

except insofar as the Board may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section." Section 204(a)(3) provides that nothing in this section shall preclude the Capitol Police from using lie detector tests in accordance with regulations issued under section 204(c) of the CAA.

The Capitol Police is the primary law enforcement agency of the legislative branch. The proposed regulations would provide the Capitol Police with specific authorization to use lie detector tests. The limitations on the exclusion of the proposed regulation are derived from the Secretary of Labor's regulation implementing the exclusion for public sector employers under Section 7(a) of the EPPA (29 C.F.R. §801.10(d)), which limits the exclusion to the entity's own employees.

The Board issues concurrently with this proposed regulation a separate Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking which invites comment regarding a number of other regulatory issues, including what regulations, if any, the Board should issue to implement the remainder of Section 204.

Proposed Regulation—Exclusion for employees of the Capitol Police

None of the limitations on the use of lie detector tests by employing offices set forth in Section 204 of the CAA apply to the Capitol Police. This exclusion from the limitations of Section 204 of the CAA applies only with respect to Capitol Police employees. Except as otherwise provided by law or these regulations, this exclusion does not extend to contractors or nongovernmental agents of the Capitol Police, nor does it extend to the Capitol Police with respect to employees of a private employer or an otherwise covered employing office with which the Capitol Police has a contractual or other business relationship.

Recommended Method of Approval

The Board recommends that this regulation be approved by concurrent resolution in light of the nature of the work performed by the Capitol Police and the fact that neither the House of Representatives nor the Senate has exclusive responsibility for the Capitol Police.

Signed at Washington, D.C., on this 27th day of September 1995.

GLEN D. NAGER,
Chair of the Board,
Office of Compliance.

RATIFICATION OF THE CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I offer my congratulations to the conveners and participants of the Fourth World Conference on Women, held in Beijing this September, and the parallel NGO Forum on Women for promoting the human rights of women around the world. I would especially commend the members of the U.S. delegation to the Women's Conference, particularly First Lady Hillary Clinton and Ambassador Madeleine Albright, as well as the many others who contributed to its success.

The goal of this conference was to promote the advancement of women by identifying and overcoming the obstacles still facing women. In many parts of the world today, discrimination

against women results in forced abortions, in the trafficking or forced prostitution of young girls, and in the denial of nutrition or health care, even to the point of infanticide. Women are also the primary victims of domestic violence or rape, and rape is increasingly being used as a tool of war in conflicts such as Bosnia, Cambodia, Liberia, Peru, Somalia, and Rwanda.

In many parts of the world, women are denied education, job training, or employment opportunities. Today, 64 percent of the world's illiterate and 70 percent of the world's population that lives in absolute poverty are women. Even when employed, women frequently face pay discrimination in the workplace. In too many countries, women are excluded from participating in policy-making or prevented by law from voting in elections.

Mr. President, the Women's Conference addressed all of these issues and called upon governments to commit to specific actions that would advance the status of women. The United States delegation made commitments that continue the long-standing tradition of U.S. leadership in the fight for equality for women and men. American commitments include: the creation of a White House Council on Women to coordinate the implementation of the Platform for Action within the U.S.; a new Justice Department initiative to fight domestic violence; increased resources for improving women's health; improved access for women to financial credit; and continued support for the human rights of all people.

Mr. President, I commend the Clinton administration for its continued efforts to promote the status of women at home and abroad. This year marks a historic point in the fight for women's equality. 1995 is the 75th anniversary of women's suffrage in the United States. It is also the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations, whose Charter recognizes the equal rights of women and men. And of course, the success of this year's Fourth World Conference on Women has set a new agenda for the advancement of women. In this spirit, Mr. President, I believe it is time for the United States Senate to give its advice and consent to the ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

The Women's Convention is the most comprehensive and detailed international agreement that promotes the equality of women and men. The Convention legally defines discrimination against women for the first time and establishes rights for women in areas not previously covered by international law. Today, 147 countries have ratified the Convention. The United States is the only industrialized democracy in the world that has failed to ratify the Convention.

Under my chairmanship, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held three hearings on this important convention. On September 29, 1994, with

my whole-hearted support, the Committee voted 13 to 5 to report favorably the Convention with a resolution of ratification to the Senate for its advice and consent. Despite support for ratification from many Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, from the Clinton administration, and from the American public, opponents of ratification succeeded in blocking the Convention from reaching a vote in the Senate last year.

