ugly speech given in French, describing burning people to death in the slow manner as chic that is both the same obviously in French or in English, chic, and then French words for pretty, wonderful, he admired the smell of burning flesh.

Within minutes, within the hour, one of the presidential candidates from a major election, the John-Bertrand Aristide, was arrested, Mr. Silvio, or in Haiti they say Monsieur SilvioClaude; he was captured by a crowd as Aristide had suggested be done to Aristide's enemies. He was almost beaten to death, then lynched, and then when they found the gasoline they were looking for, they attempted to burn him alive. Instead they burned his corpse. Every human rights group worthy of the name in Haiti or in the Caribbean says that Aristide was responsible for that death.

In my Catholic training there were three things required for a mortal sin capable of destroying your soul for eternity unless you were sorry. It was a grievous matter to bring about the death, let alone the torture death, of a fellow citizen, a fellow human being, a fellow politician, a candidate you defeated it certainly a grievous matter, and the other two theologians talk about for centuries, sufficient reflection and full consent of the will.
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An ordained Catholic priest under the order of Melchizedek, certainly in every case that I know of, at least in this country and this hemisphere, is a college graduate, and Mr. Aristide is a man of many letters, and that would indicate sufficient reflection and full consent of the will of this ordained Catholic priest. That is just one among many, I use the word "sins," of Jean-Bertrand Aristide, such as inciting a mob to burn down the papal nuncio's house, the Pope's representative in the majority catholic nation of Haiti.

Last month I said, and I have said this on the floor twice, he fingered for noo vengeance every bloody shot fired in Haiti because every bishop in Haiti signed a letter, intellectually written, responding to the U.N. mandate to invade Haiti, the only mandate that Clinton looked for. He did not care about the elected Representatives of this Chamber or the United States Senate. But when the United Nations said, "Go for it, Bill Clinton," the bishops in Haiti said, "Do not invade our country. Violence is not the answer to resolve the thorn in our side." And Aristide said, "These men, the bishops, are as equally criminal as the men who overthrew me in the illegal coup," September 30, 1991, 3 years ago this very day.

I do not want to lose any of my electronic audience on C-SPAN, Mr. Speaker, but I just came from a television set looking at a film scene of rioting and looting in Port-au-Prince with no American troops in sight. I think that may be merciful, because the vengeance could have gone either way.

The cameramen reached the zenith of reportorial courage. One cameraman was filming another cameraman being beaten, because a man about to be beaten to death was hiding behind him, and they were clubbing him over and over again with the big, heavy camera. The cameraman is the easiest target to blindside in the world in any situation, because that big, heavy camera is on his shoulder, looking through that lens, counting on one's presence, of a sudden blood splatters on the lens of the CNN camera shooting. I have never seen that in my life. Then the blood begins to drool down the left side of your television screen. It is a dimensional problem. It is when you see water on a lens, it is right in your face up close, and you are seeing the action through the draining blood, and you see a man being dragged with a knife held right at his throat. He is obviously very submissive with the dagger at his throat, then you see more beating and pouding, and then it says what you see being locked is a cash and carry store, no cash, plenty of carrying, and it was a sad sight, and I will leave this Chamber, go right to the CNN news and see again, as I do every day, have any American men or women
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been asked by President Clinton to trade their young lives for this worse than flawed excuse for a deposed presid-

Because I believe he brought it on himself. And I make no case for the thugs that overthrew him or the Tons-

Mons Macoutes, so-called attitude style of torture and abuse that the God-loved dirt-poor people of Haiti have

Today is a tough day in history. Lin-

coln was right, we cannot escape it. Today in 1938, and did an hour special order on the 50th anniversary back in

in Cholame,

never asked by President Clinton to walk the halls of the United States Congress. I am a veteran of that struggle.

today? Our No. 2 man at the State Department said he had a chant, "Hey, hey, LBJ, how many babies did you kill today?" Our No. 2 man at the State Department said he was not proud of it.

But now he is the man who is the principal architect of this "tar pit" disaster that we are in in Haiti. Mr. Talbott is now in an absolute nose-to-

nose shootout with Danie Caputo, who quit as one of our highest American representatives at the United Nations

Because the dialogue that went on in the spring and summer between him and representatives of the Clinton

of the Palau Islands, particularly the battle of the island of Peleliu, at an end. It was not so. The military was

not trying to deceive, but they meant it to some degree. We controlled the island. But for 88 days our young Marines and one of our

Army infantry divisions continued fighting in among all of these jagged volcanic rocks of Mount Umurgrobol, as many deaths as Ivo Jima, but a

name lost in the pages of history.

\[1640\]

The French units were having some success, small French units; 117 days after Normandy. And the beautiful

French port city of Calais finally sur-

rendered to Canadian divisions 117 days after Normandy. That battle was still continuing all along the French coast.

And deep within, for the first time

American and German tanks met in even numbers, and we prevailed with the inferior but reliable Sherman tank.

In a battle of the French forest that I visited once, if you went there today you would have no idea that 50 years ago today a terrible tank battle with

great loss of life on both sides was fought. It was bloody, the right to capture the land, after we had been expelled from capturing it once from the

German tank forces in the Gremliexy forest.

If anybody wonders, Mr. Speaker, why I sometimes spell these tough words, it saves the reporters from chas-

ing me down afterward because they like to get it right too.

