

what can we do to grow this economy. And that clearly is a very important element to the last part of our plan, and that is beside just getting our financial house in order to have certain tax incentives to encourage growth in this economy.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And I think the people that talk about or advocate a flat tax or a consumption tax or a value added tax or a national sales tax are not saying that, look, this is the golden way to have a successful tax, they are saying, look, the tax system we have now is failing us. We are penalizing investment, we are penalizing savings, we are discouraging businesses from expanding and creating more and better jobs by putting more and better tools and facilities in the hands of the greatest work force in the world, which is the American work force.

Somehow, in our look-see to changing our tax system, it has to be an admission, an acknowledgment that what we have now, that has been written many times over by the special interest lobbyists and their huge PAC contributions to candidates for office, has ended up being not what is good for the future of America.

□ 1800

So I think it is important that we do exactly what you are suggesting, Mr. SHAYS, that we have the kind of tax policy changes that encourages savings, that encourages investment.

Mr. SHAYS. And encourage people to pay their taxes. It is estimated we could lose almost \$100 billion in revenue, one, because it is not simple enough and, second, that people simply have found a whole host of ways to avoid paying taxes in the course of trying to do what they think are legitimate or maybe not legitimate write-offs.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There are so many loopholes and so many corporate tax breaks that probably should not be there that it justifies a whole new look at our tax system.

Mr. SHAYS. I would like to spend the last 5 minutes and just summarize what we are trying to do.

We are trying to do what Prime Minister Itzhak Rabin said. We are elected by adults to represent the children, and we are trying to get our financial house in order and balance the Federal budget. We are trying to save our trust funds from bankruptcy, particularly Medicare. And we are trying to transform our caretaking, social, corporate and farming welfare state into an opportunity society. We do that by allowing our spending to grow.

We allow it to grow 20 percent more each year, 20 percent or more in the next 6 years as opposed to the last 6 years, 20 percent more, from 8.7 billion to 10.4 billion. We do it by allowing the student loan program not to cut but to grow from 26 billion to 37 billion, a 42-percent increase.

We take the earned income tax credit, which is an expenditure made by

taxpayers to the working poor where they actually receive money rather than pay taxes, and that program over the last 6 years we spent 109 billion. We are going to spend 155 billion under our 6-year plan. Under welfare spending over the last 6 years we have spent 441 billion. In the next 6 years we will spend 30 percent more; we will spend 575 billion.

In Medicaid we will grow from 463 billion over the last 6 years to 731 billion. We are going to spend 58 percent more in the next 6 years under Medicaid, which is health care for the poor and nursing care for the elderly.

Then we are going to deal with Medicaid, Medicaid spending, which grows from 463 to 731, just to point out that our numbers are not that different than what the President's numbers are, except we want to allow for more flexibility on the State and local level under this plan and not have a one-size-fits-all Medicaid plan done by the Federal Government.

Medicare is going bankrupt. It is going to be highlighted tomorrow when the trustees report that Medicare part B, the money we pay in our payroll tax, we will run out of money potentially by the year 2000, rather than what we originally thought, the year 2002. We had a plan to save Medicare until the year 2010 and the President vetoed it last year. Our new plan will not stretch it out entirely to the year 2010 but close to it. We spent in the last 6 years 920 billion; in the next 6 years we are going to spend 1.4 trillion, a 61-percent additional expenditure in dollars.

In Medicare premiums we are going to grow from 5200 this year to 7000. Last year they were 4800. So we are allowing this plan to grow per beneficiary and we do it without increasing the copayment, without increasing the deductible, without increasing the premium. We give seniors choice. We do ask the seniors who are the wealthiest, making over 100,000 plus, to pay more of their Medicare part B premium. But for all other seniors the program remains the same, no increase in copayment, deduction or premium, and we give them extensive choice.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I am absolutely convinced that this Congress is on the right track, trying to get our financial house in order, trying to balance the Federal budget, trying to save our trust funds and trying to transform this social and corporate welfare state into a truly caring opportunity society.

SAFETY NET FOR CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by congratulating the Children's Defense Fund and Marian Wright Edelman and all of the other sponsors of Stand for Children which took place here in Washington last Saturday, June 1.

They came from all over, all parts of the Nation. They came from every ethnic group, every religion, every race, they were all together, children and families, making it clear that in America the great caring majority stands for children and American policies. Government policies at this point in our Nation's history reflect this fact. They reflect the fact that this Nation stands for children. The policies of the Government stand for children.

Mr. Speaker, the problem that they did not talk very much about on Saturday is the problem of the present attempt to change those government policies, to turn our policies around and make this a Nation whose policies are hostile toward families and children.

In contrast to the Stand for Children that was taking place in Washington here, more than 200,000 people by the official estimates, in contrast to that Stand for Children, let us consider for a moment the problem of Brazil and Colombia, where large numbers of children are being found dead in the streets every day. They are being found dead as a result of being shot the night before. They are killing children in Brazil. They are killing children in Colombia. They are killing children in certain other South American countries.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mean child abuse in the usual sense. There is a high degree of child abuse in these nations, but there is a phenomenon which we have not yet experienced in America. That is they are shooting children at night, and you find the dead bodies the next day. The elite classes of Brazil and Colombia and certain other South American countries are the classes of people that are envied by our Republican majority here in this country.

We have an elitist philosophy driving an attempt by the Republican majority to change the policies that have an impact on children. The previous speakers talked about they were not cutting school lunch programs because after all the figures, the numbers will show that there is an increase in the numbers over the years. They do not tell you that the number of children will increase faster than the dollars that they have put in the budget will increase. If you did a simple mathematical calculation of dividing the number of children into the number of dollars available, you will see that the amount of dollars available, you will see that the amount of dollars per child will go down as a result of the cuts that they are proposing.

They are also taking out large blocks of children and saying that immigrant children shall not be served and we are going to just leave them on their own. We are going to leave them to fend for themselves. So the contrast is very important, to take into consideration the fact that in this Nation at this point in history, the majority of Americans still stand for children. They stand for

children regardless of what the Republican majority in the Congress right now is trying to do.

