

Herger	McHugh	Schaefer
Hilleary	McInnis	Seastrand
Hobson	McIntosh	Sensenbrenner
Hoekstra	McKeon	Shadegg
Hoke	Metcalf	Shaw
Horn	Meyers	Shays
Hostettler	Mica	Skeen
Hunter	Miller (FL)	Smith (MI)
Hutchinson	Moorhead	Smith (TX)
Hyde	Myers	Smith (WA)
Inglis	Myrick	Solomon
Istook	Nethercutt	Souder
Johnson (CT)	Neumann	Spence
Johnson, Sam	Ney	Stearns
Jones	Norwood	Stump
Kasich	Nussle	Talent
Kelly	Oxley	Tate
Kim	Packard	Tauzin
Kingston	Parker	Thomas
Klug	Paxon	Thornberry
Knollenberg	Petri	Tiahrt
Kolbe	Pombo	Upton
LaHood	Porter	Walker
Largent	Portman	Walsh
Latham	Pryce	Wamp
LaTourette	Radanovich	Watts (OK)
Laughlin	Ramstad	Weldon (FL)
Lazio	Regula	Weldon (PA)
Lewis (CA)	Roberts	White
Lewis (KY)	Rogers	Whitfield
Lightfoot	Rohrabacher	Wicker
Linder	Roth	Wolf
Livingston	Roukema	Young (AK)
Longley	Royce	Young (FL)
Lucas	Salmon	Zeliff
Manzullo	Sanford	Zimmer
McCollum	Saxton	
McCrery	Scarborough	

NOT VOTING—42

Ackerman	Gutknecht	Nadler
Barton	Hayes	Payne (NJ)
Becerra	Houghton	Peterson (FL)
Buyer	Jefferson	Quillen
Chabot	Kennedy (MA)	Quinn
Costello	King	Richardson
Davis	Lincoln	Ros-Lehtinen
de la Garza	McCarthy	Shuster
Dunn	McDade	Stark
Engel	Meehan	Studds
Fields (LA)	Molinari	Taylor (NC)
Fields (TX)	Mollohan	Vucanovich
Foglietta	Montgomery	Wilson
Gibbons	Murtha	Yates

□ 2118

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Ackerman for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GORDON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. GOODLATTE). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: from the Committee on the Budget, for consideration of the House concurrent resolution and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. KASICH, HOBSON, WALKER, KOLBE, SHAYS, HERGER, SABO, STENHOLM, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. COYNE.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their re-

marks on the motion to instruct conferees on House Concurrent Resolution 178, the House concurrent resolution on the Budget for fiscal year 1997.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3540, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. GOSS from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-601) on the resolution (H.Res. 445) providing for consideration of the bill (H. R. 3540) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the distinguished majority leader regarding the schedule for the rest of the evening and week and the following week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I am pleased to announce that the House has completed legislative business for the week. On Tuesday next, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

We will consider the number of bills under suspension of the rules. I will not read through that list now, but a complete schedule will be distributed to all Members' offices.

Members should note, however, that if any recorded votes are ordered on the suspensions, they will be postponed until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday, June 5.

On Wednesday, June 5, and Thursday, June 6, we will consider the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill which, of course, will be subject to a rule.

Mr. Speaker, we should finish legislative business by 6 p.m. on Thursday, June 6.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I have just two quick questions to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]. Does he expect to have the conference report on the budget resolution next week?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, it is our hope that we would be able to do this possibly even by Thursday. Obviously, we have to see what we can accomplish when the Senate is back in town, but we are hopeful.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the other inquiry I would make to my friend from Texas is that we on this side of

the aisle have heard rumors that the gentleman may be considering adding a suspension concerning welfare reform. We are obviously concerned, since it is not on the gentleman's list, at least the list that we are aware of, and we have not seen this legislation.

So, my query to my friend from Texas is, will we be considering a welfare bill on Tuesday, a day which I might add, that Members will not even be in town?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that bill has not yet been written, but the gentleman should expect that it will be added to the Suspension Calendar for Tuesday.

Mr. BONIOR. For Tuesday?

Mr. ARMEY. For Tuesday.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am confused about that response from the majority leader, because when our staff met with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] today, he indicated that neither he nor anyone involved in putting that bill together had read the waiver request submitted yesterday and he said he was simply operating on trust.

