

football scholarship. Back then we did not have one woman who was on an athletic scholarship. They were on the sidelines. Back then young women, because of their gender and despite their talent, were denied access to the game. Women were discouraged from playing catch or mixing it up or from clinching the title. In 1963 that was the reality for women.

Today we are in a new world. Today young girls are turning out in droves to see the Silver Bullets, hungry to watch women play baseball. Seventy-six thousand fans pack a stadium in Athens, GA to watch the U.S. women's Olympic soccer team defeat China for the gold. The daughters of women who were relegated to half-court, 3-dribble basketball just began just this week their inaugural season of the WNBA, a women's professional basketball league.

Everywhere in this country girls are playing sports with an intensity their mothers did not have the opportunity to learn. The lessons they are learning, that growing sense of physical power, is strengthening the rest of their lives.

We are all familiar with the clichés that we want our daughters to grow up so they can be doctors and lawyers and Presidents of the United States, and now basketball players. But that is really what this law and this struggle is all about.

We have spent the last 25 years not only fighting barriers, bringing down walls and opening doors, but also trying to establish a norm. With every freshman class, with every graduation, young women are establishing another layer of accomplishments, another layer of firsts and another layer for younger girls to see, so that by the time their turn comes, they feel not fortunate to be given a chance, but that it is their right to have a chance.

We are reaching a crucial point where young girls are not only being given the resources they need to succeed but also can look to role models, people like the Mia Hamm and Sally Rides and Sheryl Swoopes, and then look inside themselves and wonder if they have those same abilities.

Before title IX in 1972, only 9 percent of the medical degrees went to women, only 1 percent of the dental degrees went to women, only 7 percent of the law degrees. Now women are receiving 38 percent of medical and dental degrees and 43 percent of law degrees.

Title IX has opened doors and allowed our daughters to entertain big dreams. For many girls these dreams are evolving into reality. But while we are getting there, we are not there yet. There is still a wage gap. There are still too many doors closed to young women today.

There are still too many places where title IX is not enforced. Twenty-five schools are now under scrutiny by the Women's National Law Center for being out of compliance. And even though in the last 5 years women's sports participation at the collegiate

level has soared to 37 percent, women are still only getting 23 percent of the operating expenditures.

Oftentimes we can get lost in those statistics, but if we think of these not as statistics but as our daughters, and if we think of the wage gap not as a pie chart but as a message of worth, and if we think of the operating expenditures not as numbers on a ledger but as the tools and the support our daughters need to succeed, then we can begin to understand where we are today, why it is not good enough, why we have to move forward.

Today millions of girls play on the soccer fields, are involved in little leagues and compete in gymnastics. They do not know that title IX is the reason that they have these opportunities, but title IX was passed for them. From the field and from their games and from their meets, they will learn lessons about commitment and concentration and energy which they will use throughout their lives. In the next 25 years, may we help our daughters use these lessons to continue laying the foundation for a better tomorrow.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am just pleased to join my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] in offering today a bipartisan resolution which not only celebrates the 25th anniversary of title IX but also looks to the future with a promise to uphold and enforce this legislation in order to ensure equal opportunity for all Americans.

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

[Mr. KOLBE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SUPPORT H.R. 1984 TO LIMIT POWER OF EPA

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

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to beg of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in an effort, and I have spoken on this during the last several weeks. We have a bill called H.R. 1984. That is the number. I thought it was very unusual that we end up with the No. 1984, because there are those of my colleagues who remember the George Orwell novel about Big Brother peering into our lives. This really is to deal with Big Brother peering into our lives in the form of the Environmental Protection Agency.

All of us agree with the goals, I believe, of the EPA and, that is, that we should have clean water to drink and to use and we should have clean air to breathe, and we have all been working to that end. However, many of us are concerned that at a time when States

across this Nation are working to clean the air, when the Clean Air Amendments of 1990 and the Clean Air Act itself are showing themselves to be working, than here comes the EPA, about to change the finish line in the middle of this race. We fear that they are about to propose a tightening of the standards for something called particulate matter. Particulate matter is a fancy word for the soot that comes out of the smokestacks of this Nation or for the dust that blows off of fields in agricultural areas. And also for changing the standards for something called ozone which is nothing more than smog.