They are going to reject the attempts wholesale to change the policies which favor children and families. They are going to reject it in November, but in the meantime we have a serious problem of trying to beat back the threats to the policies and the programs in our Government which support families and children.

There are three examples I would like for you to consider. Consider the fact that in America we do stand for children. Still our Government policies are favorable to children and families. In Brazil, Colombia and certain other South American countries, they do not have the safety net for families and for children, so they have gone in the opposite direction.

They have created so many problems with families and children that large numbers of children roam the streets day and night, and they have begun to hate those children. They have begun to demonize those children. They are wiping out those children at night through vigilante groups. Many groups involved are even considered to be close to the police, or in a few examples the police themselves have been accused of murdering children at night.

These children become a nuisance because they steal in the daytime. They obstruct the beauty of the sidewalks. They do a lot of things which make people very upset with them. Society will not deal with them in a rational way. Society will not provide programs which will guarantee that they have a decent home or decent meal, school lunches, will not guarantee that they have some safety net so that families are not thrown into the streets, that society ends up at the other extreme, exterminating children, large numbers of children are being killed.

Contrast the societies of the industrialized nations that the United States is in economic competition with. Brazil, not Brazil, Italy, England, France, Germany, those societies have safety nets which are far greater than any safety nets that we have here in America. They treat children far better. Recent articles in the newspaper, the New York Times talked about in Italy the mothers under the provisions which allow family leave have abused it to the point where certain mothers have stayed off a whole year from work and gotten paid. That was an example of abuse. But then they described the kinds of programs that they have for family leave in a country like Italy. They showed how a person who wanted to abuse the system could do that. What they were saying is that there is a very strong family net there for people who have children.

In this country, which has a gross national product which is smaller than ours, Italy is not a rich industrialized nation, as rich as the United States, but in Italy they have policies for families which are far better. In France,

they are always citing the day care programs in France, unparalleled, no parallel programs anywhere in the world to the kind of day care programs they provide in France.

In Germany, the programs for workers that allow vacations and sick leave and so forth are unparalleled in terms of any workers anywhere in the world. So on the one hand you have families and children in certain industrialized nations who are far better off and supported far more by the government and the country as a whole than we have in this country.

On the other hand, you have the other extreme, the elite minorities of South America, the rich leadership of South America who are envied by the elite minority here in this country. They do not pay very much taxes. They are not bothered with the nuisance of taxes. You have billionaires in South America who are scot-free from responsibilities of trying to guarantee that there is a safety net for children and families, and our Republican majority here wants to create a situation for our elite minority to have a similar situation. They want more and more advantages for the rich, less and less taxes, less and less disturbing their abilities to make maximum number of dollars in profits.

In South America they do not have environmental laws. They do not have a number of things which force our corporations and businesses to act in a more humane way, ways which are supportive of life in general and of families and of children. So they have gone to the extreme in places like Brazil and Colombia.

On the other hand, we are at least in the middle. We have some safety net programs. Right now we are at a critical point in our history where a Republican majority in control of the Congress is striving to try to eliminate those safety net programs.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk in a little while about specific examples of programs for children that the Republican majority has attempted to eliminate, programs for families that the Republican majority is attempting to eradicate at this very moment. One of the most important programs of course is Medicaid, the Medicaid entitlement. Families will be hurt a great deal if the program passed by the Republican majority in this House were to be signed into law.

Last Thursday there was another program, the reauthorization of IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. That, too, was under the hammer by the Republican majority. They are chipping away at that program now and creating a situation where it is possible that the Federal Government may pull out of its support for children with disabilities, the education, completely. I will talk more about that later.

Mr. Speaker, let me just go for a moment to some clippings related to Brazil. I want to make the point clear

here that, if a society takes the route of accepting no responsibility for the poor families within that society, the society takes the route that it is against minimum wage. So those who are working cannot earn a decent living and then takes the route that those who are not, those who cannot find jobs and are on unemployment do not deserve any help from government. If it takes the route of cutting back on job training programs as all of these routes taken by the Republican majority here in this Congress, you take that route, you are eventually going to end up in a situation where the children are demonized and hated because they are running out there without any support. Families cannot keep them at home. Families cannot keep them. Families cannot house them. Families cannot clothe them. So they are on the street.

□ 1815

Where do they go if not onto the streets? And once they are on the streets, they become scum in the eyes of the general population. It is not surprising that it is the police that sometimes end up being involved in trying to eradicate these children.

These are not my words. Let me just quote from a story that appeared, a United Press International story, on April 25, 1995. I use this story because it is an example of a situation where they caught, for the first time they caught some of the people who were doing the eradication of children. Children have been dying, being shot, like flies. You know, they have been dying in large numbers and being found on the street dead, shot in large numbers, and nobody has been held responsible. This is the one example where there was a witness, and they actually arrested people, and a trial was taking place last April related to the killing of these children.

Let me just read from the United Press International article of April 25, 1996. A former military police agent in Brazil confessed Thursday to his part in the 1993 killings of eight street children as they slept outside the Candelaria Church in Rio de Janeiro and said people scheduled to go on trial are innocent. The police agent was one of those accused, and as he came up for trial, he confessed, but he said certain other people that were accused were not innocent.

The important thing about this is that the prosecutor, Jose Muinos Pineiro, said that this trial was the first ever in the case of the killing of street children, and the trial was to begin as planned, and it would be a landmark in Brazil, although for years they have been finding children shot in the streets in the morning, and nobody has ever been punished. So this was the first case.

Mr. Santos, who was a former policeman, confessed, said he decided to confess because of conflicts of conscience, conflicts of conscience. The witness who identified Mr. Santos and the others is a boy named Wagner dos Santos,

and Wagner dos Santos, the little child who identified the assailant, the assassins, has suffered two assassination attempts since the time he identified them and the time of the trial. He has been so threatened that he had to be moved to Switzerland and kept there between the time of the assassinations of the children and the time of the trial; the only trial being held; only time they have caught the killers of children in the streets of Brazil.

