

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 47, 104th Congress, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies: Mr. GINGRICH of Georgia, Mr. ARMEY of Texas, and Mr. GEPHARDT of Missouri.

There was no objection.

SHAMELESS HUSTLING FOR VOTES IS MAKING A MOCKERY OF IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, last Friday's Washington Times contained a front-page article which showed me just how far the President will go to win votes. The article claimed that the Clinton administration has pressured the Immigration and Naturalization Service to speed up the standards and background checks on applicants for citizenship and to ignore other requirements in order to naturalize as many immigrants as possible before the November elections.

By taking such shortcuts, the President is putting in danger the naturalization of immigrants with criminal records and other immigrants not qualified for citizenship.

In the past year 1.3 million people have become naturalized citizens, nearly three times the number of previous years. The reason for this is a Presidential initiative called Citizenship USA, which is supposed to help legal immigrants through the naturalization process. Instead, the program is being used as a campaign tool of the Clinton campaign in hopes of winning votes of these new citizens. Complying with the directives established by this program has some INS officials feeling like the campaign workers of INS.

Becoming a U.S. citizen is a great honor, and I suspect the President will indeed receive the reward he has envisioned, but I believe that shameless hustling for votes is making a mockery of our immigration.

CORRECTIONS DAY PROCESS IS RESPONSIVE GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. EHRLICH. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of H.R. 3056, the 18th bill brought to the floor of the House this session under the corrections day process.

Since the commencement of corrections day, the President has signed

nine bills into law, and the House has passed eight bills that are waiting further action in the Senate.

The American people are demanding a more responsive government, and corrections day is a key part in meeting their demands. H.R. 3056 provides a technical correction to the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985; it permits certain county-operated health insuring organizations in California to qualify as organizations exempt from certain otherwise applicable Medicaid requirements, even though they enroll Medicaid beneficiaries residing in another county.

I believe this bill we are considering today is a perfect example of how the corrections day process works to correct outdated regulations that place financial burdens on many industries in the United States.

I want to recognize Chairman BLILEY, Mr. RIGGS, and the Commerce Committee for the expedient and hard work they did to get this bill to the floor.

DRUG USE BY TEENAGERS IS A NATIONAL TRAGEDY

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

Mr. WICKER. Madam Speaker, drug use is up, and the response from the White House is a plea not to make an issue out of it. Our children are getting hooked earlier and at rates never before seen in the history of this Nation. Overall drug use among 12- to 17-year-olds is up 78 percent since 1992.

But look at these figures. In just 1 year, 1994 to 1995, marijuana use in the same age group is up 37 percent; LSD use, again in just 1 year, up 105 percent; cocaine use, 12- to 17-year-olds, from 1994 to 1995 is up 166 percent. This is a tragedy, a national tragedy. We are losing a generation of children right before our very eyes. Drugs destroy families and they destroy lives.

Madam Speaker, this is no time to run and hide. We need to make sure that children can grow up in an environment where cocaine, LSD, and pot-smoking are not part of their daily surroundings.

WHERE ARE THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION'S PRIORITIES?

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

Mr. RIGGS. Madam Speaker, I think we should remember 3 weeks ago the Clinton administration released a startling report on drug abuse. It showed increases in drug use of almost unbelievable proportions. In just 1 year cocaine use among 12- to 17-year-olds has increased 166 percent; one year, 166 percent. That is completely unacceptable.

But we have to realize that when we have a President who all but ignores this problem, it is no wonder that we

have a soaring rate of drug use in America. Within just a few days of becoming President, President Clinton slashed the budget of the drug czar's office by 80 percent.

Madam Speaker, President Reagan and Mrs. Reagan proved the importance of a bully pulpit, using the Presidency as a bully pulpit. They set a standard of behavior for children of the eighties when they said, "Just say no." Today we have an administration that seems to be confused about what message they ought to deliver to our children.

It makes us wonder, Madam Speaker, where are this administration's priorities?

CORRECTIONS CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is the day for the call of the Corrections Calendar.

The Clerk will call the bill on the Corrections Calendar.