Since my understanding is that the governor himself exercised some 70 item vetoes on the legislation that was passed by the legislature covering some 27 different subjects, whether or not the Congress is going to be allowed to at least fully understand what is in that package, and how those item vetoes have changed the package as it was originally passed by the Wisconsin legislature. Are we going to have adequate understanding of that before we asked to vote?

I mean, if this is going to be debated on a day when Members are not even here, and then voted on a subsequent day, I would venture to say that there will not be three Members of the Congress who know what is in the bill which they are passing on to the Senate.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, in light of the President's ringing endorsement just given recently of the Wisconsin welfare plan, we have the relevant committees in discussions with the State and they are preparing a resolution which, frankly, will not be that lengthy or complex or difficult to understand.

I am confident that Members who find themselves keenly interested in this subject will be able to make their way back to the floor in time to participate in the discussion on Tuesday next.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman suggesting that this is going to go through the appropriate committee before it is brought to the floor of the House?

Mr. ARMEY. No, if the gentleman would continue to yield, it is being prepared by the appropriate committee

and it will be on the agenda next Tuesday.

Mr. BONIOR. But, Mr. Speaker, I gather from the gentleman's answer that, in fact, there will be no markup in the committee. So this is an example of a welfare bill not yet written brought directly to the floor of the House of Representatives without adequate attendance on Tuesday, when there are no votes scheduled, and to be debated. That seems to be a pretty, if I may say so to my friend from Texas, a pretty outrageous thing for the majority to do next week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I reiterate we are acting in response to the President's enthusiastic endorsement of the Wisconsin welfare plan and we want to give the President every opportunity to act in accordance with the very, very public position he has taken demonstrating the enthusiastic support, and it will be on the schedule next Tuesday.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to observe that this seems to me to be nothing but a blatantly political act. The question is not what the President has said he will or will not do. I hope he will provide ample opportunity for Wisconsin to get what it is asking for, after he has met his responsibilities and we have met ours, to understand what it is we are helping to support.

But as I understand it, the legislation to be brought before the Congress has nothing to do with the President. It simply provides a congressional waiver without, at this point to my knowledge, a single Member of the House having read what it is that is supposed to be waived.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, clearly a single Member of the House will have read it if a single Member of the House will have written it. That being an academic point, it will be on the floor and the gentleman will have ample opportunity to debate it on Tuesday.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, I would say to my friend from Texas, that 20 minutes of debate is hardly ample time to debate one of the most important issues that this country is facing, and that is welfare.

And it just, if the gentleman will pardon my vehemence, I say to my friend from Texas, to bring this out to the floor without the committee having marked it up, without attendance here, to debate it for 20 minutes, is not the proper way to conduct the business of this House.

□ 2130

While the President may have endorsed it and while many of us on the other side of the aisle agree with many of the features of it, we have a responsibility as Members of this institution

to look at it, look at it carefully to make sure that it meets the standards that we think are appropriate for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, do I understand then that we will be taking up on Tuesday, a day when many Members will not be here, I certainly plan to be here personally, that a piece of legislation that has not yet been written and that we will have only 20 minutes per side to debate that piece of legislation? Are those the circumstances that we will face on Tuesday?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I do appreciate the fact the gentleman from Texas will be here because then the 40 minutes of debate, which is so much more than is usually given by Congress to a presidential waiver, will be that much more enlightening and I do appreciate it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman's interest in confining this debate to 40 minutes on a bill that has not yet been written that will be presented on a day when most people will not be here an indication of his disinterest in getting a welfare reform bill passed or just his wry sense of humor?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, this is an endorsement of the President's stated public intention to give a waiver to the State of Wisconsin due to his enthusiastic support for what it is the State has done. I do not understand why those on the gentleman's side of the aisle are so reluctant to stand by their man. That being what it is, they will have their opportunity to do so on Tuesday next.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA].