Mr. President, I believe the U.S. ratification of this Convention is important to demonstrate American commitment to eliminating all forms of discrimination against women both at home and abroad. Equally important, the United States should ratify the Convention in order to underscore the importance we assign to international efforts to promote and protect human rights. By failing to ratify the Women's Convention, the United States has rightfully encouraged criticism from allies who cannot understand our refusal to uphold rights that are already found within the provisions of our great Constitution. The United States cannot criticize other countries' violations of women's rights if we have not recognized those rights as international legal standards. The Women's Convention is an important human rights document that is consistent with the existing laws of the United States. Senate advice and consent to this Convention will demonstrate U.S. leadership in the fight for women's equality.

Finally, Mr. President, as we consider the appropriations bill for the State Department budget, I would emphasize the difficulties that funding cuts will produce in the work to promote human rights. Without adequate funding, the U.S. will be unable to continue to play a leadership role in the international effort to promote women's equality. The ability of the State Department to monitor human rights abuses, to participate in the work of the U.N. Human Rights Commission, to support NGOs in their human rights work, and to gather information on human rights violations would be severely threatened. Clearly, it is in the best interests of the United States to promote human rights and democracy in every country. Let us not lose our leadership role in the protection of human rights.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the extraordinary impact of the National Endowment for the Humanities on my home state of Rhode Island. Rhode Island has long had a special relationship with the Endowments—ever since the President of Brown University, my old friend Barnaby Keeney, formed a Commission to investigate the possibility of a national support for study in the humanities.

The Commission returned with a forceful recommendation for the creation of such a program and in 1965 we created the National Endowment for the Humanities. Since that time, the Humanities Endowment has supported scholarly research, education and public programs concerned with history, literature, philosophy, language and other humanistic disciplines, and have helped to make the United States a leader in these fields of study. Programs have included both popular and scholarly works characterized by their singular excellence, including the Pulitzer Prize winning *Slavery and Human Progress* and programs such as "The Civil War," "Columbus and the Age of Discovery" and "Baseball."

Barnaby Keeney, a decorated veteran and a medieval historian, left Brown University to become the first chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities. Since then, Brown University has been in the forefront of research and study in humanities, recognized for its extraordinary excellence with repeated fellowships and grants for humanities research over the last thirty years. Rhode Island and the Nation as a whole have benefited enormously from this work. Mr. President, I would ask unanimous consent that two pieces by Edward Abrahams, director of government and community relations at Brown University—an op-ed article on the importance of the humanities that appeared recently in the *Providence Journal* and remarks delivered on Humanities Day—be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Providence Journal-Bulletin, Mar. 17, 1995]

LYNDON JOHNSON, BROWN AND THE BIRTH OF THE NEH

By Edward Abrahams

'A great nation (and a great civilization) feeds upon the depth of its scholarship—as well as the breath of its educational opportunity.' So said President Lyndon Johnson at Brown University in 1964.

Today, in sharp contrast, the new Republican majority in Congress has targeted, among many other legislative accomplishments of Johnson's Great Society, the National Endowment for the Humanities. While President Clinton's budget would increase expenditures for the endowment by 3 percent, to \$183 million, House Republicans, led by Newt Gingrich, say they intend to kill both NEH and its more controversial partner, the National Endowment for the Arts.

Because NEH has not been reauthorized for the past two years, most analysts concur that the effort to eliminate it could succeed. House Republicans have said that they do not intend to fund any programs that remain unauthorized. In fact, NEH will claim victory if it survives in its current configuration with a smaller budget. Indicative of things perhaps to come is the current drive to rescind \$5 million from this year's budgets for both endowments.

Last year, the NEH spent about \$150 million to help support research, education and cultural life in America, including \$2.3 million in Rhode Island. Among the larger projects funded by the endowment at Brown

in their joint effort to provide public service through education and research, for example, were a summer seminar for college teachers on *Piers Plowman* and *The Canterbury Tales*, a summer course for high school teachers on *The Tale of Genji*, and the Women Writers Project. The last, matched by contributions from the university, seeks to ensure the inclusion of women's contributions to literature by rediscovering, encoding and sometimes publishing (with Oxford University Press) lost women's writing in English from 1330 to 1830.