So this is one of these days in his-

tory. As we stand here, sit here, record here, listen here on September 30, to the rioting going on in Port-au-Prince, putting our men and women in danger from all sides and recall what we brought out on this floor last night, the fellow who rode in on the so-called multinational force and they are all safely in one of the headquarters buildings in Port-au-Prince.

Here is what the Washington Times

wrote as an editorial on the No. 2 man at the State Department. Strobe Talbott, the man who let Clinton sleep on the floor of his digs in Oxford, Eng-

land. Mr. Talbott, writing in Time magazine, April 6, 1992, which is in to-

day, "Strobe Talbott," all morning long yesterday. He did not show up and sent no underlying or rep-

resentative. Just nobody from the State Department.

John Deutch, No. 2 at Defense, doing a good job, and General Sheehan, the military planner for Haiti, also doing a
good job, were both there although General Sheehan, 3-star Marine gen-

eral, shocked my socks off when he told me that he had never heard that the father of a Medal of Honor winner

killed in Mogadishu 1 year ago this coming Monday, the father of Randall Shugart, had never heard that the fa-

ther of Sergeant Shugart refused to shake Clinton's hand in the White House posthumous Medal of Honor

White House, particularly Mr. Talbott. I will tell you, the hottest desired item on talk shows right now is—the most sought-after guest, is Mr. Dante

Caputo. And he is going to be the most sought-after person on this hill for a

rush to have some hearings next week to see who is the fool liar, to find out the truth, whether it is Strobe Talbott or Dante Caputo.

Here is what the editorial in the Washington Times says:

Say what, Mr. Talbott?

And it goes on,

As Senate and House committees debate and vote on Haiti doing after the fact what the Democratic leadership made sure they
could not do before United States troops landed on Haitian shores, the question of how we got there in the first place remains of enduring interest.

The next day, because of the toughness of Chris Smith's questioning, Mr. Talbott stiffed those of us on the Com-

mittee on Armed Services who had every bit as much interest in Haiti, because the Foreign Affairs Committee has jurisdiction over the general for-

eign policy of this country and they also have concern for our fighting men and women. But the Armed Services Committee has additional committee

responsibility in addition to our con-
itutional oath that a whole new Con-
gress will take in this Chamber on the first Monday of January, and that is the welfare of our young people in a hot combat, riots, or civil war situa-

tion. And he stiffed us.

I stared at the sign "Strobe Talbott,"

all morning long yesterday. He did not show up and sent no underlying or rep-

resentative. Just nobody from the

State Department.

First atomic-powered submarine, the Nautilus, was commissioned at Groton, CT; Babe Ruth hit his 60th homer, breaking his own record today; Jimmy

Dean dead in a sports car only at age 34 in Cholame, CA; a young black, African-American student James Meredith succeeded on his fourth try get-
tting to and torture for almost three-quarters of a century, ending fi-

nally when the Berlin Wall came down on my son's birthday, November 9, 1989.

Today, this very day, 1777, this Con-
gress was fleeing. We then met up in Philadelphia. British offensive military pressure caused the Congress to with-

draw. We do not even think about this chamber today. Chamber today. Everybody running for their horse, try-
ing to reach their wives and families, and communication no different than it had been for tens of thousands of years, and the Congress was withdrawn to York.

And then communism prevails on one side of that world conflict and contin-

ues to kill and torture for almost three-quarters of a century, ending fi-
nally when the Berlin Wall came down on my son's birthday, November 9, 1989.

Today, this very day, 1777, this Con-
gress was fleeing. We then met up in Philadelphia. British offensive military pressure caused the Congress to with-

draw. We do not even think about this chamber today. Chamber today. Everybody running for their horse, try-
ing to reach their wives and families, and communication no different than it had been for tens of thousands of years, and the Congress was withdrawn to York.

First atomic-powered submarine, the Nautilus, was commissioned at Groton, CT; Babe Ruth hit his 60th homer, breaking his own record today; Jimmy

Dean dead in a sports car only at age 34 in Cholame, CA; a young black, African-American student James Meredith succeeded on his fourth try get-
tting into the University of Mississippi.

And then World War II. Mr. Speaker, I have said many times on this floor that I am stunned that we have gone through all of 1942, 1943, 1944, the 50th anniver-
saries; of all of those years, not a word by anybody, not a word by anybody except the gentleman from Missis-
issippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], a reserve National Guard general, not a word about the catalysmic battles in the Paciﬁc.

Today, 1944; September 30, the military in the Pacific declared the Battle

of the Palau Islands, particularly the battle of the island of Peleliu, at an end. It was not so. The military was

not trying to deceive, but they meant it to some degree. We controlled the island. But for 88 days our young Marines and one of our Army infantry divisions continued fighting in among all of these jagged volcanic rocks of Mount Umurgrobol, as many deaths as Ivo Jima, but a name lost in the pages of history.

\[1640\]

The French units were having some success, small French units; 117 days after Normandy. And the beautiful French port city of Calais finally sur-

rendered to Canadian divisions 117 days after Normandy. That battle was still continuing all along the French coast.

And deep within, for the first time

American and German tanks met in even numbers, and we prevailed with the inferior but reliable Sherman tank.

In a battle of the French forest that I visited once, if you went there today you would have no idea that 50 years ago today a terrible tank battle with

great loss of life on both sides was fought. It was bloody, the right to capture the land, after we had been expelled from capturing it once from the

German tank forces in the Gremliexy forest.

