

bought tanks instead of food. Instead, we used nongovernment food relief agencies to make sure that the food reached the people who needed it most. This is exactly what this amendment would assure: that our food aid goes through responsible, international organizations, not directly to the Communist government of North Korea.

Currently, our food aid to North Korea is sent through the World Food Programme and other international food-relief organizations. The World Food Programme has monitors on the ground in North Korea who closely follow the food deliveries to make sure that the food gets to the starving people.

USAID has come up to Capitol Hill—and has testified before the International Relations Committee—that the majority of the food does get to the innocent civilians who need it most.

While some food may be diverted, cutting off all food and aid will really only hurt the starving people of North Korea. It will not hurt the ruling communists or the North Korea Army.

Finally, I fear that cutting off this aid would endanger the fragile stability on the Korean Peninsula. While we all want to put pressure on the North Korean regime, I do not want to create a situation where North Korea is blocked so much into a corner and its only response would be to come out fighting. Not with 37,000 United States troops on the Korean peninsula. With the United States troops stationed along the DMZ, are we going to get dragged into another Korean War?

Believe me, in no way do I want to "prop up" the North Korean regime. My family and I were victimized by the Communists in the 1950s. But it is not our food aid that is proping up Kim Jong-Il. Our aid is not enough to really subsidize his regime. It is only enough to help feed the truly starving men, women and children in North Korea: those poor people the Communists have ignored.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud the compromise and call on all my colleagues to support the Cox amendment.

RACE RELATIONS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1997

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, July 23, 1997 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A NATIONAL DIALOG ON RACE RELATIONS

A Member of Congress from southern Indiana does not very often have to deal with the problem of race. Looking back over several years it is difficult for me to remember many public discussions of the race issue in my public meetings. And that is probably because in southern Indiana blacks and Hispanics are a small percentage of the population.

Race, nonetheless, is a dominant strain in our national politics, much as it has been since the settlement of America in the 17th Century. This country has long struggled with the meaning of race and the implications of people of different racial backgrounds living and working together. We fought a Civil War over the issue. When I first came to Congress in the middle of the civil rights era in the 1960s, national debate focused on race relations between whites and blacks. Race relations today are more complex, particularly with the large influx of

immigrants from Asia and Central America in the last 20 years. Half a century from now, there will be no majority race in America.

The great challenge of public policy is to lessen historic divisions among the races, to build a country where people of diverse backgrounds can coexist peacefully. Sometimes we confront the issue of race, sometimes we don't. Often it takes a crisis to make us really examine the issue. And even when we do confront it, we have difficulty achieving a national consensus on what exactly to do.

PUBLIC VIEWS ON RACE

Polls suggest that while Americans view race as a serious problem, only one in 10 believes the country faces a racial crisis. Most people, at least most white people, tend to think that there is no race problem or if there is, it is more a problem of individual moral failure than it is of race or racism. Whites also think that the biggest race problem facing the country is the continuation of racial preference policies.

Blacks are far more pessimistic about the racial climate than whites. Three in four white Americans said blacks in their community are treated the same as whites. Only 49% of the blacks agreed. Whites really see very little problem when it comes to opportunities for blacks in jobs, education, and housing. Many blacks see racial discrimination as a fact of life. Most blacks think the government should play a role in addressing the effects of past and present discrimination. Only a minority of whites think that government should make special efforts.

I find in southern Indiana a distinct lack of urgency about racial issues. Many other things are more important to people, such as balancing the budget, creating good jobs, fighting crime, reducing health care costs, and improving educational opportunities. Hoosiers believe race relations have significantly improved since the 1960s. Nonetheless, when matters of race do arise, they can be sharply polarizing.

A NATIONAL DIALOG ON RACE

The challenge is to approach any discussion of racial problems in a manner likely to produce consensus in the country. There has been a trend in recent years toward separation of the races. Blacks and whites may often share a common workplace, but social interaction between the races, whether at school or after work, is limited. The mantra of the civil rights movement used to be integration of the races. Today, there is serious discussion among black and white leaders about the merits of separation and self-help.

President Clinton recently initiated what he hopes to be a national what he hopes to be a national dialog on race by appointing a commission to study ways to improve race relations. He has said he will host public meetings throughout the country to discuss issues of race. Such a dialog may be painful, but also may ultimately be helpful and healing. How the dialogue is carried out makes all the difference. Honesty is critical. It is also important to frame the issues not in terms of conflict, but rather areas of common interest, such as good schools and safe neighborhoods.