Now, am I exaggerating the situation? Here is another article dated October 12, 1995 from Inter Press Service, and it states that a study, according to the article, a study by the United Nations Children's Fund, UNICEF, reported that Colombia's average of 2,219 child killings each year now outstrips the more notorious death by violence of children in Brazil, where the figure was 1,533 annually.

Now, I am not talking about child abuse, I am not talking about child deaths as a result of neglect. We are talking about children being shot in the streets, children being shot like rats.

The Colombian city with the highest children's death rate in Medellin, with 64 children murdered for every 100,000 inhabitants. The city of Cali, the third largest city, has 13 deaths per 100,000 children. We know some of these names because they are drug centers in Colombia. In the capital of Colombia, Bogota, they have a better record: Eight children die violently each year per 100,000 inhabitants.

Now, I quote these statistics to let you know, you know, in a civilized society, and these are civilized societies, they are quasi-democracies in some cases, but the situation has deteriorated to the point where instead of standing for children, the citizens stand against children, enough of them stand against children to allow this to go on day in and day out, night in and night out, and the children are picked up in the morning like rats, dead rats.

Human Rights Watch stopped short of describing the widespread murder of street children as government policy, but it did state that the police agents are involved in a broad range of abuse against minors, including torture, corporal punishment and widespread killings. Human Rights narrated the story of Frankie, a Bogota street urchin who had managed to escape three social cleansing operations. It also discussed the case of Andres, a child prostitute who, according to three friends, was taken out of the center when he was working by three armed men dressed in police uniforms, and several days later this body was found on the outskirts of Bogota.

The report notes that the most extreme attack took place November 15, 1992, when eight children and one adult who were members of a community group were murdered in Villatina, a marginal barrio of Medellin, in the northwest of Colombia. According to witnesses, the youths were gathered at

night on a street corner in the barrio when 12 men in three vehicles approached and demanded that they lie on the ground, and opened fire on them.

One of the victims reportedly managed to tell his mother before dying that he recognized his killer as a member of the judicial police. One human rights organization linked the Villatina massacre to the deaths of two police officers the same day and said that because those police officers had been killed, they were out to get revenge on the children before this massacre took place.

Now, I only mentioned police and make a point about police because police are an agent of government. Police are the front line of what people really want. And when societies have degenerated to the point where they are killing children and policemen are involved or turning their back, refuse to investigate, then you know that the society is culpable. It is not something out there on the outskirts, on the edges of society, taking place that does not have approval from a large number of citizens.

You know Daniel Goldhagen has written a book called "Hitler's Willing Executioners," and in the book, "Hitler's Willing Executioners," Daniel Goldhagen says that what Hitler did could not have happened if the Nazis had not taken over the government. They had control of the government, and they had power over people, but the extent to which the mass murders occurred, the massacre of 6 million Jewish people occurred, they also had to have a willing population, and that too many people in the German population cooperated because they had come to the point where they demonized Jewish people and saw them as subhuman, and because they saw them as subhuman, they could participate in these outrageous acts without any conscience.

When a society reaches the point where frustrations and failure of government and failure of institutions is such that children become a nuisance, a threat, and the society begins to demonize its children, then they can do unspeakable things to its children, like murder them in the streets like rats.

Mr. Goldhagen also makes some references to slavery. Slavery took place in a situation where large numbers of human beings were treated in a outrageous subhuman, criminal manner for 232 years in America. Slavery in South America lasted longer. Slavery in South America was more brutal. Slavery in South America did not have the constriction of early laws which forbade the import of slaves, so for a much longer time in South America they were importing slaves. And South America was much more brutal in the treatment of its slaves because they were expendable, they did not try to keep their property alive the way the American slave owners did, they did not set up breeding farms and try to

breed slaves and take care of female slaves because they were valuable property. In South America they had an access to large numbers of incoming slaves, and the tradition was they just worked them until they worked them to death. The brutality was so much greater and the heritage of that brutality probably has something to do with the fact that they are shooting children down in the streets of certain South American countries right now.

I might add, my colleagues, that in these South American countries there is a black population. Colombia has, I learned on the radio this morning, 6 million, at least 6 million, people who are of African descent. In Brazil at least half of the people in Brazil are of African descent, and probably, if you use the general yardstick that is applied in America that if you have one drop of African blood you are of African descent, the majority of people in Brazil are of African descent.

The children who are shot down in the streets are usually black or mixed children in the streets of Colombia; it is the black and the mixed children who are being murdered in the streets of Brazil because they are the bottom of the economic ladder, they are the despised ones who have no safety net, there is no welfare program, there is no school lunch program, there is no Medicaid, there is no program for children with disabilities. So they are thrown into the streets.

This is my introduction to my discussion of the Stand For Children. I applaud the Stand For Children because it says a lot about where the majority of Americans are at this point.

There was one thing that happened with Stand For Children that disturbed me. Marian Wright Edelman, who is the organizer of this Stand For Children, on last Saturday did a brilliant job, and we all know Marian Wright Edelman on the Hill very well. Republicans and Democrats are familiar with the work of the Children's Defense Fund, and they have done a great job, and they are very knowledgeable about the political process. They are non-partisan, and sometimes they have appealed to us to act in a bipartisan way, but they are political. I was disturbed in Marian Wright Edelman's final speech, her closing speech on Saturday when she said to people, "Go back home," and she asked them to follow God. "Don't follow politicians, follow God."

Now, by all means they should follow God. But I wonder why she had to say do not follow politicians. It struck me as strange and sounded dangerous because in my community I have had a problem with people putting down politicians, not wanting to get involved in the political process, not even bothering to go out and vote because they are so fed up with following politicians, they are fed up with the political process, they do not participate, and therefore the people who do participate and those who have the power are making

rules and laws which are very much to the detriment of those people. "Don't follow the politicians."

