

and churning out mindless regulations for our teachers and our States.

President Clinton really did not tell the rest of the story when he did not tell the people that of those nearly 5,000 people in the U.S. Department of Education that three-quarters of them, about 3,500, are right down the street in Washington, DC, making over twice what our average classroom teacher is making in my district.

President Clinton did not talk about ending welfare as we know it, welfare, really which has destroyed our family structure, any sense of values, self-discipline, and respect and really any hope for education. President Clinton really did not tell the rest of the story about his failed drug policy that has raised youth drug use to all-time levels and made juvenile crime epidemic in this country.

You know, the debate going on, the debate today about funding the country, and we have just been in the process of passing a resolution to continue for 4 more weeks, a lot of people say, "Why can you not decide this?"

There are some fundamental differences about how we spend money on education, the environment, and these other issues. Most people would not know this. But, in fact, the Republicans have proposed from the beginning in their budget a vast increase in spending in education, \$25 billion more over the next 7 years.

But the real debate is over how those dollars are spent, again, whether we finance bureaucrats in Washington, whether we pay to continue to support programs where students cannot read their own diplomas, where students continue to score lower in their tests and we spend more money. My community college has entrants of which over 50 percent need remedial education. So the real question is how we spend our money.

I wanted to also cite for the House and the Speaker here a story from the Orlando Sentinel that cites a report on State education and job training programs. It says State and Federal Governments spend about a billion dollars in Florida on vocational education programs. What is the result? And this is from the report: The programs fail to produce graduates or workers who can earn a decent salary. In fact, only about 20 percent of those who enter these programs completed them, and then a small percentage, 19 percent, found a job after that, and then most of them got a low-paying job and were out of the job in a short period of time.

Lawmakers in Florida were astonished, this report says, when they heard the findings.

The report also indicated that money was wasted on duplicate programs. So this debate about education and environment is paying more and getting less, and that is what this is all about.

People have to understand, because this is important, it is not just how much money you throw at the program, it is how you spend it and do we

improve these programs, do we provide a better education, do our students come out with a diploma they can read and then get a job where they can earn a decent living and be a productive and capable, independent citizen in this great Nation?

So that is what the debate is about, paying more and getting less.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, again, as Paul Harvey would say, that is the rest of the story.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BRITISH-AMERICAN INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 168(b) of Public Law 102-138, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the British-American Interparliamentary Group: Mr. CLINGER, Pennsylvania, vice chair; Mr. BROWNBACK, Kansas; Mr. EMERSON, Missouri; Mr. LINDER, Georgia; Ms. MOLINARI, New York; Mr. PETRI, Wisconsin; and Ms. PRYCE, Ohio.

There was no objection.

#### THE MICHAEL NEW CASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, it is an unusual thing for me to come over and do a 5-minute special order. I very seldom do that. Part of the reason that deals with the issue of Michael New, who was stripped of his position and discharged from the U.S. Army because as a military hero he was twice decorated, he refused to wear the blue beret and the shoulder patch of the United Nations. As some people say, Michael New should be thrown out. He was insubordinate, he did not listen. That is what the Army said in their court martial and their proceedings.

But I have a resolution in with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT], a good friend of mine that says that the Congress of the United States should reinstate Michael New with his rank and back to the Army because he brings to the attention of the American people more than just this individual obstinacy. He said he took an oath to the U.S. Constitution, not to the charter of the United Nations. And, quite frankly, I agree with him, and I think we have taken this new world order business a little bit too far.

I think the Michael New case is more than about a soldier that has been thrown out of the Army. I think it is a microcosm of how we as a Nation have gone so far that we have our troops under foreign command wearing the uniforms of other identities. And, quite frankly, all the money we give the United Nations, I think they blow an awful lot of it. They should be doing more peacekeeping so we would not

have to send in our troops in the first place.

I just wanted to come over here for the New family, because it was a special order that was put together by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT], and I stand in support of Michael New and I oppose this new world order madness that has our troops under foreign command, wearing foreign uniforms, and I think Michael New is not an individual that has just gone off rebelliously. He is a twice-decorated veteran. He is a patriot, and I think he takes a stand that should become the subject of great debate here in the Congress of the United States.

So I thank you for belaboring that issue with me, and Mr. BARTLETT will give more information on the resolution itself because I just came over spontaneously and wanted to offer my support.

#### THE HEALTH COVERAGE AVAILABILITY AND AFFORDABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to my colleagues about two items.

First, I wish to congratulate the House on the passage last evening of H.R. 3103, the Health Coverage Availability and Affordability Act. For the first time in this Congress we have passed legislation which will provide for 25 million Americans at least accessibility, affordability, and accountability in health insurance.

This legislation in its most pertinent parts provides portability. If you lose your job, you take the insurance with you. If you get a new job, you will take that insurance with you.

It also makes sure that no matter what preexisting medical condition you may have, you still qualify for health insurance.

It increases deductibility from 30 percent to 50 percent for the self-employed who provide health coverage for themselves and their employees. It will allow small businesses group coverage of insurance, will also provide medical savings accounts.

I am very hopeful the Senate will agree. This legislation is forward-thinking and positive.

#### TRIBUTE TO CHARLES REED

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a tribute to a fallen hero. U.S. FBI agent Charles Reed of my district was gunned down last Friday trying to do his job to win the war against drugs, and for 16 years served the people of the tristate area of Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, in making sure we eliminate the scourge of drugs in our country.

One of the most successful agents in the history of the country, he found leads where no one else could even tell there was evidence lurking, and he

brought whole cartels of drug dealers down in his work, and he was dedicated. Every day he worked the longest hours, did the best job, and as Louis Freeh said, the FBI Director who came to his funeral in Montgomery County, PA, this week, he said this was a fallen hero, a man who is a role model for all FBI agents. He was the first FBI agent to be killed from the Philadelphia area in the history of the department. He is someone who is a great loss because he was a wonderful father, a loving husband, and a great community leader, and he epitomizes for me what is great about America.