My own experience is that the best way to improve relations among races is to have people work together at something they believe both to be worthwhile and important. If you get two adult women, for example, of different races together to talk about the future of their children, you can see the making of harmony and consensus. People who may not believe they have very much in common learn that they really do. A dialogue that simply leaves people feeling that we remain far apart doesn't get us very far.

ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

Some will argue that any national effort to improve race relations must include a strong commitment of federal resources to break

the cycle of poverty, improve schools, and provide jobs. But in today's budget and political climate, that's just not possible. Public policy is focused on cutting the budget and cutting taxes, not on financing massive new government programs. There is no possibility that Congress would approve a massive new social program.

Government can nonetheless play an important role. Expanding opportunities, particularly educational opportunities, must be a top priority. The more Americans who have a full opportunity to participate in a growing community, the stronger the community becomes. Obeying and enforcing the law are also fundamental to improving racial relations. We have a long list of civil rights laws on the books today, but also a backlog of discrimination claims. It is also important to recruit and encourage people of all races for political, civic, and business leadership so we can develop common solutions to our problems.

CONCLUSION

We still have a long way to go before we feel really comfortable working with each other, living with each other, and helping each other solve problems. We have torn down many of the legal barriers in the country. We have not been as successful breaking down the barriers in our hearts and minds.

I do find that Hoosiers, like most Americans, really would like to talk about the racial problems in their communities, in the state, and in the nation. A national dialogue on race which helps reduce the gaps in knowledge and perception will have merit. The right kind of dialogue can help us move forward in dealing with the challenges of race. The wrong kind of dialogue can hold us back.

ON THE INTRODUCTION OF THE TEACHING EXCELLENCE FOR ALL CHILDREN (TEACH) ACT OF 1997

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1997

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer The Teaching Excellence for All Children (TEACH) Act of 1997.

This legislation addresses a long-standing concern that many of our Nation's school children are being taught by teachers who are not qualified to teach in their subject areas. This is a disservice to students, to parents, to the teachers themselves, and to taxpayers.

The problem, documented in several studies, will only get worse as the student population continues to rise along with the demand for ever more new teachers.

Parents have a right to know whether their children are being instructed by qualified teachers. And taxpayers have a right to expect Congress to do all it can to ensure that federal education dollars are being spent in a responsible manner. I believe this legislation addresses both of those important demands.

Under this legislation, states receiving Federal education funds would set clear standards for teacher quality. The bill also will ensure accountability for federally supported teacher education, provide financial rewards to teachers who choose to teach in high-need schools

and who pursue advanced teaching credentials, and establish local community partnerships to help to schools to recruit and retain qualified teachers.

TWO MILLION TEACHERS NEEDED OVER NEXT NINE YEARS

The number of elementary and secondary school students is expected to increase each successive year between now and the year 2006, from the current level of 51.7 million to an all time high of 54.6 million.

The need for qualified teachers will increase accordingly. Between now and 2006, enrollment and teacher retirement together will create demand for an additional 2 million teachers.

The shortage right now of qualified teachers to fill this demand is a significant barrier to students receiving an appropriate education.

TOO MANY TEACHERS ARE NOT FULLY QUALIFIED TO TEACH IN THEIR SUBJECT AREAS

Last September, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future found that one-quarter of classroom teachers were already not fully qualified to teach in their subject areas. An even newer report—forthcoming from the Department of Education—indicates that 36% of teachers have neither a major nor minor in their main teaching field. Both reports show that the problem is even more serious in academic subjects such as math and science and in schools with high numbers of low-income and minority children.

Research evidence suggests that teacher quality is probably the single most important factor influencing student achievement. Now is the time to redouble efforts to ensure that all teachers in our Nation's public schools are properly prepared and qualified and that they also receive the ongoing support and professional development they need to be effective educators.

A FAIR DEAL FOR TEACHERS

Teachers are among the hardest working people in our country and they certainly have one of the most important jobs in our country. The vast majority of teachers deserve our wholehearted admiration, respect, and gratitude.

Unfortunately, our public polices have not always reflected this attitude. As the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development recently pointed out, "teacher education, which encompasses preservice preparation as well as ongoing professional development, has suffered a chronic lack of funding resources, and status in the United States, particularly as compared to education in other professional fields."

In addition, the Teaching for America's Future report pointed out that: "Not only do U.S. teachers teach more hours per day but they also take more work home to complete at night, on the weekends and holidays." At the same time, the report goes on to say that "Other industrialized countries fund their schools equally and make sure there are qualified teachers for all of them by underwriting teacher preparation and salaries. However, teachers in the United States must go into substantial debt to become prepared for a field that in most states pays less than any other occupation requiring a college degree."