You know it is strange in many ways because it lets all of us off the hook. All politicians, Members of Congress, city council members, members of State legislatures, you are off the hook if you do not have responsibility for children because we have been told, the people have been told, not to follow us.

I do not think Marian Wright Edelman meant this at all; I am positive she did not, because nobody has more political sophistication in America than Marian Wright Edelman. But it came over that way. For a layman listening, it sounds as if we should not follow politicians, that God, you know, cannot be for politicians.

Some politicians are not following God. You know, the scenario, as I see it, is God is up front there, and if you want to get something done through the political process, you have to have certain laws change, you have to have programs in this country and public policy in this country which benefit children; then to do that you got to get behind the politicians. God is in front, the politicians are behind God; some of them are, some of us are. We are the advocates of God's work, we are the advocates for children.

□ 1830

You have to get behind us. If you are going to go in another arena, you want God to be up front. If you want educators and teachers to be up front, get behind them. If you go into the arena where you are talking about health care and you want the doctors in the health care system and the nurses, God is up front and the doctors and health care system and nurses are behind God.

If you want to accomplish something in this world, you have to do it through men and women who make decisions. God is not a dictator. God is not totalitarian. God has left us with free will. God will not intervene in America and deal with whether the Medicaid entitlement stays in place or not. God is not going to come down and deal with that directly. God will act through agents.

There are some advocates that follow God and will fight to guarantee that we keep Medicaid, because it is a life and death matter. We must keep the Medicaid entitlement. There are some advocates who are on the side of God, who are behind God, who will guarantee that we have children with disabilities be supported by the Federal Government. God will not get involved. God will not intervene. That is what free will is all about.

I am not a theologian or deep philosopher, because we have gone through that over and over again. The decision has been made that God leaves mankind free to make certain decisions. God sits and watches, and he is disappointed sometimes. He must spend a lot of time crying about the kinds of decisions that we make. From time to

time horrible things are done by men and women who are making the decisions. Horrible things are done by men and women who have the power. God must be very disappointed.

On the other hand, there are men and women who do things that God, I am sure, appreciates a great deal and supports, and in the final analysis I think that those people who are following God, doing God's work, will triumph. But never tell people not to follow politicians, follow God. Tell them to follow the politicians who are in line behind God, and it makes much more sense.

The Children's Defense Fund certainly knows that the political process requires that you talk to politicians, that you confront the Members of Congress, confront the Senators, confront the Members of the House. All that is necessary in order to get things done.

I think that the Children's Defense Fund does its homework very well. Some of the documents they put out clearly show that they do not believe that politicians should not be followed. Or maybe what she is really saying is do not follow them, push them; get behind them and push them. Or maybe it meant that you should get in front of them with some ropes and pull them, because the Children's Defense Fund certainly engages us. We are engaged in problems with children, and I applaud them for that. I applaud them for engaging us year in and year out on problems related to children.

They gave us a list. They sent it around to all the Members of Congress. This list says, "Who's for Kids and Who's Just Kidding?" This came from the Children's Defense Fund, the top 10 kids' votes in the 104th Congress. In after school and summer programs for kids, they give a record of how the Congress voted on the after school and summer programs for kids.

Cut school lunch, that is another vote that was taken. They give a record of how Republicans and Democrats voted. Cut basic education and Head Start and summer jobs, a third vote that was taken which directly impacts on children, on families. Allow parents to block out violent or sexual TV shows. That was a vote that directly affects children and families. If you stand for children, they indicate that you would have voted yes on that vote.

No. 5, cut student loans and children's health and nutrition programs. We heard a discussion before from our Republican colleagues, that they really are not cutting student loans and they are not cutting children's programs. The amount of money is increasing, but they do not tell us that the number of children, the number of students, is increasing, and when you divide the number of children for these programs into the amount of money, as the children increase, the amount of money is going down per child.

No. 6, restore \$3.1 billion in education cuts. We restored that, yet the vote to do that is important. Cut education by

\$3 billion, that was a vote taken. She is recapitulating past history over the last few months, where the Republicans tried to cut education and to cut job training and to cut summer youth programs and to cut school lunches, and we stood firm. We took our case to the American people. We made it clear to everybody out there what was happening, and they backed down. But she is recounting how the votes went down. These were votes against children.

Accept the Senate's proposal for higher spending on education. That is a vote that is important. Provide a \$5,000 adoption tax credit. That is a vote for children on which I think we almost had unanimous consent, we almost had every person on both sides of the aisle voting for the \$5,000 adoption tax credit. They note that. That was a vote for families and for children.

Cut funding for basic education and Head Start by 20 percent. Originally the Republican majority voted to cut Head Start by \$300 million. I am happy to say that we had yet another vote where we put it back in. I do not know how many Republicans voted to put it back in, but the bill passed which put the money back in for the Head Start cut. Those are concrete things the Children's Defense Fund, the stand for children people, sent around as examples of votes that impacted on children. They understand the political process. They understand clearly.

In another place they make it clear that the Republicans have come up wanting as a party. As a fact, they say, and it is not that they are bipartisan, they are not Democrat or Republican, but they state the facts clearly. I am going to quote from an item in a letter of March 27, 1996, signed by Marion Wright Edelman. This is when the Children's Defense Fund first announced it was the prime sponsor for the Stand for Children.

"Every child in America needs and deserves a healthy start, a had start, a fair start, a safe start, and a moral start in life. Yet this year's book shows that we continue as a Nation to leave millions of our children behind. Despite overwhelming evidence of child suffering and neglect, proposals pending in Congress would return America to the past rather than prepare children for the future; weaken rather than strengthen the guaranteed safety net for children and families during times of need, recession, and disaster; and decrease rather than increase cost-effective child investments in order to give a tax cut to the non-needy. At a time when more than 15 million children are poor, over 3 million are abused and neglected, and more than half a million drop out of school, it is essential that Congress strengthen rather than shred the Federal guaranteed safety net for children.

"I hope that you will find this information, including State by State tables contained in the Appendix, valuable as a resource and as a guide for future action on behalf of America's children. If I or my staff can be of assistance, please contact," et cetera, et cetera; a letter from the Children's Defense Fund in March of this year, saying that we still are taking steps that threaten children and threaten families.