If anybody wonders, Mr. Speaker, why I sometimes spell these tough words, it saves the reporters from chas-

ing me down afterward because they

like to get it right too.

So this is one of these days in his-
tory. As we stand here, sit here, record here, listen here on September 30, to the rioting going on in Port-au-Prince, putting our men and women in danger from all sides and recall what we brought out on this floor last night, the fellow who rode in on the so-called multinational force and they are all safely in one of the headquarters buildings in Port-au-Prince.

Here is what the Washington Times

wrote as an editorial on the No. 2 man at the State Department. Strobe Talbott, the man who let Clinton sleep on the floor of his digs in Oxford, Eng-

land. Mr. Talbott, writing in Time magazine, April 6, 1992, which is in to-

day, "Strobe Talbott," all morning long yesterday. He did not show up and sent no underlying or rep-

resentative. Just nobody from the

State Department.

John Deutch, No. 2 at Defense, doing a good job, and General Sheehan, the military planner for Haiti, also doing a
good job, were both there although General Sheehan, 3-star Marine gen-

eral, shocked my socks off when he told me that he had never heard that the father of a Medal of Honor winner

killed in Mogadishu 1 year ago this coming Monday, the father of Randall Shugart, had never heard that the fa-

ther of Sergeant Shugart refused to shake Clinton's hand in the White House posthumous Medal of Honor

NAUTILUS.
awarding ceremony. I cannot believe that our media has not heard that story after the national radio coverage it received and at least was printed in newsletters and the Washington Times, thanks to columnist, Recard Grennier, who has seen it on the front page of a British paper, which is where I saw it when I went over for the 50th anniversary of the D-day invasion.

The editorial continues:

Mr. Caputo is wrong in Mr. Smith's quotes were based on a series of memos and minutes of May meetings at the United Nations involving U.N. Haiti representatives, Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, and Canadian officials. The existence of the memos was first reported in the Washington Times in June, and their substance relates to conversations between Caputo, who withdrew from his post in protest as American troops landed in Haiti.

So he has only been out there in the private sector for a few days, and Mr. Talbott hisself.

That is who the conversation was between.

What about these memos, Mr. Smith asked. On May 12 foreign minister of Canada opened a meeting with U.N. Rep­ resentatives in Ottawa concerning the United States' position such as laid out by Senator, Dante Caputo, since the time is short and the situation today cannot last beyond July.

The building political pressure domes­tically.

Dante Caputo emphasized that Haiti represents a test case for which the United States has to find a solution before November. Mr. Caputo had at that time spent over 2 weeks with American and Canadian offi­ cials, sounding out their views. According to Mr. Talbott, he never mentioned the word November to Mr. Caputo or anyone else.

This is Mr. Talbott at the foreign Af­ fairs meeting Tuesday.

I never discussed with Mr. Caputo or for that matter, anybody else I was dealing with during that period. November in any context, notably, including in any context hav­ ing to do with our own domestic politics. But Mr. Caputo, in his own confidential memo dated May 29 to Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, put it this way: "The Americans see in this type of action a chance to show strength after the strong media criticism of the admin­ istration's decision, the President's decision, the building political pressure capabili­ ty and firmness of leadership in international political matters; believed armed intervention to be politically desir­ able," officials think that 'the current position of public opinion to an armed inva­ sion will change radically once it has taken place.' What is more, the Washington Times observes, the public was concerned because he perceived that Americans were quickly foreclosing diplomatic options so that this politically desirable invasion could take place.

Footnote: This is why former Presi­ dent Jimmy Carter said our foreign poli­ cy was a disgrace, and he moved in without really being asked and in secret, himself into this position with former chief of staff of all of our milit­ ary, Colin Powell, and the distin­ guished Senator Sam Nunn, to save American lives. There were no foreign nationals involved in the invasion at night of U.S.S. 824 Airborne, our Rang­ ers, and on Special Forces were pre­ pared to bail out in the night sky over Haiti.

Now—whether or not anyone used the word "November"—it is evident that Mr. Talbott and other State Depart­ ment officials were concerned about Mr. Clinton's credibility and popu­ larity and that somehow this was related to the November midterm elec­ tions. How could that have happened? Whether or not Mr. Talbott made the connection, his purely political con­ cerns were perfectly clear to a number of people, and in any event it is hard to imagine that a conspiracy of Canadian and U.N. diplomats have made this story up. So, Mr. Speaker, there are going to be an awful lot of people try­ ing to pin down Mr. Talbott. He is going to be avoiding Capitol Hill like the bubonic plague that is breaking out in India. He will make every effort to get this House adjourned.

He is telling everybody in the White House, as a senior FOB, friend of Bill, "Don't bring up GATT, get them out of town, and then the administration will rule the roost.

And this happens with all adminis­ trations. When this Chamber and the other Chamber of a hundred breaks up into 530 separate people going home to their States or their congressional dis­ tricts to seek election, the executive branch, the White House rules, and they will have all of October while the rest of us are campaigning and Mr. Clinton is not, all of November, all of December, with or without a ridiculous lame duck session, and gen­ erally, if there is a tidal sea change around here, they will have most of January and February, if the Democrat Party wins in this February, they will be set up in Haiti, and I hope that every Amer­ ican is as concerned as I am about the death toll mounting and that we will, as I said, pray for a miracle, and I guess this happens occasionally in dan­ gerous situations. The State of South Carolina pounded the Union fort on April 12, 1861, to begin the Civil War, pounded it from this big, beautiful, massive forth with hundreds of can­ nonses in it, into a pile of rubble, all night and all morning, and not a single Union Soldier died. Miracles can hap­ pen in combat.