COUNTY HEALTH ORGANIZATION EXEMPTION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3056) to permit a county-operated health insuring organization to qualify as an organization exempt from certain requirements otherwise applicable to health insuring organizations under the Medicaid program notwithstanding that the organization enrolls Medicaid beneficiaries residing in another county.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3056

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PERMITTING COUNTY-OPERATED HEALTH INSURING ORGANIZATIONS TO ENROLL MEDICAID BENEFICIARIES RESIDING IN ANOTHER COUNTY UNDER MEDICAID WAIVER FOR CERTAIN COUNTY-OPERATED HEALTH INSURING ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9517(c)(3)(B)(ii) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (42 U.S.C. 1396b note), as added by section 4734 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, is amended by inserting "or counties" after "county".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to quarters beginning on or after October 1, 1996.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD].

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

(Mr. MOORHEAD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOORHEAD. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3056.

This bill would allow a Health Insurance Organization to serve Medicaid beneficiaries residing in one or more counties. Current law, as interpreted

by the Health Care Financing Administration, limits such coverage solely to the county in which an organization operates.

This bill redefines an eligible organization to be one that "enrolls all Medicaid beneficiaries residing in the county or counties in which it operates."

This will enable eligible health insurance organizations, including the Solano partnership health plan—which operates in Solano County, CA—to extend coverage to Medicaid recipients residing in counties other than that county in which their operations are based.

In the case of the Solano plan, coverage will be extended to 12,000 Medicaid recipients residing in Napa County. Since coverage costs for these organizations are lower than the average monthly payment for beneficiaries, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that this bill will save the Federal Government up to half a million dollars a year.

This bill is supported by Governor Wilson, the California Department of Health Services, and the Solano and Napa County Boards of Supervisors.

I especially want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] for bringing this issue to the attention of the committee.

I urge the Members of the House to approve this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

(Mr. RIGGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me and for his leadership on the Committee on Commerce, and as my very good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California, and the dean of our delegation, and let me just say I hope we will have future opportunities in the next few weeks as we wrap up our legislative work, but I want to salute CARLOS MOORHEAD for his distinguished service in the Congress and tell him the he will be sorely missed in our ranks, and particularly as the dean of the California Republican congressional delegation.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my legislation, H.R. 3056, a very simple bill that I introduced that makes a technical change to current Medicaid law as it applies to California and my congressional district. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Nevada, BARBARA VUCANOVICH, who is the chairwoman of the Speaker's Corrections Day advisory group, the gentleman from Virginia, TOM BLILEY, the chairman of the House Committee on Commerce, the gentleman from Florida, MICHAEL BILIRAKIS, from the Committee on Commerce, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. BARR, of the Committee on Commerce, the gentleman from California, Mr. WAXMAN, and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, on the minority side, for their help on this legislation.

This is a very commonsense bill that would simply allow county health systems that are currently prohibited from providing Medicaid services to eligible recipients in other counties to do so. That is to say, it changes the law by making a technical modification to Medicaid HMO amendments included in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985, as amended by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, by specifically inserting the phrase "or counties" after the word "county" in one place to clarify the intent of the law.

What this technical amendment does, of course, is allow a Medicaid HMO, in this case the Solano Partnership Health Plan, a nonprofit Medicaid HMO, to be able to expand out of its home county, its county of origin, if you will, Solano County, to a neighboring and adjacent county, Napa County, and in the process serve an additional 12,000 Medicaid recipients in my district.

This legislation, making technical amendments to the law, will provide those 12,000 Medicaid recipients with greater access and greater quality of medical and physician services. It will decrease the reliance on hospital emergency facilities for primary health care for Medicaid beneficiaries. The Congressional Budget Office has scored this legislation and found that it will actually save the taxpayers \$500,000 annually.

The bill contains no private sector or intergovernmental mandates of any kind. This bill is health care reform at its finest. It offers the neediest of patients greater access to health care, decreases the administrative burden on providers, and allows for more efficient program management, which results in savings and cost containment.

Let me suggest to my colleagues that this is the wave or the trend of the future in Medicaid health care services to the truly indigent and desperately poor in our society, a very important part of the American safety net.

I happened, flying back yesterday to Washington from my California district, to read an article in USA Today, the headline of which is "Medicaid Outcome Will Affect All." The subheadline is "The Clinton Administration, Congress, and the Nation's Governors have failed to reach consensus on future of Medicaid. With caseloads rising, the States have had to step up."