Here is a statement that came out just last week, along with a copy of the top 10 votes for kids. I read from the statement: "The record of the Republican-led 104th Congress on protecting our children is truly an outrage. While Republicans talk about a pro-family agenda, they have voted repeatedly to slash funding for education programs, student loans, child nutrition, health care for children, foster care and other child protection services, and aid for disabled children. The Republican agenda of the 104th Congress has been everything but kid-friendly. In fact, it's been hostile."

Continuing to quote from the item distributed by the Children's Defense Fund last week, it says "This Republican agenda threatens the education and well-being of our Nation's children, effectively abandoning the promise and future of America. Without healthy children in good public schools, our businesses will not be able to compete in the new global economy, and yet throughout, the Republican agenda essentially balances the budget on the backs of our Nation's future."

We heard our Republican colleagues talk before about how important it is to get rid of the deficit and to deal with the budget so children in the future can not have the burden of having to pay for those programs. The debt must be eliminated because of the children in the future.

It seems to be a pattern of the Republican Party that is escalating. It is the children in the womb, they are very much concerned about unborn children. We all should be, because you do not have children unless they get born. But they are excessively preoccupied by the unborn children, but the minute the children arrive and get here, they abandon them.

They do not care what happens to them in terms of the WIC program and the program for infants and mothers. They do not care what happens in terms of mothers who have to stay home to take care of their children. They do not care what happens when the children go to school and have a school lunch program. It is the unborn child, and then it is the child in the future, posterity.

Republicans are concerned about children who are unborn and they are concerned about children who have not been conceived yet, those in the far future. There is something wrong with the sudden lapse and the gap between the child who arrives here and the child in the womb and the children of

posterity, there is something radically wrong with the reasoning.

I wrote a little rap poem on April 19 which talked about this, and said that it seems that we are sending a message to the fetuses, and I place the situation in terms of a message from the newborn to the fetus. The newborn is saying "I've arrived here and I find all this hostility. Stay in there. Don't come out here. Don't come into this mean world, you know. "There is a real danger here." The people who talk about a right to life make the right to life just an empty slogan unless it is accompanied by programs and policies which provide an even playing field of opportunity for all children.

At that time I was announcing on April 19, 1996, my support, my applause for the Children's Defense Fund's call for a Stand for Children. Quoting from my entry into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on that day, I said, "On June 1st the Children's Defense Fund is sponsoring a great summit in Washington called Stand for Children. This is a gathering which deserves the support of all Members of Congress. We should all join the Stand for Children on this specific day, and for all the days before and after June 1, Congress should refocus on the business of protecting our most precious resource, children outside of their mothers wombs, as well as children inside the wombs." The I go on to give the rap poem which I will read later.

To close out this particular item that was circulated last week by the Children's Defense Fund, and I quote again from it, "Fortunately, the Democrats in Congress and the Clinton administration have successfully fought off many of the damaging cuts that the Republicans have put forth. For example, Democrats have successfully restored most of the education cuts endorsed by the GOP, and President Clinton has vetoed many damaging cuts in children's programs in the GOP welfare and budget reconciliation bills."

This is material that was distributed, despite the fact that this is a non-partisan group. They just stated the facts. Those are the facts. This is a nonpartisan group that said they did not want any politicians to speak. I accepted that. I was there Saturday. I did not think it was a great problem that politicians could not speak, Republicans or Democrats. There were many other voices that ought to be heard. But I do have a problem if you tell people not to follow politicians, not to follow any politicians, to put us all in one category. That is very unreal and dangerous.

Let me just return to this list. In this list of the top 10 votes in the 104th Congress, there are some things that are left out. There are some things that we need to add. If needs to go beyond 10. We need to bring to light the fact that programs that will impact on children go beyond these 10 areas.

The cuts in public library aid, public libraries receive very tiny amounts of

Federal money, but those amounts are very important. We even cut those tiny amounts. We get the best bargain in education in public libraries. For the amount of money spent we get a greater return than anywhere else. They were cut.

Summer youth employment, they did mention that in the 10 points that were made. The destruction of opportunity to learn standards. Most people do not know that the Congress passed a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which had in it an item which called for States to establish opportunity to learn standards.

This is all voluntary. States do not have to do it, but if States are going to participate in the program where they establish curriculum standards and they establish testing standards, the curriculum standards and testing standards focus on the children. The onus is on the children to live up to the curriculum standards. They are going to be tested. We added, after much debate, a set of standards called opportunity to learn standards. Opportunity to learn standards mean exactly what they say, the opportunity to learn.

You must have standards which talk about what opportunities to learn are you providing at the State level. Are the teachers qualified? That is an important opportunity to learn standard. Are the buildings safe and conducive and modernized so that learning can take place? Does the library have books that are current, or do they have 35-year-old history books or geography books that are dangerous for children to read, because they read the wrong information?

Do they have laboratories for science and math? That is important. Do they have laboratories for science? Do they have supplies for the laboratories? All of these things are basic, commonsense items. That is what opportunity to learn standards are all about.

□ 1845

We had a great debate during the time when we were reauthorizing the Elementary Secondary Education Act, a great debate among ourselves in the House. Then when the bill was in conference, there was a great debate between the House and the Senate, and those of us who are in favor of opportunity to learn standards prevailed in the authorization process in the 103d Congress. Lo and behold, it violated all the rules. The appropriations process, this Republican majority, through a stealth attack, in the conference process took out the opportunity to learn standards.

They do not want to talk about ways in which we can help children to learn and have that discussed openly the way we discuss testing children. We want to test children until they are tested right out of school, but we do not want to provide a discussion of what are qualified teachers and what is an appropriate set of learning aids in science and math. We do not want to deal with

the responsibilities of the local education agency, the responsibilities of the State government, and the responsibilities of the Federal Government.

So the destruction of opportunity to learn standards should be added to this list of votes that hurt kids.