The war against drugs will go on, and there will be awards named in his honor because as an American hero, I salute him, this Congress salutes him, and a grateful Nation says we will keep the fight up, we will prevail, because of the agents like Chuck Reed, who really make a difference and their lives have meant so much to so many. God bless you, Chuck Reed.

#### A TRIBUTE TO PFC. FLOYD E. BRIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to reach out today to Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Bright of my community in Houston, TX, and speak to them on behalf of this Nation and this Congress to acknowledge that along with the entire Houston community this Nation is saddened and diminished by the loss of one of our finest young citizens, Pfc. Floyd E. Bright, who lost his life in the service of his country on March 22, 1996, while on duty in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In behalf of myself, my congressional colleagues, and fellow Houstonians, I would like to express our heartfelt condolences and sympathy for the family of Private Bright and to say to them that we share their loss.

Neither his country nor the community will ever forget Private Bright's sacrifice, and we hold his memory in the highest honor.

We also honor and hold in the same high esteem the supreme sacrifice that has been made by his family. We share their grief and feel deeply what it means to lose a child, a shining light gone out far too soon. Private Bright was a graduate of Lamar High School in Houston and attended San Jacinto Community College. All who knew him would acknowledge him as a person of extreme curiosity, friendliness, and a willingness to serve. How lucky we are as Americans that we have the kinds of young people that will go forth and serve their country.

It reminds us of the very special and solemn responsibility of this Government, this President, this U.S. Congress to ensure in all times that we stand for what is right in this world, that we respect the fact that we must

respect and love our young men and women and acknowledge that anytime that we can assist them in staying away from harm's way, we should take up the charge.

To the family of Private Bright, let me again say we honor you and respect you and love you, and we shall remain forever proud of him and so shall his country which he served so very well.

The entire Houston community is saddened and diminished by the loss of one of our finest young citizens, Pfc. Floyd E. Bright, who lost his life in the service of his country on March 22, 1996 while on duty in Bosnia and Herzegovina. On behalf of myself, my congressional colleagues, and fellow Houstonians, I would like to express our heartfelt condolence and sympathy for the family of Private Bright and to say to them that we share their loss. Neither his country nor this community will ever forget Private Bright's sacrifice, and we hold his memory in the highest honor. We also honor and hold in the same high esteem the supreme sacrifice that has been made by his family. We share their grief and feel deeply what it means to lose a child, a shining light gone out far too soon.

Private Bright was a graduate of Lamar High School in Houston and attended San Jacinto Community College. We shall remain forever proud of him, and so shall his country, which he served well.

□ 1445

#### THE MICHAEL NEW CASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, we want to spend a few minutes this afternoon looking at the very special case of Specialist Michael New. His name is out to a number of our people, but some may not be familiar with this case and the issues involved here.

Michael New is the son of missionary parents. He was home schooled. He volunteered for the military. He was stationed in Germany. The group he was with was being moved to Macedonia. As a part of that move, they were told that they had to wear the insignia of the United Nations.

Specialist New took the position that the oath he took when he entered the military was to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States; that he had not taken an oath to defend and protect the charter of the United Nations.

Now, in the helicopter accident over Iraq, when several of our military personnel were killed, the Vice President, AL GORE, went to their parents and told them they should be proud of their sons who died as U.N. soldiers. Specialist New had the conviction that if he were to wear the insignia of the United Nations, that he would become, as the Vice President indicated, he would become a U.N. soldier, and he thought that this was a violation of the oath he

took to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.

He would gladly have gone to Macedonia as a U.S. soldier assisting in a U.N. operation. Our military personnel did that by the thousands in Korea. We were there and lost many lives over a number of years, but not one of our soldiers there was a U.N. soldier. They were all U.S. soldiers.

What Specialist New was asked to do was something he felt was very different than this. He felt that he was being required to change his allegiance to the Constitution of the United States to the charter of the United Nations, and he was not willing to do this.

He was told in his training that he was not to obey an unlawful order. Let me read to you from the 1990 Army field manual. U.S. soldiers are instructed that, quoting from the manual,

Moral courage is as important as physical courage. Do not ease the way for others to do wrong. Stand up for your beliefs and what you know is right. Do not compromise your professional ethics or your individual values and moral principles. If you believe you are right after sober and considered judgment hold your position.

This is precisely what Specialist New did. He had no problem in going to Macedonia. He would have willingly gone. As a matter of fact, he is a decorated soldier, once for saving the life of a comrade, and a second time for saving the eyesight of a comrade. So he was not trying to avoid a dangerous situation.

His concern was the concern of conscience, that he could not in good conscience transfer his allegiance from the Constitution of the United States to the charter of the United Nations. He was court-martialed for this, and it is now under review within the military, but he was court-martialed, and he is to be given a bad conduct discharge.

I have some charts here that will help us to understand how we got where we are. Let me put the first one up.

As you can see in this chart, this defines the relationship between the U.N. charter and the law that regulates or controls how we relate to the United Nations. This is the United Nations Participation Act of 1945.

In the U.N. charter, there are two chapters of relevance here. The first of those chapters is chapter 6. Chapter 6 relates to peace observations. It defines the role of the United Nations in peace observations. Chapter 7 defines the role of the United Nations in peace enforcement. There are significant differences between peace observation and peace enforcement.

Now, the United Nations Participation Act of 1995 is the law which determines how we as a country relate ourselves to these two chapters of the United Nations. Interestingly, the two sections of this law, the Participation Act, are section 6 and section 7. But as you can see from the chart here, section 6 relates to chapter 7, which is