□ 2330

Now you see the problem is that industries in this Nation, that locales and States are implementing plans aiming at hitting the targets that have been set since 1987 in some instances, and now at a time when we are about to come into compliance, when many counties across this great Nation are beginning to come into compliance, the EPA is about to take an action we feel that will throw 400 counties out of compliance.

Now what happens if your county, Mr. and Mrs. Congressman, is one of those counties or the counties in your region are those counties well, what happens is first of all that your State that is about to implement a plan to clean up the air says wait a minute, we are going to stop, we are not going to take the action to clean up the air, and as a result we will have dirtier air for a longer period of time. The other result is if you are out of compliance the day these new regulations will take effect it will be harder for the local governing body, whether it is the county commissioners, whether it is a city, a township, a bureau, would not be able to issue building permits to industries that want to expand or new industries that want to locate in your region, and so the dramatic impact, even if they said let U.S. Put these new regulations on the book but we are not going to enforce them today, does not matter because the day those regulations are put on the books industries and local government leaders are going to have to begin to react to them in ways that will cost jobs across this Nation, in ways that will cause local governing bodies to spend more money, industry to spend more money.

And so this bill that I am talking about that I would like to encourage my colleagues to join me on is a bipartisan bill. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] on the Republican side, myself on the Democratic side, along with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER] have introduced H.R. 1984 that says simply this: Rather than spending billions of dollars and really ending up having dirtier air for a longer period of time and costing a million jobs or more, let U.S. Authorize the expenditure of \$75 million a year over the next 5 years, and during

that period of time we will ask that we build the new PM monitors that will measure the air across this Nation.

Right now for this particulate matter there are only 50 monitors that exist across the whole country. Let U.S. Build enough monitors that we can get the scientific data and that we can then analyze it.

The reason the EPA is moving in this direction is that they were sued by the American Lung Association that said every 5 years under the act you are supposed to go back and take a look at this. Does not mean you have to change the standards, does not mean you have to tighten the standards, but every 5 years you have to go back and review the standards, and they said, EPA, you have not done this since 1987, and now we are in 1997, so it has been 10 years. And what we are saying is that until you build those new monitors, until you deploy those monitors across this Nation, gather the data, another 5 years will pass.

Why do we want to spend billions of dollars changing the target of clean air in the middle of this race to achieve it? It makes no sense at all.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would request that our colleagues join me and say for 5 years let U.S. Not implement the new regulations, let U.S. Get good science, let U.S. Study the issue, let U.S. Deploy these monitors, and then after 5 years we will take a look at this issue again and the health and the air of this Nation will be much better for it.

REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE DURING THE 104TH CONGRESS

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

MR. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to transmit herewith, pursuant to clause 1(d) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, a report on the activities of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence during the 104th Congress.

REPORT

This report covers the activities of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence during the One Hundred Fourth Congress. Larry Combest (Republican, Texas) served as Chairman; Norman D. Dicks (Democrat, Washington) served as Ranking Democratic Member.

In carrying out its mandate from the House regarding oversight of U.S. intelligence and intelligence-related activities, the Committee created two subcommittees:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN INTELLIGENCE, ANALYSIS AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

Jerry Lewis (Republican, California), Chairman

C.W. Bill Young (Republican, Florida)
Porter J. Goss (Republican, Florida)
Bud Shuster (Republican, Pennsylvania)
Bill McCollum (Republican, Florida)
Michael N. Castle (Republican, Delaware)
Ronald D. Coleman (Democrat, Texas)
Bill Richardson (Democrat, New Mexico)
Julian C. Dixon (Democrat, California)
David E. Skaggs (Democrat, Colorado)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TECHNICAL AND TACTICAL INTELLIGENCE

Robert K. Dornan (Republican, California), Chairman

James V. Hansen (Republican, Utah)
Jerry Lewis (Republican, California)
Bud Shuster (Republican, Pennsylvania)
Bill McCollum (Republican, Florida)
Michael N. Castle (Republican, Delaware)
Nancy Pelosi (Democrat, California)
Norman D. Dicks (Democrat, Washington)
Robert G. Torricelli (Democrat, New Jersey)

David E. Skaggs (Democrat, Colorado)

The stated purpose of H. Res. 658 of the 95th Congress, which created the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, was to establish a committee "to oversee and make continuing studies of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities and programs of the United States Government and to submit to the House appropriate proposals for legislation and report to the House concerning such intelligence and intelligence-related activities and programs."