Last Thursday, in the reauthorization of the Individual with Disabilities Education Act that I referred to before at the committee level, the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee reauthorized a bill which has a drastic set of cuts and a drastic set of negative provisions which do not advance current law but, in my opinion, they build a beachhead for later destruction of the Federal Government's participation in programs to educate children with disabilities.

I sit on that committee, and I am very much aware of the dangers there; and, of course, the Children's Defense Fund could not know exactly the extent of what was happening at the committee level, because the process has gone on for several weeks.

I congratulate the chairman of the committee for holding up the process for 3 weeks while a number of programs that deal with children with disabilities, representatives of organizations, tried to get them to change critical parts of the bill. They at least entered into a dialogue, and for 3 weeks the process did not go forward while the debate took place and the groups were involved.

Finally, in very critical areas, the majority of the groups agreed; and they were overridden by two or three who did not agree on certain critical provisions of the bill.

One of those critical provisions was the provision related to the cessation of services for children. Children with disabilities now are protected in current law. You cannot expel them and throw them out on the streets no matter what happens in terms of their problems in the classroom. You have to, if you are going to remove them from the classroom, most all States now under the Federal law are obligated to provide alternative education. You cannot just throw them out.

In many States, they have State laws which say you cannot throw children out. Whether they have disabilities or not, you cannot throw them out of school without providing them some alternatives.

But there are many States that do not have it. Those children who have disabilities and would for some reason be expelled would be thrown into a situation where it would be very difficult for them to, without the support of public schools and public education, get an education or to get acclimated. They would be thrown out there on the streets and abandoned.

That is the worst thing we can do. We do not want to go in the direction of Brazil and Colombia, South American nations which, by ignoring their children, set up a situation where later on their children are despised and demon-

ized, and later on they are murdered. We want to maintain some sense of civilization as reflected through how we care for the least among us.

So I made a statement at the beginning of the markup, which to save time I will just read it here. It summarizes some of my concern with IDEA, Individuals with Disability Education Act reauthorization. I said, and I quote, at the beginning of this markup, "It would be useful for all concerned if we made a sincere effort to move away from sensational headlines about special education and establish a more objective perspective as advocates for public education."

I am talking about sensational headlines that appeared related to special education being too costly or special education threatening mainstream education because it takes money away from the children who are in regular classrooms. That is a situation that has been generated from this Capitol. This is a situation that the Republican majority has blown out of proportion and made it appear that there is a great threat out there to mainstream education flowing from special education concerns.

"This markup is for the purpose of reauthorizing a program for the most needy children in America. In the overall constellation of Federal funding, IDEA receives only a tiny amount of money. \$2.3 billion is proposed for grants to States in fiscal year 1996. Please consider this amount within the context of recent exposures of an unaudited slush fund at the CIA which totaled \$4 billion."

Some \$2.3 billion is proposed for grants to the States in the fiscal 1996 budget for children with disabilities. That is less than the \$4 billion that the CIA had unaudited in the slush fund that they did not know they had. Let us keep our perspective straight. How can we be bankrupting America by providing \$2.3 billion to the States for children with disabilities when we have lying around in the CIA \$4 billion that we do not even know we have?

"At the Federal Reserve Bank the GAO discovered an unaudited rainy day fund which totaled \$3.7 billion even though that agency has not had a rainy day in 79 years."

The rainy day fund has been there. They have been adding to it. That \$3.7 billion is far more than we appropriated for children with disabilities, sitting around at the Federal Reserve Bank unutilized. Let us keep our perspective and understand.

The problem is not that there is too much money going to special education needs. The problem is there is too little money going to education as a whole. The problem is that we have to be concerned, members of the Education Committee and members of all other committees, with where the money is going. Education cannot be examined in isolation.

The people in the education community have come to see the budget for

education as being the universe that they have to deal with. So they are looking at the total amount for education at present and saying that special education is getting too much of what is available. Let us make more available so that you do not have to cannibalize each other. You do not have to take from one to give to the other. We have the money in the CIA. We have the money in the Federal Reserve Bank. We have the \$13 billion additional funding for the Defense Department.

My colleagues from the other side who spoke before never said a word about increasing defense by \$13 billion. We talked about the need to balance the budget and need to be more responsible in government expenditures, but nobody said anything about \$13 billion more than the President asked, which for has been added to the defense budget this year.

Quoting again from my own statement, "Against the background of continuing monumental waste in B-2 bomber programs and excessive farm subsidies, we should alert all members of the education community to the fact that there is no need to participate in cannibalization among education programs. Special education will not bankrupt the overall education budget. Long overdue increases for all education programs is the solution. Demonization and scapegoating special education promulgates a disaster for overall education funding."

"This bill," the reauthorization of IDEA, which is to come to the floor of the House in the next two weeks, "attacks special education as if it was an enemy. This is a fatal flaw."

"At the time I think it is appropriate to consider the conclusion of Kathleen Boudy, Co-director of the Center for Law and Education, and I quote from her and her closing comment on the present reauthorization bill.

"Despite the earnest efforts of many who have attempted to improve this bill and existing law, it is our view that such efforts have ultimately been unsuccessful in both the Senate and the House, and that Part B of IDEA, regardless of its shortcomings, should be left alone in 1996."

It is a bill that was not broken, did not need to be repaired, but is being drastically overhauled in the direction of cutting back on the commitment of the Federal Government. It will be to the detriment of children. The neediest children in America are children who are in special education programs. It is to their detriment that we have embarked upon a course which may end up cutting back on a long-term commitment to children in special education.

The Senate has a bill that has not yet passed the House. It passed out of committee. We hope that the Senate is understood by all the people out there that care about education and care about children, we hope they understand that it is not too late.

Certainly people in the Children's Defense Fund ought to put this on their list and consider calling it to the attention of people that care about children in America. If you stand for children, it is still possible to deal with the House legislation H.R. 3268 and the Senate bill S. 1578, part of the revisions of special education law, Public Law 94-142. It is still possible that we can wake up the decisionmakers here in Washington to the fact that they will hurt children if they go ahead with the provisions in this bill which call for a cessation of services completely for children who are disciplined for certain problems.