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, would the majority leader give the Members of the body some feel as to what these waivers include? I am told that there are 75 separate waivers. Could the majority leader possible share with the Members what some of them might be?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out on a radio address Saturday about a week ago, the President said that he had received what he needed in that radio address. He said to the American public that he supported the Wisconsin plan, and I can quote directly several of his words. He said we should get this done in terms of approving the waivers.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, since the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is going to be the author of the bill, maybe he could relate to and enlighten some of the Members here as to maybe 3 or 4 or maybe 5 of the 75 waivers. Could he share that with us?

Mr. NEUMANN. I can share what is in the bill we are drafting. I would certainly be happy to do that, and I would also like to say we have been working

for the last 48 hours or more getting that bill prepared. There has been a lot of discussion back and forth on the preparation of the bill.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, let us talk about for a moment what we are doing here. The legislature passed a bill called W-2 in the Wisconsin legislature some 6, 8 weeks ago. About 5 weeks ago, the Governor signed the bill, and it has taken him 6 weeks, 5 weeks to come to Washington, DC to request the waivers to implement this piece of legislation.

When the Republicans in the House talk about a waiver, know full well it is not a single waiver. It is 75 separate waivers doing everything from eliminating the fair hearing, which is currently provided for under the law, to making provisions for those working in Wisconsin to work at a subminimum wage.

I happen to do a radio show with my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI], and we discussed this very same issue last Friday. At that point in time, I had before me a list of 42 of those waivers, and they are from soup to nuts. They are lengthy and some are complicated, but they are 42. Now our Governor comes to town, has a press conference at the Press Club and all of a sudden enlightens this person from Wisconsin that magically there are now 75 waivers.

So what we are going to be asked to do on Tuesday is to grant carte blanche all 75 waivers. I as one Member from Wisconsin, which does have some interest in this subject matter, do not even know what the 30 have to do, do not know anything about the 30. But I should also state that I have received numerous letters in my office from very, very interested Wisconsinites who do not know what the 75 waivers are, either, and have requested the Secretary of Health and Social Services and those in charge around here to provide for a 30-day public comment period.

They want to be heard. Something very unheard of in this new Congress, the public wants to be heard. I think the people from Wisconsin who this will directly affect have a right to approach this government and say I do not like number 75, I like 68.

Why are we rushing this through on a day when Congress is not going to be here? I will say there is not a Member, there is not one of nine of us, there is not any of the nine of us from Wisconsin who knows anything about these waivers, including the author of the bill. I asked him to give me a feel for one, two, three, four, five. He does not know. He has not seen them. At least I saw 42 of them and raised questions on 2 of those items.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are going to be asked to rubber stamp 75 major waivers for welfare in the State of Wisconsin. There are not any of my colleagues, including ourselves, who will know what we are doing. Is that how to run a Congress, Mr. Minority Whip?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield for a response from the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say we have already had more debate in these past few minutes announcing the schedule on a Presidential waiver than Congress usually has on such things.

Second, I might say, clearly I am sure the gentleman from Wisconsin must acknowledge that the President must have known very well what these waivers would be before he so publicly promised that he wanted to give them. Even though the gentleman from Wisconsin may not have known, I am sure the President did. In any event, the debate that the gentleman so richly wants to engage in is scheduled for Tuesday next week. That is the time to have that debate. This is a discussion of the schedule.

Mr. KLECZKA. I cannot speak for the President, but I as a Member of this body have a right to know and the gentleman is not affording that right.

Smile, very funny.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would simply like to make one additional point. The issue is not what the President knows, because the legislation that is being brought before us asks for a congressional waiver, not a Presidential waiver. So the issue is not what somebody on the other end of the avenue knows. The issue is what the gentleman knows. The issue is what the gentleman knows. The issue is what I know.

The fact is right now, nobody in this room knows diddly about the details of what is being asked to be waived.

The other point I would simply make is that the public has a right by law to comment. What we are asking the Congress to do is to make a summary judgment before the public has a right to comment about any of those waivers being proposed.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out some of us in this room do have a pretty good handle on what is being proposed.

