

learning experience with a multitude of resources often not found in smaller private schools or a home schooling environment. Those children will likely, and should, continue in their current schools even if vouchers are available.

But for many disadvantaged youth trapped in inner-city schools overrun with drugs and violence, the ability to have a choice would, with absolute certainty, greatly improve their ability to learn.

And for children with special needs or talents, the ability to choose both public and private alternate schools, or home schooling, would allow them to progress far beyond the level of our "one-size-fits-all" current policy.

All this is representative of just how distorted the debate over education has become. Instead of focusing on improving our children's learning levels, success is measured by programs and dollars spent, and by squashing reforms that threaten the monopoly held by powerful special interest groups. It's a debate that I hope changes this year.

Mr. Speaker, we need to shift the focus of Federal education policy back to parents, communities, and States—in that order. We need to encourage reform efforts like school choice. And most importantly, we hope that when our efforts are done, children will begin to learn again in even the poorest and most disadvantaged school districts.

Meanwhile, both the President and the Vice President continue to send their children to private schools instead of the District of Columbia public school system, in spite of denying that same choice for thousands of poor children in the same city.

But Mr. Speaker, we need to be willing to look beyond the issue of just school choice, and into what our States and communities can accomplish if we return real educational freedom to this land. For the last 30 years, we have seen our educational system decline, to a point that many Americans are losing hope that their children will have a future. But if we are just willing to cast aside the political blinders, we will find that we have an unlimited opportunity to bring real improvement to our Nation's schools.

For the last year the House Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee has been trying to determine just how much, and where, the Federal government has been spending on education. What we have discovered is beyond belief.

Last year, 39 separate agencies of the Federal Government were allocated over \$120 billion for at least 763 education programs. And the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service told us they believe there are probably several hundred more programs that they have yet to find.

And what are some of the things that we are spending this educational money on today?

\$3 million for the Intergovernmental Climate Program.

\$1 billion for the Labor Department's Job Corps Training Programs.

\$204 million for Clinton's Americorps volunteer program that is costing us nearly \$30,000 a year per volunteer.

Another \$42 million for Volunteers in Service in America.

\$71 million for the Foster Grandparent Program.

\$10 million for the Inexpensive Book Distribution Program—which is an oxymoron if one ever existed.

\$48 million for the National Center of Education Statistics.

\$8 million for the National Education Dissemination System.

\$311 million for bilingual and immigrant education.

\$86 million for Educational Research and Development.

\$1 million for the Institute of International Public Policy.

\$16 million for National AIDS Education and Training Centers.

\$180 million for Family Planning Services.

\$18 million for overseas schools and colleges.

And this is just the tip of the iceberg. Now, to be sure, there are some very worthwhile expenditures included in the totals, such as funding for our Nation's military academies, along with research grants to colleges and universities from which we derive direct benefits in many areas of our lives.

But imagine what we could do to improve our children's education if we returned this fortune to our local schools.

If my home State of Georgia's share is calculated on the same percentage as the formula agreed on for Medicaid funding by the Nation's 50 governors, including Georgia's Democratic Governor Zell Miller for my friends on the other side of the aisle, this comes to an astounding \$3.16 billion a year in education money for Georgia. And I believe my colleagues from both parties will find the following amazing scenario would ring true for their States as well as Georgia.

Bill Alred, statistical analyst for the Georgia Department of Education in Atlanta, says Georgia school systems spend a grand total of \$5.3 billion on grades Pre-K through 12 in fiscal year 1994, the last year for which full statistics are available. If we kept the money at home instead of sending it to Washington, we could cover nearly 60 percent of the total cost of elementary and secondary education in Georgia.

Even more astounding is the impact the Federal spending could have on our Georgia colleges and universities. Roger Mosshard, assistant vice chancellor of budgets with the Georgia State Board of Regents, says Georgia's university system took in around \$2.5 billion last year from all sources, including tuition fees; payments for room and books; Federal, State, and private grants; and direct funding.

If we kept the Federal spending at home, Georgia could fund its entire university system with over \$500 million to spare, and I think that many of you would find the same true in your State.

That would mean free college for every child who can pass the courses, not just as undergraduates, but through the doctoral level including medical and law school. And not just tuition, but dormitories and meals, rooms, books, lab fees, research, field trips, everything. And this absolutely revolutionary, quantum leap forward, could be funded with what we are already spending.

Now take a long hard look at that list of where that money goes now. Comparing the options, which do you think will help our children best prepare for a global, high technology economy in the 21st century?

I implore my friends on both sides of the aisle to stand up against the special interests, face the future with courage and an open mind instead of fear, and join the fight to bring our schools out of the failed ways of the past, and into a future that is limited only by our ability to see it.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to make education be about our children again—instead of just about supporting bureaucracy.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HALL of Ohio (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. ENSIGN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of personal reasons.