Without getting into a debate about what those particular kinds of problems are, there are some, and I agree with them wholeheartedly, who take the position that we should never cease services for children, services of any kind. Cessation of services, the throwing of children in the street, will lead us step by step into where Brazil and Colombia are at this point.

The provision which relates to the cessation of services is due to the fact that it is perceived that large amounts of disruption in classrooms is ruining the education process, and they want to stop disruption, whether it is by children with disabilities or anybody else.

Discipline is a major problem in education. Discipline is what I hear teachers talk about all the time. In this Capitol, we ought to address the problem of discipline. The States do not seem to be able to solve the problem and bring it down to reasonable dimensions. The cities, the local education agencies are not able to deal with it and bring it down to a reasonable dimension. It goes on and on, the problem with discipline.

So why not deal with the problem of discipline without invading special education? Special education suffers because large numbers of children who are discipline problems are classified as having a disability. I have complained year in and year out about large numbers of African-American males who have problems of one kind that lead to discipline problems being shunted off into a category called emotionally disturbed.

We took steps when we reauthorized the bill several years ago to begin to deal with this in a constructive way. We wanted to bring more African-American teachers into the system. We had grants for that. Historically, black colleges were encouraged to get involved in training of teachers of children with disabilities.

We wanted to get mothers and families and communities more in tune to what was involved in the way programs for children with disabilities, special education programs operate so that they would not be victimized one way or the other. The children who needed the service should have the proper identification, and they should be placed. Children who did not need spe-

cial education should not be shunted there because they have certain discipline problems.

□ 1900

All of those things are cut out of the bill. The cessation of services was one very important item that we lost on. The majority of the groups that had debated the problem, had discussed the problem with representatives of the Republican majority in the final analysis said they could not accept the reauthorization bill as it is considering that it has the cessation of services.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter addressed to the Honorable WILLIAM F. GOODLING, chairman of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, from the long list of organizations which includes the National Association of School Administrators, the National Education Association, National Parent Teacher Association, Council for Exceptional Children and many, many others. I would like to enter it in its entirety into the RECORD.

MAY 22, 1996.

Hon. WILLIAM F. GOODLING,
Chairman, Committee On Economic and Educational Opportunities, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Our organizations believe that all students, even those who break school rules, should receive educational and related services. In that spirit, we urge your strong support for including provisions in the reauthorization of the IDEA that ensure all students have access to appropriate educational opportunities. Providing quality educational opportunities to children and youth is a critical component in the development of both individual achievement and in achieving a highly skilled, competitive workforce.

The fact that students with disabilities have unique needs is recognized through the policy and practice of collaboration and individualized education programs. (IEPs). Our organizations support provisions that would help schools balance the rights of students with disabilities with the need to maintain order and discipline in the schools through preventive measures such as appropriate behavioral interventions, additional classroom and student supports, adequate financial support and other intervention strategies. Should preventive measures not prove adequate, however, we believe it is imperative that continuing educational and related services be provided to all students—even those who need to be served in alternative settings due to suspensions or expulsions from the regular settings—in order to help such students better adapt socially and educationally.

We urge you, as the author of the reauthorization bill for IDEA, to include language that will ensure access to educational and related services for all students with disabilities, even when they violate school discipline rules or policies.

Sincerely,

American Association of School Administrators, National Education Association, National Parent Teacher Association, Council for Exceptional Children, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Easter Seal Society, Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, National Association of Protection and Advocacy Systems, Learning Disabilities Association, Brain Injury Association.

American Psychological Association, Adapted Physical Activity Council, National Consortium of Physical Education and Recreation For Individuals with Disabilities, National Therapeutic Recreation Association, National Coalition on Deaf-Blindness, American Council of the Blind, Children and Adults with Attention Deficit Disorders, American Occupational Therapy Association, American Association on Mental Retardation, Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health, American Academy of Audiology, National Mental Health Association, National Association of Developmental Disabilities Councils, National Parents Network on Disabilities, Association for Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired, National Association of School Psychologists, American Foundation for the blind, American Association of University Affiliated Programs, Joseph P. Kennedy Jr. Foundation, American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry.

Justice For All, The Arc, Council of Great City Schools, National Association of the Deaf, Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, National Association of School Nurses, Washington PAVE, Project PROMPT, Vermont Parent Information Center.

Special Education Action Committee, Parent Information Center of Delaware, Federation for Children with Special Needs, Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center, Inc., Very Special Arts, American Counseling Association, American Physical Therapy Association, Council of Schools For The Blind, National Council On Independent Living, CAUSE.

Center for Access to Resources and Education, National Coalition For Students With Disabilities Education and Legal Defense Fund, National Down Syndrome Congress, Systematic Training of Military Parents, Washington State Special Education Coalition.

On the other very important controversial point that I spoke on, personnel standards, children with disabilities are now in a situation where they require people who have special training. That has been recognized for decades. We have steadily had programs to develop more teachers, to develop more people who are able to deal with these problems. This legislation all of a sudden, we not only cut out the development programs and the requirement for personnel development but the Republican majority has put in a waiver of the requirements, the qualifications can be waived for individuals. The waiver is an open door to a complete retreat from any quality standards for the personnel. Just as children who are in math and science classes should be taught by teachers who majored in math and science in college, we think that children who have special problems with respect to disabilities ought to be taught and handled by teachers and personnel who have had training in that area. The waiver says that you do not have to do it anymore. Yes, the waiver says that it is for a 3-year period, that unqualified individuals can teach children who have disabilities for 3 years only. For 3 years you can destroy a lot of lives. And the waiver is

such that large numbers of people will get these 3-year waivers.