H. Res. 658 also indicated that the Committee "shall make every effort to assure that the appropriate departments and agencies of the United States provide informed and timely intelligence necessary for the executive and legislative branches to make sound decisions affecting the security and vital interests of the Nation. It is further the purpose of this resolution to provide vigilant legislative oversight over the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States to assure that such activities are in conformity with the Constitution and laws of the United States."

REPORT

SCOPE OF COMMITTEE REVIEW

U.S. intelligence and intelligence-related activities under the jurisdiction of the Committee include the National Foreign Intelligence Program (NFIP), the Joint Military Intelligence Program (JMIP) and the Department of Defense Tactical Intelligence and Related Activities (TIARA).

The National Foreign Intelligence Program consists of activities in the following departments, agencies or other intelligence elements of the government: (1) the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA); (2) the Department of Defense; (3) the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA); (4) the National Security Agency (NSA); (5) the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO); (6) the Departments of the Army, Navy and Air Force; (7) the Department of State; (8) the Department of Treasury; (9) the Department of Energy; (10) the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI); (11) the Drug Enforcement Administration; and (12) the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA).

The Joint Military Intelligence Program (JMIP) was established in 1995 to provide integrated program management of defense intelligence elements that support defense-wide or theater-level consumers. Included within JMIP are aggregations created for management efficiency and characterized by similarity, either in intelligence discipline (for example, Signals Intelligence, Imagery Intelligence) or function (for example, satellite support or aerial reconnaissance). The programs comprising JMIP also fall within the jurisdiction of the National Security Committee.

The Department of Defense Tactical Intelligence and Related Activities (TIARA) are a diverse array of reconnaissance and target acquisition programs that are a functional part of the basic military force structure and provide direct information support to military operations. TIARA, as defined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of De-

fense, include those military intelligence activities outside the defense intelligence program that respond to requirements of military commanders for operational support information as well as to national command, control, and intelligence requirements. The programs comprising TIARA also fall within the jurisdiction of the National Security Committee.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACTS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1996 AND 1997

During the 104th Congress, the Committee authorized funding and personnel levels for fiscal years 1996 and 1997. This activity was carried out at the full Committee level, rather than through a separate subcommittee, as had been the practice in past years.

The Committee conducted detailed and extensive reviews of the President's fiscal year 1996 and fiscal year 1997 budget requests for intelligence and intelligence-related activities. These reviews included substantive and programmatic hearings member briefings and numerous staff briefings. The Committee conducted hearings organized across functional lines within the Intelligence Community rather than by agency. This permitted the Committee to take a broader view of each of the issues and analyze how the various intelligence functions relate to one another.

Testimony on the President's budget submission was taken from the Director of Central Intelligence; the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence (CI); the Directors of the DIA, NSA and the FBI; and major intelligence program managers.

The Committee began its review of these budget submissions with the view that the Committee's recommended authorization levels for the past several years had been driven to some degree by political considerations as to an "acceptable" intelligence budget level. For the fiscal years 1996-1997, the Committee emphasized the future needs and requirements of the Intelligence Community, believing firmly that the U.S. must start building now for the Intelligence Community we will need in the 21st century.

Four themes were central to the Committee's budget deliberations: (1) evaluating each budget line solely on the merits of that program; (2) eschewing the practice of establishing an arbitrary budget ceiling and then forcing program trade-offs to remain within the ceiling; (3) giving increased emphasis to "downstream" activities (the processing, exploitation and dissemination of intelligence data and analysis) in order to create a better balance between these activities and collection; and (4) thinking about longer term intelligence priorities.

As a result of these themes and its detailed reviews, the Committee recommended very modest increases for both fiscal years in order to reverse the decline of past years and to create some stability in which intelligence program managers could make necessary and appropriate plans for the future.

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

The following issues were of special interest to the Committee during the 104th Congress:

IC21: The Intelligence community in the 21st century

IC21 was a major focus of the Committee's activities during the 104th Congress—a review of the roles, functions, missions and capabilities of the Intelligence Community with an emphasis on how well suited these were to likely national security concerns in the 21st century. IC21 started from the premise that the United States continues to need a strong, highly capable and increasingly flexible Intelligence Community and