The project has enabled scholars to study the development of the English language as well as pioneer the writing of computer codes for international transactions of information in business and technology.

Brown's relations with NEH have been notably close. The university's leaders were in fact present at the proposed creation of the endowment. In September 1964, President Lyndon Johnson traveled to Brown to receive an honorary degree, and announce that in his view "national greatness" required that "there . . . be no neglect of the humanities." Johnson said that he "look[ed] with the greatest favor upon the proposal [issued earlier in the year by Brown's] President [Barnaby] Keeney's Commission for the National Foundation for the Humanities."

In language suggestive of another era, the Keeney Commission had recommended the creation of a federal foundation to support "whatever understanding can be attained . . . of such enduring values as justice, freedom, virtue, beauty, and truth." Within months of Johnson's address, with the help of Sen. Claiborne Pell (who is regarded as the father of both endowments) in the Senate and John Brademas in the House, Johnson pushed through Congress the act that established both NEH and NEA.

In 1966, Keeney, a decorated veteran and a medieval historian, left Brown's presidency to become the first chairman of NEH.

After Vietnam and Watergate, few intellectuals on either side of the political spectrum find much firepower in the old-fashioned liberal rhetoric that Keeney and Johnson both used to launch their hope of providing modest federal funds to promote education and research in the humanities. But in 1964 most Americans felt that the humanities and the arts not only could enrich their lives, but that they also could contribute to realizing the promise of American life, which they did not then, and perhaps do not today, see only in materialist terms.

Without faith in the inherent national significance of the mission of universities like Brown, not to mention the federal government, it becomes difficult to defend, let alone advance, the public commitment Johnson legislatively harnessed only 30 years ago to support scholarship and public programming and, with the passage of the Higher Education Act in 1965, begin to provide universal access to higher education. All have come under considerable pressure for years. They are threatened even more by the new Congress.

The attacks on both endowments are serious, far out of proportion to the insignificant amount of federal dollars in a \$1.6 trillion budget they channel to such projects as rediscovering lost literature or teaching high school and college teachers medieval literature. They suggest that we have lost confidence in our national institutions to solve collective problems or to give us a sense of identity or direction.

HUMANITIES DAY

"Our cultural institutions are an essential national resource; they must be kept strong." So said President Reagan in 1981.

For over three decades, one of the most important agencies that has helped keep them strong has been the National Endowment for the Humanities. That is why the Association of American Universities, which I represent here today, unequivocally supports full funding for the Endowment. An association of 60 universities represented in almost all fifty states, the AAU is committed to advancing research and education in America.

NEH has more than fulfilled its mission. It has, in the parlance of our budget conscious era, offered an impressive return on the investment of public dollars. Every President and every Congress since 1965 has supported NEH. They have done so because they have understood that a free and good government, in Jefferson's words, depends on an enlightened citizenry.

A single controversial project should not blind us from seeing how well NEH has advanced culture and learning in America, while helping us also conserve our nation's heritage and preserve its memory.

I have here a list which is also available to you. It is a representative sample of NEH-sponsored projects at America's colleges and universities. Permit me to mention three.

At Rice University in Texas, an NEH grant enables scholars there to compile and edit a seven-volume series of Jefferson Davis' papers.

At the University of Mississippi an NEH grant facilitated a "Memories of Mississippi" exhibit that recorded ordinary citizens' recollections of the Depression era in the northern part of that state.

And at Ohio State University NEH funds are assisting secondary school teachers' efforts to integrate Arabic language and culture courses in local high schools.

What these projects have in common is that they make our nation stronger through the advancement of knowledge, culture, and education.

In brief, we need to understand—and we need to make our elected representatives understand—that if NEH is disproportionately cut, America's cultural institutions will not be kept strong. They will bleed.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:33 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by M, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2288. An act to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to extend for 2 years the deadline by which States are required to have in effect an automated data processing and information retrieval system for use in the administration of State plans for child and spousal support.

H.R. 2404. An act to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until November 1, 1995, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 108. Joint Resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2288. An act to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to extend for 2 years the deadline by which States are required to have in effect an automated data processing and information retrieval system