I had a gentleman write me this week, just reach his letter at about 2 a.m. last night. Charles O'Connor, June 19, finally made it to me. Sorry, Mr. O'Connor. He was one of the survi­ vors of one of the greatest naval ships ever to sail, the U.S.S. Franklin, CV-13 in World War II, that during this time, in that Second World War crusade, this ship lovingly called Big Ben took mas­ sive damage, the worst damage any of our carriers took that did not sink, and the combat zone to limp back into the Brooklyn Navy Yard, and I remember it to this day, all those pic­ tures, some of them taken through the televised wreckage of where the Japa­ nese bombs and flaming airplanes had crashed on its deck in one horrible in­ cident of combat on that carrier, the U.S.S. Franklin, 913, as Charlie O'Con­ nor puts it, very young men died. He belongs to a group called The 704 Club: the survivors, I guess they reduced that number each year as some of these heroes go to their eternal reward. He said:

"Please mention that we have had our 50th reunion in September. We have not forgotten."

And I do not want to embarrass Char­ lie, who had retired, had a great 40­ year career with Westinghouse. He send me the calendar of the reunion year, and I, in the back, noticed there were two Medal of Honor winners, and one of them was a hero of my family, and I remember meeting him, Father Joseph T. O'Callahan, a Jesuit who won the Medal in World War II, the Franklin with explosions all around him, moving from boy to boy, giving them last rites, most of them burnt to death or dying, and many Americans remember this famous picture where Father O'Callahan is in a combat hel­ met, a Navy all-weather jacket, and he puts his hands together reverently, like an altar boy, after he blessed each dying sailor and officer, and then raises his eyes to heaven; I remember that picture vividly from the closing months of the war. Lieutenant Donald A. Gary and Father O'Callahan saved dozens of men, and fortunately both of these Medal of Honor winner survived the war. I have no idea if they are alive now, but they have gone to heaven. Donald Gary, and Joseph O'Callahan—tonight I will get out my Medal of Honor book and read every detail of how they won the Medal of Honor.

Now Back to those two Medal of Honor winners in Mogadishu on Octo­ ber 3 last year:

In that 2-page essay, and I have never seen a 2-page essay in Time, except on the fall of Communism, glorifying Gorbachev; in that 2-page essay by Strobe Talbott, and it is in today's RECORD. Anybody can send for it through their Congressman. Give me a break! Write your own Congressman. It is in the RECORD of September 29. Strobe Talbott says that he got out of serving in Vietnam with a—how did he put it—a trick knee, and he said that it did not keep him off the squash courts or the playing fields of Oxford. That is his exact words, and, oh, how he, free from serving, listened to the anguish of Clinton and Frank Aller, who later committed suicide. He committed suicid­ e, Frank Aller, in the White House, Government per­ doned him, and let him go, and said, "We don't need you anyway." Then he
committed suicide because his family had never accepted that he let other young men go in his place.

But Strobe Talbott says that 2-page essay in April 1992 admitted he was a friend of Clinton’s for 23 years and then wove a clever, devious story, hoping to put away, with absolute provable misrepresentations, a candidate who was 43 years old and a triple draft evasion, draft avoidance, of Bill Clinton. This is the man who is now accused of lying by a man who resents in anger from his U.N. post, the man he is inviting Mr. Caputo—we have got calls out to him now—to come here to a luncheon meeting or Republican committee meeting next week to get to the truth of this.

Now, remember Charlie O’Connor, one of the proud survivors of that day 50 years ago when over 900 young Americans died in an incident as the Franklin lifted out of the water with massive explosions; he said that he watched 14 people in both those groups die in the Chamber. Mr. Speaker, talks about listening to Rush Limbaugh, says, “What is the liberal bunch in Washington doing to our great country,” and then he says three words that I had said to my staff last week when I saw the cover of Time or Newsweek magazine with a 14-year-old boy murdered execution style by the gang members who recruited them into their gang and ordered them to murder an 11-year-old girl. An 11-year-old child, her murderer executed at 14. I turned to my staff, and I said, “Are we doomed?”

And then I read these words a week later in Charlie O’Connor’s letter. Congressman, can we reverse the direction in which we are headed? I believe that we have a very poor President, a man unworthy of holding such high office, a man who will in a sense put them in the position of a front running candidate. I was running third, Mr. Speaker, I have to be honest. A front running candidate in an open primary election for a district as unique as the 27th is certainly a humbling experience. As with most candidates who have a recognition factor in their favor, I have that advantage because of the selfless assistance of countless people in the causes we have championed.

My origination of the POW bracelet, proudly worn at its zenith by 5 million Americans, and my worldwide travels, even to Communist countries with countries enemies and missing in action servicemen, these efforts were made possible by the patriotic generosity of others funding the trips. The opportunity to lecture and debate for over 16 years across our country, to produce my own television shows for host issue-oriented radio programs, and to produce my own television shows for over 6 years in Los Angeles, all this was made possible by others. But I have worked extremely hard over the years to justify the faith that people have put in me through their support.

I must also acknowledge with loving gratitude the spiritual and patriotic inheritance entrusted to me by my recently deceased mother and father, two of the greatest Americans I will ever know.