Mr. OBEY. That is not what the gentleman said in a meeting today.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that a lot of us in this room do have a pretty good handle. Even if we did not have a pretty good handle on it, I personally do. Even if we did not, I would like to point out that our State legislature did pass this. I for one have more faith in the great people in the State of Wisconsin, and I think they know better for the people in the State of Wisconsin than anybody in this city does. I for one trust their judgment.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think we need a little his-

tory on this measure if we are going to talk about the legislature in Wisconsin. The legislature in Wisconsin did pass this measure. This was a measure that Governor Thompson publicly embraced long before the Wisconsin legislature passed it. But once the Wisconsin legislature passed it, he exercised his line item veto 97 times; 97 times he used his partial veto on this piece of legislation affecting 27 areas. And he did it consistent with his statement earlier that he embraced this legislation.

Now he comes to Washington, DC. He presents it to the President of the United States. He does not give it to us. I called the Governor's office yesterday looking for a copy of this waiver request. I still have not received one from the Governor's office. Yet the gentleman is coming before the Congress of the United States asking us to vote on something.

I certainly think that the President has every right to embrace this proposal, but that does not mean we take away the 30-day period for the public to comment. All the politicians in this body will have a chance to comment on this, but what is wrong with letting the American people have an opportunity to have their say on this issue? Why are we squelching them? If this is such a good proposal, let us give it a little sunshine. Let us the American people look at it.

Let us just not ram it through here because all this is an attempt to embarrass the President. Let us debate it. Let us talk about it. The gentleman says he knows what all the details are. I bet he does not know what the details are. There are 250 pages.

There is one last statement I just want to point out because this piece of legislation affects my district more than any other district in this entire country. It requires mothers who have given birth to a child to go back to work within 12 weeks. Now, that might be something that people support here. But I represent those areas, and I have talked to the child care providers. They say they do not exist. We are telling women to go back to work after 12 weeks. Where are they supposed to put their children? That is what I want to know.

We have all these pro-life legislators here but, once that child is born, you are on your own. I want to know what is going to happen to those children? Those are real people. They are alive now, and I want to know what happens to them.

Mr. Speaker, I think just to come in here for political purposes to say we are going to try to ram it to the President, that is good Presidential politics. But there are people involved in this action, and this body should not abdicate its responsibilities to the people who live in my community.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to the gentleman

from Wisconsin, to my colleague, my neighbor to the north, I would just like to point out that this welfare reform bill is not about a welfare reform bill for the United States of America. It is about a welfare reform bill for the State of Wisconsin. I am not quite sure what all the people here are so afraid of. The great people in Wisconsin have figured out a way that people that have been on welfare all of their lives are going to go back into the work force once again, instead of looking forward to welfare for the rest of their lives. They are going to look forward to again living the American dream. They are going to look forward to the opportunity to return to the work force and improve their lives and improve the lives of their families.

I do not know what this body is so afraid of. This is not a welfare reform plan for the United States of America. This is a welfare reform plan for the State of Wisconsin that the President has said he will grant the waivers for. All we are doing, all we are asking for here is to go ahead and grant those waivers so the people in the State of Wisconsin can do what the people in the State of Wisconsin believe is best for their own people in Wisconsin, not for the whole country, just for the people in Wisconsin.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply take note of the fact that we have had a great many claims made about W-2 by the Governor and by various members of the legislature. I think the test that ought to be followed is that, before this Congress votes on this legislation, that it knows that the legislation measures up to each and every claim made for it by the Governor of the State of Wisconsin. That is the test by which we ought to determine whether the Congress, rather than the executive branch, ought to exercise its responsibility and provide this waiver.

If the Congress does not meet that test, then this is nothing but a cynical, crass, political maneuver aimed at going after the President of the United States without any intent to provide a constructive movement forward on the complicated, important issue of welfare reform.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I guess I am stunned. I just cannot believe the President of the United States did not give consideration to all of these ailments described here on the floor. I cannot believe the President of the United States would have taken such callous disregard when he went to Wisconsin just a few days ago and so enthusiastically endorsed this Wisconsin plan and pledged that he would grant these waivers.

It strikes me the gentleman's complaint might be with the President. In any event, we will further air this out on Tuesday.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend that the President of

the United States will not be voting next week on this floor, but 435 Members will. They have an obligation and a duty and a responsibility to understand what is brought before them. Hopefully it will be done through the system which we have established here through the committees and with adequate time for Members on both sides of the aisle to debate this.