The article starts out by saying, "President Clinton and Congress succeeded in revamping the Nation's antiquated welfare system" when we passed through this Congress a bipartisan welfare reform bill that the President signed into law just last month. And it goes on to say, "President Clinton and Congress succeeded in revamping the Nation's antiquated welfare system this year only by failing a more difficult test. Left in the wake of welfare reform is Medicaid, the health insurance program for the poor, which dwarfs welfare in both caseload and cost."

Clearly, Medicaid in recent years, Medicaid expenditures, have been growing at an unsustainable rate. Because this is a 50-50 cost-shared program between Federal taxpayers and State taxpayers, State taxpayers and State government has been asked to pick up an ever-increasing portion of Medicaid health care cost in America. The program cries out for reform.

As I mentioned, I believe that the wave of the future in the Medicaid services and in trying to control Medicaid costs is managed care plans such as the Solano partnership health plan.

Presently today in America, nearly one-third of all Medicaid recipients are in managed care plans. Those States that have aggressively, those States that have aggressively experimented and expanded Medicaid managed care programs have realized a significant cost savings.

□ 1415

Michigan, for example, has put 80 percent of its Medicaid recipients into managed care and cut inflation, the growth of health care cost, from 11 percent to 1 percent in 1 year. To quote health policy adviser Vernon Smith for the Engler administration in Michigan, "These are real savings." So again, Madam Speaker, I believe it is unfortunate we have not been successful in enacting more ambitious or more broad-based Medicaid reform in this session of Congress, but I submit that this legislation is perhaps the only meaningful Medicaid reform that we will be able to enact in the 104th Congress.

Again I want to thank the gentleman for being so gracious in yielding me the time today. I want to reiterate, as he said, that this legislation is supported by Governor Pete Wilson, the California State Department of Health Services, and many other organizations in California. This bill is health care reform at its finest. As I mentioned before, this is going to expand access to and quality of health care for 12,000 Medicaid recipients in my district. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

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

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, we have no objection to the policy change in H.R. 3056. The bill was marked up in our Committee on Commerce in July with no controversy. As I think the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] described the bill, what we are doing here is allowing the Solano Partnership Health Plan, which currently operates in Solano County, CA to enroll Medicaid beneficiaries residing in neighboring Napa County.

What we do question, Madam Speaker, is why is the Republican leadership choosing to move this bill on the Corrections Calendar? This should be on suspension. A correction implies that

some mistake was made. What I understand we are doing in this bill is to expand a special exemption for Medicaid requirements that California obtained for three of its HMO's in 1990.

This is a policy change. I would think that it should be part of the Suspension Calendar. Now we have it in corrections. That provisions in the 1990 reconciliation bill intentionally limited this Solano Managed Care Organization and two others in California to providing services only to residents of the respective counties in which they operated because at the time this was an experiment.

Madam Speaker, there is no reason today that this legislation could not have been handled with less attention and less fanfare on the regular Suspension Calendar. So why the special attention? Our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], is a good Member. He is my friend. We serve on some committees together. But why are we hiding this useful but largely insignificant piece of legislation on the Corrections Day Calendar?

We are left wondering on this side whether it is simply a reason to make my good friend look good, which he many times, I am sure, deserves, but we are acting here in good faith. So I am going to remain perplexed and ask some of my colleagues to explain why we are doing it this way. I think we have to be very careful about how we use corrections day.

Again, I do not object to the policy in this bill. We should be handling this bill together with the other 14 small, noncontroversial bills taken up under suspension of the rules. I have been here 14 years. I have never had a corrections bill.

Madam Speaker, I support passage of this legislation, but I would urge our friends in the Republican leadership to confine the use of corrections day to corrections, not use it for expansion of special exemptions in current law to benefit specific constituents of specific Members.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would just make one comment, that in the meeting of the Committee on Commerce, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], who was the chairman of the subcommittee during the last Congress and is the ranking member of it this time, said he hoped he would see the bill on the Corrections Day Calendar. So the Republican leadership was basically following his advice.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH].