I think the public is willing to address these issues. Education tops the list of concerns in most public opinion polls. But at the same time, parents and taxpayers want greater accountability to ensure that any additional re-

sources directed at improving teacher quality have a maximal impact on student achievement.

By coupling support for teachers with enhanced accountability, this bill is a win-win for all those involved—educators, parents, taxpayers and, above all, our Nation's school-children.

125TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF PEARL RIVER, NEW YORK

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 125th anniversary of Pearl River, NY, this year. This is indeed a great moment for the people of this Rockland County, NY community, and I invite my colleagues to join with me in extending our congratulations to the Pearl River community on this momentous occasion.

It was on the 11th day of January, 1872, that a post office was founded in Pearl River, signaling the emergence of a community in that area. Since then it has steadily grown to become the second largest hamlet in the State of New York. Pearl River might well have remained a small, sleepy back-woods locality, had it not been for the coming of the railroad, which literally opened Pearl River to the outside world, allowing the place, and with it the people, to grow and diversify. However, although many things have changed in Pearl River over the last 125 years, one thing still remains the same: Pearl River's pride in its merchants and community. In 1997, a person can walk down the streets of Pearl River and still feel the sense of self-respect and security that was felt all those years ago. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, every year I look forward to the parade held in Pearl River on St. Patrick's day, which according to "The Almanac of American Politics" is the third largest St. Patrick's day parade in the world.

A committee has been set up to oversee Pearl River's anniversary celebrations, in what promises to be an action-packed, fun-filled week of excitement and jubilation. Festivities will begin on Sunday, July 27, 1997, with events for all age groups and interests. The calendar of events is filled with such diverse activities as a bicycle race, musical performances, slide shows, and the cutting of the 125th birthday cake. Celebrations will end with a parade, to be held on Sunday, August 3.

Mr. Speaker, in joining the celebration on this auspicious occasion, I once again invite our colleagues to join with me in extending our greetings and congratulations, and wishing the people of Pearl River continued progress, growth and happiness for the next 125 years.

STAMP OUT BREAST CANCER ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1997

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R.

1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act. The bill would authorize the Postal Service to establish a special postage stamp, priced one cent above the price of ordinary first class postage, the revenues from which would go toward the research of breast cancer. Seventy percent of the profits would go to the breast cancer research at the National Institutes of Health, and the remaining 30 percent would go to the Defense Department where breast cancer research is also conducted.

The importance of breast cancer research cannot be over-emphasized. More than 1.8 million women in America have been diagnosed with cancer. Each year, nearly 50,000 die. Although medical research and greater public awareness have gone a long way toward improving these statistics, through early detection and more effective treatment, the challenge still remains. As you may know, I have long been a strong supporter of legislation that helped promote breast cancer research and treatment. In the 104th Congress I cosponsored a bill that provided Medicare coverage for annual screening of cancer for women over the age of 65. I also supported H.R. 418, the Breast Cancer Early Detection Act, which required Medicare to cover annual mammograms for women over the age of 65.

Now, in the 105th Congress, I rise in support of the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act, an innovative and effective weapon in the battle against breast cancer. The act deserves special praise in two particular aspects. First, the act insures that Federal support for breast cancer research is not decreased, offsetting the increased funds raised through the special postage rate. Second, the act helps increase public awareness and involvement in this worthy cause by allowing them to make voluntary contributions to breast cancer research through their purchase of the stamp. Once again, I state my unwavering support of the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act and urge my fellow Members of Congress to do likewise.

DENYING LEGAL IMMIGRANTS VALUABLE PRENATAL CARE SERVICES ISN'T EVEN PENNY WISE—IT'S JUST POUND FOOLISH

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1997

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to defend the rights of legal immigrants in our country. In particular, I would like to address the potential health care crisis that is threatening the well-being of our legal immigrants and our health care system.

In the quest to shrink the Federal budget deficit, many government programs have been threatened. Many of my Republican colleagues would lead you to believe that eliminating funding for legal immigrant health care is a fiscally and morally responsible way of attacking the deficit. In the new welfare law, my colleagues have done just that, by leaving many health care funding decisions to state governors. As a result, health insurance programs that currently benefit legal immigrants, such as California's Medi-Cal Program, stand to lose funding when money-strapped states refuse to appropriate sufficient funds. Legal immigrant prenatal care is an example of an