I will win the 27th Congressional District primary on June 6, and carry my lead on to victory in the general election on November 2.

There were 14 people in both those primaries.

Because the voters of both parties in my district are hungry for a Congressman to represent them who is an outspoken fighter.

Mr. Speaker, that word “outspoken” is twice in here, and it is used against me all the time. I guess I kept my promise over 19 years, didn’t I?

An outspoken fighter. A Congressman who will in a sense put them in Washington with a strong voice that can really make a difference, someone who is clear thinking and straightforward. When elected, I will articulate the concerns of those I represent with forcefulness and clarity.

One deep concern that will anger and frustrate all citizens in America is the lack of morality in government, which
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naturally results in an absence of leadership. Voters have been betrayed for years by political corruption, waste, absenteeism, laziness, arrogant self-indulgent pay raises.

We were making $42,000 then. Now it is $133,600, augmented by constantly expanding fringe benefits. As an outspoken opponent of immorality in all facets of modern life, I will continue to hit hard and often at every attempt to abuse the taxpayers. I will call for a six-term limit for all U.S. Congressmen, and two terms for U.S. Senators. Three additional areas of concern stand out when talking with citizens in my 27th Congressional District. I have found during visits to 42 States in the last 2 years—I was traveling, speaking for a group against child pornography—in the last 2 years, that these same three issues are paramount with the voters nationwide. And then I split the three issues into four.

Americans are devastated by the twin plagues of unemployment and inflation—that is the one thing we have cured in this letter, inflation—that works to destroy our fantastic free enterprise system. Reckless government spending, a la New York City creates the vicious hidden tax of inflation, an economic cancer that eats away at the paychecks of all Americans. Government now absorbs 44 percent of our personal income.

We left 50 behind a long time ago, Mr. Speaker.

Next, most Americans insist upon a strong national defense shield.

This is 7 years before SDI or strategic defense. We pray for lasting peace with our adversaries, but détenté must be a two-way street. Détente must not become the epitaph scrawled across the coffin of liberty. Her torch of freedom now burns in only 2 dozen or so countries, and that threatened light will quickly be extinguished in each and every remaining democracy if the United States does not, to quote from our preamble, provide for the common defense of our adversaries, referring to our adversaries' strength, both strategic and conventional.

A fourth issue, of particular interest, is that Americans are outraged at the growth of all crime. Nineteen years ago, organized crime, street crime, white collar crime, and the mislabeled so-called victimless crimes, referring to prostitution, and narcotics. The preamble to our great Constitution speaks of establishing justice, ensuring domestic tranquility. We Americans had better start thinking of justice for the victims of crime.

As for domestic tranquility, what a deepening disgrace to have foreign totalitarian regimes, hated by their own people, able to point with scorn at our soaring rates of murder, rape, assault, and drug addiction and then sneer about the decline of decadent western culture.

Are we an example of freedom or gutless passivity? One year from now, when I take the oath of office as a U.S. Congressman, you have to enter these campaigns with a lot of confidence, the people of the 27th district will have a choice to make. I have a conscience, I have a sense of commitment and a determination second to none.

Today we are defending in an increasingly dangerous world the most delicate and fragile of societies, a Republic. For all of its flaws, the Nation of which we are citizens, is a wonderful country with a truly remarkable history. What a magnificent challenge to defend her and to improve her. We should welcome that challenge with a renewed spirit of '76, now in 1976. Yes, we should ask for God's blessings on our beautiful land, but we should also roll up our sleeves and try to correct the mammade social problems that torment us.

I will start by campaigning vigorously and positively and treating my opponents with respect for their desire to serve. I want to come back to that, Mr. Speaker.

Together, let us lean on our apathetic fellow voters and ask that they inform themselves on the issues, participate in the process, and then use that enlightenment to exercise one of the greatest rights in a free society, the right to choose leaders through the ballot. See you out there in the precincts and at the polls on June 8 and November 2 of our bicentennial year, 1976.

Mr. Speaker, my young opponent—I never laid eyes on him. Younger than all five of my kids who, as I said, were teenagers then, four of the five are now married and they have made me and Sally proud grandparents nine times.

A My opponent says that he is determined to make my character the issue in this campaign. He proceeded to tell the press that he was going to run the dirtiest campaign I had ever seen. If I said in 1960 any Republican said that, we would be properly crucified. I wish they applied the same standard to some challengers in your party.

This young person, who I would not know if I fell over him, has taken money from photographers. I forced him to give it back. He wants to cut off the home mortgage interest deduction on our IRS 1040 forms. He wants to put a 50 cent gasoline tax on every gallon of gas you and I buy, Mr. Speaker, for the rest of our lives, because we are still paying excise tax on our phones. That was put in to rebuild the USS Franklin in World War II, to fight the good fight against Nazism and fascism. And we still have excise tax on our phones. I have never seen a State gasoline tax rolled back. When you put 10 gallons in a tank or if you fill it up with gas, that is regressive every tank of gas for the rest of your life.

But what I resent is this boast that he is going to make it a dirty campaign. Let me make this perfectly clear. What I wrote in the margin 19 years ago. Get something clear for the LA Times here. I will start by campaigning vigorously and positively and treating my opponents with respect for their desire to serve.