Mr. EHRLICH. Madam Speaker, I regret my colleague is perplexed. Maybe I can help him out as a representative of the Speaker's Corrections Day Committee, which is a bipartisan organization, as my colleague well knows.

This is the classic example why corrections day was put together by the

Speaker and this leadership. H.R. 3056 is very narrow in scope. It is certainly bipartisan in nature. Not only is the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] a member of the Committee on Commerce, but he is a member of the bipartisan group which constitutes in fact the corrections day advisory group.

This bill is a technical, commonsense bill that actually saves the taxpayers money. It is what corrections day and the entire process of corrections day is all about. It proves to the American people that this House is capable of doing things expeditiously and fairly when called upon.

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

Let me continue this dialog, because the reason I am here representing the Committee on Commerce is because former Chairman WAXMAN, former Chairman DINGELL, object to this procedure. I was asked by the committee to represent the views of the minority members of the Committee on Commerce—Chairman HENRY WAXMAN is the ranking minority member; the gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL, is the ranking minority member of the full committee—and their concern with this procedure.

If I could ask my colleague, are we not talking about this legislation being a specific policy change in effect for certain beneficiaries in a State? Is that not correct? Are we not talking about a policy change?

Mr. EHRLICH. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. EHRLICH. The answer is certainly yes, but that is not exclusive of the jurisdiction maintained by the corrections committee. I missed the point the gentleman is making. I can reiterate the fact that whenever a corrections day bill is reported out of the Corrections Day Committee to the standing subcommittee of the House, it is done in a bipartisan way. Certainly this bill was done in a likewise manner, in a bipartisan way. I remain concerned on this side as to why the gentleman is perplexed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, let me be perfectly candid. A corrections day implies a mistake. This is not a mistake. This is policy change.

Would the gentleman explain to me where the mistake occurred? If we pass a piece of legislation, it is to advance a policy. The implication is, and the gentleman knows, that a Corrections Day Calendar is to correct a mistake. Where is a mistake in this legislation?

Mr. EHRLICH. If the gentleman will yield further, I believe the gentleman is actually mistaken with respect to his interpretation of the Corrections Day Committee and the Corrections Day Calendar. It is simply not limited to mistakes. It certainly can include mistakes, but it also concerns Federal regulations that may in fact have not

been mistakes when they were originally promulgated but no longer make sense given the passage of time or the change of circumstances concerning any particular Federal agency. So the answer to the gentleman's inquiry is that certainly mistakes can be taken care of on the Corrections Day Calendar but the Corrections Day Calendar is not limited to, quote-unquote, "mistakes."

Mr. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I remain very perplexed. The gentleman keeps talking about bipartisanship. Policywise, bipartisanshipwise, we are going to support the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], but procedurally I am here to object to the use of this procedure in the Corrections Day Calendar.

I wish my colleague would stop saying about a bipartisan agreement on the process. We are going to support this bill, but I just think that this is highly unusual. There are several suspensions. Would the gentleman answer this question; I do not know if he is on the rules, and maybe it is unfair to ask him: Why is this bill not on the Suspension Calendar? On the 14 bills that we will be doing later today, why is this on corrections and not on suspension?

Mr. EHRLICH. If the gentleman will yield further, those decisions are made at a higher level than where I sit, as the gentleman well knows. But, quite frankly, in view of my membership on the Corrections Day committee and my personal knowledge as to the way the Corrections Day advisory committee operates, we certainly have not had this problem, and this committee has now been operating for well over a year.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I thank the gentleman. I just want to raise this. We support what the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is trying to do. This is again a major policy change. As the committee of jurisdiction, we will not object. We just would like to be consulted when these procedures take place. I would not be sitting here or standing here. Chairmen WAXMAN and DINGELL are not here. I was asked on their behalf to please voice these objections. This is why I am here.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Madam Speaker, I obviously do not have any choice one way or the other in the operation of the House, but this is a good measure. It is something that will do good for the country. I appreciate very much the gentleman from New Mexico's support for what we are trying to do even though he does not like the way it is being done. I ask for an aye vote on the bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman as usual is very persuasive, and he is a very fine Member. I just want to make my point.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GREENE of Utah). Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and (three-fifths having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORHEAD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3056, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that she will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV. Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken on Wednesday, September 11, 1996.