Mr. FLANAGAN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of attending funerals.

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 Members (at the request of Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROHRBACHER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOKE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SERRANO.
Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
Mrs. MALONEY.
Mr. ORTIZ.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. JACOBS.
Mr. MENENDEZ.
Mr. HINCHEY.
Mr. MATSUI.
Mr. BENTSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROHRBACHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
Mr. QUINN.
Mr. ENSIGN.
Mr. GUNDERSON.
Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
Mr. ALLARD.
Mr. SCARBOROUGH, in three instances.
Mr. SHAW.
Mr. BILIRAKIS.
Mr. HASTERT.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 419. An act for the relief of Benchmark Rail Group, Inc, and

H.R. 701. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey lands to the city of Rolls, Missouri.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NORWOOD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCINTOSH, in two instances.
Mr. TATE.
Mr. BLUTE.
Mr. MCDERMOTT.
Mr. FARR in California.
Mr. PASTOR.
Mr. TORRES.
Mr. MURTHA.
Mrs. CLAYTON.
Mr. HOKE.
Mr. VENTO.
Mr. FIELDS of Texas.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. KOLBE.
Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

OMISSION FROM THE RECORD

The following was inadvertently omitted from the RECORD of Thursday, July 11, 1996, at Page H7447.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called Defense of Marriage Act.

As I listen to the dire predictions, the "sky is falling" rhetoric and hateful pronouncements, I am reminded of one of the greatest declarations in our Nation's history: We have nothing to fear but fear itself. We have nothing to fear, Mr. Chairman. Same-sex marriage is legal in no jurisdiction in the United States. We have nothing to fear.

The Hawaii case, *Bare versus Lewin* decided 3 years ago and making its way through the appeals process, will not be finally resolved for some time. There is no crisis. We have nothing to fear. Eleven States have already invoked their unquestioned power and enacted laws, objected to same-sex marriage. There is no need for new laws. We really have nothing to fear.

Loving, long-term relationships between men and women or between same-sex couples do not threaten our children, our families or our communities. On the contrary, stable relationships enhance society's ability to raise healthy, engaged, and productive citizens. There is no problem. We have nothing to fear but fear itself.

Many Members of this Chamber are simply afraid to face the changes that are taking place in our society. We cannot run away from change, Mr. Chairman. We cannot embrace fear and scare tactics as society advances and evolves. We have a responsibility to represent all Americans, as Members of the House of Representatives. Let us not be guided by prejudice, ignorance, and fear. Let us not use a segment of our population to employ a political strategy for this election year. Let us act with compassion, strengthen vision.

We have nothing to fear but fear, Mr. Chairman. Oppose this bill.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, to close for our side, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], my friend and colleague.

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

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, somebody may wonder why I or my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] have not taken greater personal umbrage at some of the remarks here. I was thinking a moment ago that there might even be grounds to request that someone's words be taken down because my relationship, that of the gentleman from Massachusetts and, I suspect, others in the House, was referred to, among other things, I believe, as perverse. Surely if we had used those terms in talking about anyone else around here, we would have been sat down in one heck of a hurry.

I am not taking this personally, because I happen to be able, I hope, to put this in some context. I would ask those, anyone listening to this debate this hour of the morning, to listen carefully to the quality and the tone of the words over here and the quality of the tone of the words over here. I would also ask people to wonder how in

God's name could a question like this be divided along partisan lines. There is nothing inherently partisan that I know of about sexual orientation. I do not believe that there is some kind of a misdivision of this question between the aisles, and yet there is a strange imbalance here in the debate and the tone and quality of the debate.

I want to salute some of the folks who have spoken over here, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. We have talked about this before. I marched, although he did not know it at the time, with him in 1963 in the city with Dr. King. I was about as far from Dr. King as I am from the gentleman from Georgia when he delivered that extraordinary speech.

Two years later I marched, although the gentleman did not know it, behind him from Selma to Montgomery. A few years after that, when it was the first march for gay and lesbian rights in Washington in 1979, I was a Member of Congress too damn frightened to march for my own civil rights. Actually, I changed my jogging path so that I could come within view of the march. I thought that was very brave of me at the time.

But what I know is, because I had heard people like the gentleman from Georgia and because I am of the generation, and there were many, who were inspired by Dr. King is that this is, as someone has said, the last unfinished chapter in the history of civil rights in this country, and I know how it is going to come out. I do not know if I am going to live to see the ending, but I know what the ending is going to be. There is, as the gentleman said before me change, there has always been change.

As I observed earlier, the men who wrote the Constitution, to which we all swear our oath here, many of them owned slaves. Slavery was referred to specifically in the Constitution. People of color were property when this country was founded.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 16, 1996, at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4118. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule—Management Official Interlocks Docket Number R-0907—received July 11, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4119. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting notice of final priority for school-to-work