One of the great mythologies built around ROBERT KENNETH DORNAN by the liberal press, Mr. Speaker, is that I fight too tough in campaigns. I gave my young multimillionaire opponent 17 debates in that first campaign. We were both challengers. It was an open seat. No big deal. He stayed clean until 3 weeks out. He got so dirty 3 weeks out. I sued him for millions of dollars. Millions is just for the lawyers. That is all show. But guess what, Mr. Speaker? I am the only Member of this Chamber in all of history, 218 years, no U.S. Senator has ever done this. I refused to drop the suit after I won big. I said I would win with 54.5 percent. I won with 54.7. Pretty good campaigning. I wrote it on a blackboard, morning of the election.

He gave me a $35,000 cashier's check, tax free, legal damages, of $35,000. Thomas Jefferson sued somebody, never got a nickel. Bill Buckley sued Gore Vidal, got a dollar and court costs.

Nobody in history has ever sued an opponent and got money. He might have beat me in court. We know what we are supposed to be subjected to out there in the free marketplace. But his father was a good man, owned Familion Pipe and Supply, and he wanted this thing done because it was hurting his father's reputation because the son got dirty in the last few minutes. He was not a bad fellow at that. Had these two Dino Ferraris up on blocks to run for Congress.

Then came Gregory Peck's son, LA Times to this day cheats and lies on my 1978 campaign. Young Peck, Gregory Peck's son, took 13 sequentially numbered money orders on children's books. And the son got dirty in the last few minutes. He was not a bad fellow at that. Had these two Dino Ferraris up on blocks to run for Congress.

This young person, who I would not know if I fell over him, has taken money from photographers. I forced him to give it back. He wants to cut off the home mortgage interest deduction on our IRS 1040 forms. He wants to put a 50 cent gasoline tax on every gallon of gas you and I buy, Mr. Speaker, for the rest of our lives, because we are still paying excise tax on our phones. That was put in to rebuild the USS Franklin in World War II, to fight the good fight against Nazism and fascism. And we still have excise tax on our phones. I have never seen a State gasoline tax rolled back. When you put 10 gallons in a tank or if you fill it up with gas, that is regressive every tank of gas for the rest of your life.

Mr. Speaker, my young opponent—I never laid eyes on him. Younger than all five of my kids who, as I said, were teenagers then, four of the five are now married and they have made me and Sally proud grandparents nine times.

A My opponent says that he is determined to make my character the issue in this campaign. He proceeded to tell the press that he was going to run the dirtiest campaign I had ever seen. If I said in 1960 any Republican said that, we would be properly crucified. I wish they applied the same standard to some challengers in your party.

This young person, who I would not know if I fell over him, has taken money from photographers. I forced him to give it back. He wants to cut off the home mortgage interest deduction on our IRS 1040 forms. He wants to put a 50 cent gasoline tax on every gallon of gas you and I buy, Mr. Speaker, for the rest of our lives, because we are still paying excise tax on our phones. That was put in to rebuild the USS Franklin in World War II, to fight the good fight against Nazism and fascism. And we still have excise tax on our phones. I have never seen a State gasoline tax rolled back. When you put 10 gallons in a tank or if you fill it up with gas, that is regressive every tank of gas for the rest of your life.

But what I resent is this boast that he is going to make it a dirty campaign. Let me make this perfectly clear. What I wrote in the margin 19 years ago. Get something clear for the LA Times here. I will start by campaigning vigorously and positively and treating my opponents with respect for their desire to serve.

One of the great mythologies built around ROBERT KENNETH DORNAN by the liberal press, Mr. Speaker, is that I fight too tough in campaigns. I gave my young multimillionaire opponent 17 debates in that first campaign. We were both challengers. It was an open seat. No big deal. He stayed clean until 3 weeks out. He got so dirty 3 weeks out. I sued him for millions of dollars. Millions is just for the lawyers. That is all show. But guess what, Mr. Speaker? I am the only Member of this Chamber in all of history, 218 years, no U.S. Senator has ever done this. I refused to drop the suit after I won big. I said I would win with 54.5 percent. I won with 54.7. Pretty good campaigning. I wrote it on a blackboard, morning of the election.

He gave me a $35,000 cashier's check, tax free, legal damages, of $35,000. Thomas Jefferson sued somebody, never got a nickel. Bill Buckley sued Gore Vidal, got a dollar and court costs.

Nobody in history has ever sued an opponent and got money. He might have beat me in court. We know what we are supposed to be subjected to out there in the free marketplace. But his father was a good man, owned Familion Pipe and Supply, and he wanted this thing done because it was hurting his father's reputation because the son got dirty in the last few minutes. He was not a bad fellow at that. Had these two Dino Ferraris up on blocks to run for Congress.

Then came Gregory Peck's son, LA Times to this day cheats and lies on my 1978 campaign. Young Peck, Gregory Peck's son, took 13 sequentially numbered money orders on children's books. And the son got dirty in the last few minutes. He was not a bad fellow at that. Had these two Dino Ferraris up on blocks to run for Congress.

This young person, who I would not know if I fell over him, has taken money from photographers. I forced him to give it back. He wants to cut off the home mortgage interest deduction on our IRS 1040 forms. He wants to put a 50 cent gasoline tax on every gallon of gas you and I buy, Mr. Speaker, for the rest of our lives, because we are still paying excise tax on our phones. That was put in to rebuild the USS Franklin in World War II, to fight the good fight against Nazism and fascism. And we still have excise tax on our phones. I have never seen a State gasoline tax rolled back. When you put 10 gallons in a tank or if you fill it up with gas, that is regressive every tank of gas for the rest of your life.