The problem is money. School boards and local education agencies will see themselves saving large amounts of money by accepting unqualified people, giving the waivers, saving the money. In the meantime the children are the victims of unqualified personnel who do not know what they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I again made a statement which I would like to read in its entirety:

This amendment concerns a provision which is at the core of the Federal Government's commitment to a free and appropriate education for children with disabilities. Without properly trained personnel, the best that children with disabilities can expect is to be warehoused. The worst that will happen under the tutelage of the untrained and inexperienced will be psychological and emotional damage, as well as a substandard education.

In a letter from the Center for Law and Education which I am attaching to this statement, a co-director concludes that we should just abandon this effort and leave the bill alone.

I would like to strongly echo these sentiments. IDEA, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, was not broken. The current law did not need to be overhauled. The current law did not need to be replaced. This bill is not a reauthorization. The bill that passed out of committee last Thursday is an attack to establish a beachhead. From this beachhead the Republican majority, which has already drastically indicated its contempt for all public education, will attempt a total annihilation of Federal support for special education.

Like a sledgehammer pounding away at a thumb tack, massive power is being brought to bear on programs for the education of children with disabilities, a very tiny component of public education in America. A slander campaign waged against special education has generated distorted perceptions which scapegoat a very productive and beneficial program. Despite these distorted perceptions, special education is in no way a threat to mainstream education. This tiny minority deserves fairer treatment at the hands of the education majority. This minimal program for the most needy students also deserves continued support from both Democrats and the Republican majority.

I congratulate the community of people with disabilities and their consensus group which launched a monumental effort to maintain workable legislation consistent with the original intent of the law and bowing to no partisan dogmas. The language before us is in many ways improved beyond the original doctrinaire attack as a result of the efforts of these negotiators. But the revisions do not go far enough in several fundamental areas. Personnel standards is one of these areas.

This bill, with premeditated stealth, wrecks the carefully developed protec-

tions which have been thoughtfully crafted over many years with the input of both recipients and providers of service to children with disabilities. Obliteration of these requirements is a contemptuous and hostile act against children with disabilities. No member of this committee would ever support the wholesale waiver of standards for science and math teachers in the schools located in his or her district. Waiving personnel standards only serves one ignoble purpose: Compliance can be achieved cheaply. For less money, the quality of teaching and other services will most likely be adulterated.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit the statement in its entirety for the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF HON. MAJOR R. OWENS "RESTORATION OF PERSONNEL STANDARDS" MAY 30, 1996

This amendment concerns a provision which is at the core of the federal government's commitment to a Free and Appropriate Education for children with disabilities. Without properly trained personnel the best that children with disabilities can expect is to be warehoused; the worst that will often happen under the tutelage of the untrained and inexperienced will be psychological and emotional damage, as well as a substandard education.

In a letter from the Center For Law and Education which I am attaching to this statement the Co-Director of the Center, Kathleen Boundy, concludes as follows:

"Despite the earnest efforts of many who have attempted to improve this bill and existing law, it is our view that such efforts have ultimately been unsuccessful in both the Senate and the House and that Part B of IDEA, regardless of its shortcomings, should be left alone in 1996."

I would like to strongly echo these sentiments. IDEA was not broken. The current law did not need to be overhauled. The Current law did not need to be replaced. This bill is not a reauthorization. This bill is an attack to establish a beachhead. From this beachhead the Republican Majority, which has already dramatically indicated its contempt for all public education, will attempt a total annihilation of federal support for Special Education.

Like a sledge hammer pounding away at a thumb tack, massive power is being brought to bear on programs for the education of children with disabilities, a very tiny component of public education in America. A slander campaign waged against Special Education has generated distorted perceptions which scapegoat a very productive and beneficial program. Despite these distorted perceptions, Special Education is in no way a threat to mainstream education. This tiny minority deserves fairer treatment at the hands of the education majority. This minimal program for the most needy students, also deserves continued support from both Democrats and the Republican majority.

I congratulate the community of people with disabilities and their consensus group which launched a monumental effort to maintain workable legislation consistent with the original intent of the law and bowing to no partisan dogmas. The language before is in many ways improved beyond the original doctrinaire attack as a result of the efforts of these negotiators. But the revisions do not go far enough in several fundamental areas. Personnel standards is one of these areas.

This bill, with premeditated stealth, wrecks the carefully developed protections

which have been thoughtfully crafted over many years with the input of both recipients and providers of service to children with disabilities. Obliteration of these requirements is a contemptuous and hostile act against children with disabilities. No member of this Committee would ever support the wholesale waiver of standards for science and math teachers in the schools located in his or her district. Waiving personnel standards only serves one ignoble purpose: Compliance can be achieved cheaply. For less money the quality of teaching and other services will most likely be adulterated. Children will most certainly be shortchanged. But on the surface, the letter of the law will be met.

In this bill funding for staff recruitment and development has been gutted. Efforts to overcome the critical shortage of minority staff have been abandoned. The problem of qualified staff shortages will be solved superficially and dishonestly by simply ignoring the need to employ persons who are qualified. We are civilized leaders agreeing to a savage solution. We would never take the same route to resolve a problem of a shortage of airline pilots or a shortage of open-heart surgeons.

At this point it should be noted that the current law contains a component which would have offset the negative consequences of the waiver of personnel standards, but this has also been greatly reduced. Provisions which facilitated the recruitment, training and certification of personnel have been adulterated. During the negotiations with the Consensus group it was generally assumed that these provisions would remain substantially as they are in current law. The Republican Majority, unfortunately, violated the good faith effort of the negotiators and destroyed and most relevant parts of this component.

In summary, I urge the adoption of this amendment as the first giant step away from this bill's oppressive posture against children with disabilities. This oppressive posture of the Republican Majority generates an impact which is destructive and deadly.

Let us move forward in a bi-partisan spirit to ensure that this body creates the proper federal legislation and resources to provide quality programs and quality staff for children with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that standing for children means that you stand for children with disabilities, and you stand for policies that are going to promote children across the board. We are fortunate in this Nation that we presently do stand for children. Never let us go to the other extreme and be in the position of Brazil and Colombia where they are killing children instead of standing for children. We stand for children and we should continue to stand for children.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ABERCROMBIE) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)