MONITORING OF STUDENT RIGHT TO KNOW AND CAMPUS SECURITY ACT OF 1990

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 470) expressing the sense of the Congress that the Department of Education should play a more active role in monitoring and enforcing compliance with the provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 related to campus crime.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 470

Whereas crime on our Nation's college campuses is a growing concern among students, parents, and educators;

Whereas Congress passed the Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act in 1990 so that students and parents would have access to information with respect to crimes occurring on college campuses;

Whereas Congress intended that information on crime be provided so that students could take steps to protect themselves from becoming victims;

Whereas Congress was particularly concerned with the timely reporting to students instances of violent crimes occurring on campus; and

Whereas questions have been raised with respect to compliance with the Campus Se-

curity Act and enforcement by the Department of Education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in order for students to have information vital for their own safety on our Nation's college campuses, it is the sense of the Congress that the Department of Education should make the monitoring of compliance and enforcement of the provisions of section 485(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 with respect to compiling and disseminating required crime statistics and campus policies a priority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

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

Today we are considering House Resolution 470, expressing the sense of the Congress that the Department of Education should make the monitoring of compliance and enforcement of the Crime Awareness and Campus Safety Security Act a priority.

It is most appropriate that we consider this legislation at this time. This is the time of year when tens of thousands of young people are filling college and university campuses throughout the United States.

Many of these students are away from home for the first time. They are excited. They are thinking of the friends they will meet, the classes they will take, school activities in which they will participate, and other thoughts which normally fill the minds of college students.

Few, if any, of them are thinking that they could be the victim of a crime on campus. And this is where the problem begins. Colleges and universities are not safe, carefree havens from the outside world. The same crimes which occur in our neighborhoods and on our city streets take place on college campuses. Students are robbed, they are raped, and they are murdered, and many times by other students and many times under the influence of alcohol and other drugs.

□ 1430

The Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act was first signed into law by President Bush on November 8, 1990. It requires institutions of higher education participating in the title IV student aid programs to provide yearly statistics to students, faculty and prospective students with respect to the number of crimes reported on campus in the following categories: Murder, forcible and non-forcible sex offenses, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, and motor vehicle theft.

In addition to the reporting of statistics, institutions must make timely reports to the campus community of those crimes considered to be a threat to other students and employees in order to aid in the prevention of further crimes on campus.

Crime on college campuses is a very serious problem. Witnesses testifying

at a June hearing on campus crime before the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Training and Life-long Learning agreed that crime is a major concern of students, parents and college administrators.

During this hearing, several witnesses called into question the Department of Education's commitment to enforcing compliance with the Campus Security Act. In part, their concerns were based on a quote by the Assistant Secretary for the Office of Postsecondary Education which appeared in the New York Times on January 7, 1996. When asked about enforcement of the Campus Security Act, the Assistant Secretary said, "We aren't going to essentially establish a major monitoring effort in this area."

I share the concerns expressed by those witnesses, and I would like to remind the Assistant Secretary that this law was enacted for a reason. Students were being raped, murdered, and robbed on our Nation's campuses, and this information was being hidden from other students. Students who are provided information on crime on campuses can and will take steps to protect themselves. If they are not informed, they can become victims of campus crime.

The Department of Education must make certain that institutions are complying with the Campus Security Act. Safety of students must be the No. 1 priority. If the Department of Education fails to fulfill its enforcement responsibilities, we will have to consider other measures aimed at improving safety awareness on our college campuses.

One such measure under consideration is the Open Campus Police Logs Act of 1995. This bill, introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], would require institutions of higher education to maintain a daily log of all crimes reported to their police or security department, and make such logs open to public inspection.

All of us must work together to ensure campus safety for our college students, but we cannot do this if the law is not being enforced. I would urge my colleagues to support passage of House Resolution 470.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 470, expressing the sense of Congress that the Department of Education should play a more active role in monitoring and enforcing compliance of the Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act of 1990, signed into law by President George Bush.

I have always been a strong supporter of the Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act since it was enacted 6 years ago, and believe that it is important for the Department of Education to make the enforcement of this act a priority. This law was enacted in order to highlight the issue of