But what I resent is this boast that he is going to make it a dirty campaign. Let me make this perfectly clear. What I wrote in the margin 19 years ago. Get something clear for the LA Times here. I will start by campaigning vigorously and positively and treating my opponents with respect for their desire to serve.
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speakers after he beat me fair and square. I ran against Tom Bradley. He said it was the cleanest campaign he had ever had. I have run against Sam Yorty in the primary. He made me his number one speaker after he beat me. Ran the college trustees board, predicted I would get 44 percent and got it. I was just in training for the race I won 1976 race. Today I am still friends with Gwen Moore, who is still in the California assembly, who beat me. That Familion and that Peck race were rotten, and they started it. I did number one speaker after he beat me. It was tough with the facts. When somebody is dirty and they are being hit with facts, they always call it dirty campaigning. I am the only Congress­man here, Mr. Speaker, who represents two totally different seats, the 27th, 38th, and now I am in the 46th.

In my 1984 race, a newspaper did something I have never heard of before or since. They mistakenly, I think honestly, printed the incumbent Congress­man's votes during these 8 years that I served here with him from the Santa Monica district. They printed our votes together and they gave me all of his votes and, worse than that, gave him all of my votes, on abortion, on busing, on all these key issues.

Mr. Speaker, I could not believe my eyes. They said, "We will correct it." They buried the correction on B-12, the second section. I told him he would reprint it as a last-minute mailer. They said never would anybody do so outrageously a foul deed. The sitting 10-year Congressman did just that, created a mailer giving all of my votes to him and attributing all of his liberal votes to me. It nailed him. I won 33 to 42, and he won 62 just a few years before, in 1982.

Then my 1986 race, Tony Coelho comes out to my district. Years before he left here in disgrace. He questioned my military record, when I had been on my military record, when I had been on

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate of the bill (H.R. 4649) "An Act mak­ing appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said Dis­trict for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 6, 12, 18, 20, 21, and 23, to the above entitled bill.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis­lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORRAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. WELDON, for 5 minutes, today and thereafter.

Mr. EHLERS, for 5 minutes each day, on October 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes each day, on October 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Mr. DORRAN, for 5 minutes each day, on October 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FINGERHUT, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PETRI and to include therein extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $2,167.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORRAN) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. MANO.

Mr. REED.

Mr. FARR of California.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

Mr. BENSON in two instances.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

Mr. MELNEY.

Mr. STARK.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. HMENT.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. SWETT.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORRAN) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. ORTON.

Mr. BONILLA.

Mr. HOYER.

Ms. FURSE.

Mr. KLEIN.

Mr. MENDENDE.
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ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DORRAN, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order the House adjourned until Monday, October 3, 1994, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:


3888. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting the Secretary's determination and memorandum of justification for assistance to support the U.N. Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3889. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Amending the Location of a Thomas Paine Memorial"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MINETA: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 3884. A bill to provide for the establishment of mandatory State-operated comprehensive one-call systems to protect natural gas and hazardous liquid pipelines and all other underground facilities from being damaged by any excavations, and for other purposes; with amend (Rept. 99-765, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MINETA: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 3874. A bill to provide for conveyance of certain lands and improvements in Hopewell Township, PA, to a nonprofit organization known as the "Beaver County Corporation for Economic Development" to provide a site for economic development; with an amendment (Rept. 103-768). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CLAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 2970. A bill to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-769). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MINETA: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 4460. A bill to provide for conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-770). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

SPECIAL COURTESY

Mr. CLAY: The Committee on Public Works and Transportation has before it the biennial report of the United States Postal Service. This report is available at the Committee on Public Works and Transportation Web site.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order the House adjourned until Monday, October 3, 1994, at 10:30 a.m.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXIV, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 5139. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of voluntary programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5140. A bill to provide for improved procedures for the enforcement of child support obligations of members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. STEBBINS, Mr. SHARP, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. COLE, Mr. FURHMAN, Mr. GRANADA, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BRAYANT, Mr. MANTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KREIDER, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FitKOSKI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KLECKA, Mrs. MALONY, Mr. MEEKAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OKANOWICZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PELLOSI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ):

H.R. 5141. A bill to reauthorize the Ryan White Care Act of 1990, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey:

H.R. 5142. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to establish a condition on the provision of assistance under export enhancement programs for the export of durum wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERREUTER:

H.R. 5143. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to provide for disclosures by consumer reporting agencies to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for counterintelligence purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARD JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. STEINDLHOF, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. TOM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SARPALIS, Mr. ARNEY, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. FROST, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BRENNER, Mr. PETE PRUETT, Mr. CONODIT, Mr. BLILLY, Mr. HENDER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DUCAY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DUNN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTCHISON, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. RODGERS of California, Mr. SPUDE, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. HUFFINGTON):

H.R. 5144. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that no species may be determined to be an endangered species or threatened species, and no critical habitat may be designated, until that act is reauthorized; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. FAWWAZ, Mr. BOHNER, Mr. ROEKKSTA, and Mr. MCEKON):
H.R. 5145. A bill to amend section 1977A of the Revised Statutes of the United States to repeal the authority to award punitive damages under the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and the居室 Rights Act of 1964 and the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, for the purposes of egalitarian damages between the contractor and the private sector under these laws; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Education and Labor.