I think the gentleman understands from the debate we have had here tonight how serious we view this, not so much on substance but the procedures that are being laid out here to consider this important issue. I would hope that the distinguished majority leader and the leadership on his side of the aisle would reconsider the time, the time of debate, and the whole manner in which they hope to carry this out next week. We consider it a very serious matter.

I would say to my friend from Texas, we will act accordingly with respect to how this is performed in the days ahead of us.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO HAVE UNTIL 5 P.M. FRIDAY, MAY 31, 1996, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 2650, MANDATORY FEDERAL PRISON DRUG TREATMENT ACT OF 1995

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until 5 p.m. tomorrow, Friday, May 31, 1996, to file a report on H.R. 2650, to amend title 18, United States Code, to eliminate certain sentencing inequities for drug offenders.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MAY 31, TO TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 1996

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, May 31, 1996, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 4, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. MCCOLLUM. 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 gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

□ 2145

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

TEENAGE PREGNANCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker the month of May has been set aside as teenage pregnancy prevention month. Although May is coming to an end, it is imperative that legislators and the American people continue to focus attention on creating policies and programs to reduce the growing number of teenagers who become pregnant each year.

This is critical because, unfortunately, the United States has the highest rate of teen pregnancy among the industrialized nations of the world. The result is the devastation of the lives of millions of young girls and the loss to our country of their talents and potential contributions. This loss weakens our country's future, because in order to compete in the ever expanding global economy, we must utilize the full talents of all our young people.

In my State of California, for example, 8 out of 10 teen mothers never finish high school. The result? Thousands of uneducated and untrained young girls forced onto welfare with little hope for a better future.

Furthermore, moneys that could be used to help improve the quality of life for all Americans are diminished by the expenditure of billions of dollars on health care and cash assistance programs for families with teen parents.

For example, the average AFDC and Medicaid costs for just one teen pregnancy through the first year of support total more than \$10,000 per child; and the total spent in California for teen pregnancies is between \$5 billion and \$7 billion annually.

Tragically, this pattern is often repeated from mother to daughter, creating a vicious cycle of despair and dependency on public assistance.

It is therefore in the best interests of all Americans to do what is necessary to help end this national tragedy of teenage pregnancy. To succeed however, we must be fair and humane in our solutions. We must not advocate policies that hurt innocent children or punish teen mothers by denying them assistance to care for themselves and their children.

Instead we must invest in comprehensive programs that have a proven track record of success. One example is the Teen Outreach Program, known as TOP.

TOP, which has been chosen as a model program for California's Teen

Pregnancy Prevention Initiative, is a comprehensive program focused on preventing adolescent pregnancy and fostering overall youth development. This program incorporates both a classroom-based curriculum focused on adolescent reproductive health and a community service component which offers young people the opportunity to help others while helping themselves.

A recent 10-year evaluation found that students who participated in TOP had an 18 percent lower rate of suspension from school, a 60 percent lower dropout rate, and a 33 percent lower rate of pregnancy than nonparticipating students.

The Teen Outreach Program is just one example of the effectiveness of prevention and education programs. Further, statistics support the fact that money spent on prevention programs saves billions of dollars in future costs to society.

As May comes to an end, let us remain vigilant in our effort to end teenage pregnancies. In so doing, we save more than dollars; we save our Nation's children and strengthen our country's future.

REPORT FROM INDIANA: MEMORIAL DAY HEROES

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my weekly report from Indiana.

Every weekend, my wife Ruthie and I travel across Indiana.

So often we are blessed to be included in very, very special ceremonies.

Last Memorial Day weekend we participated in two unforgettable events honoring veterans for Memorial Day.

They reminded me that 220 years ago, the signers of the Declaration of Independence took a solemn oath:

And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm Reliance on the Protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.

Last weekend as we celebrated Memorial Day, Americans reflected upon the grand project to which those men, our Founding Fathers, pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

That grand project was the United States of America.

It was not merely a territory, was not a treasure, and was not an allegiance to a king.

No, that grand project was an idea. It was the idea of freedom.

The first event was held last Friday in Indianapolis where awe-inspiring half-oval limestone memorials were dedicated for Indiana's Vietnam and Korean war veterans.

These memorials were dedicated thanks to George Busirk, president of the Indiana War Memorial Commission; and Gerald "Dutch" Bole, the director of the Indiana Department of Veterans Affairs.