H.R. 5146. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, to the Committee on the Judiciary and Labor.

H.R. 5147. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to lower the maximum Federal medical assistance percentage that may be applied with respect to any State under the Medicaid Program and to increase such percentage with respect to all States under such program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. INSEL: H.R. 5148. A bill to authorize certain elements of the Yakima River Basin Water Enlargement Project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KLEIN: H.R. 5149. A bill to amend the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 to enhance the flow of credit to low- and moderate-income housing in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods; to the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Housing Affairs.

By Mr. LEHMAN: H.R. 5150. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act concerning the eligibility of irrigators and employers of State, county, and municipal governments to serve as members of State boards that issue permits for discharges into the navigable waters; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

APPENDIX:

H.R. 5151. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an exemption from the overtime provisions for professional employees of contractors or subcontractors of the Resolution Trust Corporation who are paid on a hourly basis; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5152. A bill to require States to report certain information to the Federal Bureau of Investigation concerning the convictions for financial crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STARK: H.R. 5153. A bill to amend title VI of the Social Security Act to provide for an open enrollment period under part B of the Medicare Program for individuals formerly covered as retirees under group health plans of local educational agencies; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MINGE: H.R. 5154. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to temporarily suspend operation of the adjustment in the provision of extended price support loans for corn under the farmer owned reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HASTERT: (for himself and Mr. HALL of Ohio): H.R. 5155. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to temporarily suspend operation of the adjustment in the provision of extended price support loans for corn under the farmer owned reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5156. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, to prohibit employers from discharging, dismissing, or retaliating against employees to the extent that such employees request reasonable accommodations for disabilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5157. Mr. OWENS. H.R. 5158. Mr. CARR. H.R. 5159. Mr. NADLER. H.R. 5160. Mr. BROWN. H.R. 4758. Mr. ZIMMER and Mr. WELDON. H.R. 4799. Mrs. MINK of Hawaii and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 4839. Mr. SCHUMER and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 4936. Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. BOYD of Georgia.

H.R. 4938. Mr. FROST.

H.R. 4939. Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 5155. Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. STARK, and Mr. KLEIN.

H.R. 5002. Mr. SAPARLUS, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. KAPTURE, Mr. NEAL of Florida, Mr. KING, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. ORTON, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HOKTON, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. LIVSTDN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 5008. Mr. FROST.

H.R. 5009. Mr. VENTO, Mr. MANTON, Mr. LEVY, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. EVANS.

H.J. Res. 385: Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. GEPHARDT, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.J. Res. 398: Mr. VISCOLSKY, Mr. WISE, and Mr. ZURIFF.

H.J. Res. 401: Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. PETE GEEREN of Texas, Mr. HOYER, Ms. MOLINARI, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TUCKER, and Mr. WATT.

H.R. 5003: Ms. LOWEY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. BLILEY.

H.J. Res. 405: Mr. BAKIR of California, Mr. BEKELTON, Ms. DANTUM, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. TALENT, Mr. WHEEL, Mr. GUNDERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. FROST, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Ms. PICKLE, and Mr. CONRAD.

H.J. Res. 411: Mr. COBLE, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. McDADE, Ms. DUNN, Mr. DISTRICH, Mr. HICKS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SWETT, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. KING, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. SISKIN, Mr. CONROY, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. YARMOUTH, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Ms. PETERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BAUMGARTNER, Ms. CAPPETTI, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ALSOP, Mr. MILLER of Texas, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. BURTON, Mr. VEDNTY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WEITZEN, Mr. TARR, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. ANNETTI, Mr. BAUMGARTNER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SUNDBERG, Mr. CAMP, Mr. GILL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. HOFFMAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. TURLEY, Mr. TURLEY, Mr. WEBSTER, Mr. FISHER, Mr. WELDON, Mr. BROWN.

H.R. 162. Mr. COYNE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. COPPER, Mr. HORBREUCKER, Mr. MINGE, Ms. LONG, Mr. LIPSKI, Mr. REUBA, Mr. COPPERMITH, Mr. SMITH, Mr. YATES, and Mr. INHOFE.

H. Con. Res. 303. Concurrent resolution concerning commencement of all-party talks to seek a peaceful resolution to the conflict in Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. MISTICK, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. WASHINGTON): H.R. 557. Resolution commending the Police Athletic League; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 404. Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2438. Ms. WYDEN.

H.R. 2420: Mr. MONTGOMERY and Mr. NOLLER.

H.R. 2305. Mr. KYL.

H.R. 1420. Mr. MONTGOMERY and Mr. MOLLER.

H.R. 2327: Mr. Rangel.

H.R. 3039: Ms. DUNN and Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 3765: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 3862: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 4040: Mr. THOMPSON and Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona.

H.R. 4056: Mr. SKEEN and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 4142: Mr. TORKILDSEN and Mr. Kim.

H.R. 4394: Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 4514: Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.R. 4517: Mr. OWENS.
The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 3 by Mr. McCollum on House Joint Resolution 38: Christopher Shays.

Petition 15 by Mr. ELLIKAIS on House Resolution 382: Major R. Owens.

Petition 18 by Mr. HASTERT on House Resolution 402: Peter G. Torkildsen and James H. (Jim) Quillen.

Petition 23 by Mr. TAUZIN on H.R. 3975: Martin Frost.