

than the charters in Delaware, which are different than the charter schools in Phoenix and these choices in local communities. The choice in Delaware allows full public school choice so a parent can choose the program and the school and the curriculum that best meets the needs of their child. It is enabling parents to become consumers of education. It is empowering parents. It is empowering students and it is empowering teachers.

One of the most exciting things that is happening is that the National Education Association, the National Education Association, the organization that represents teachers, they are going to get involved in the charter school effort. They are going to start I believe four charter schools in different parts of the country. If anybody should be establishing charter schools, I want our teachers to do it. They should be more knowledgeable and better equipped about what needs to go on in the classroom than almost anybody else in our society, those front-line teachers. I am excited about the opportunity and the learning that we can achieve when the National Education Association sets up its charter schools and how that may be a catalyst for learning and for change that can just go throughout our entire public school system, unleashing teachers from the rules and the regulations and the bureaucrats and the bureaucracies that have been defining for them what they need to do, rather than empowering them to do what they want to do and how they can best help their kids.

Can you imagine empowered teachers working with consumers of education, parents, all focused on what the student needs? What a wonderful opportunity to improve education in America and what a much better picture and what a much more optimistic picture that is for America and American education than one which focuses on bureaucracy and bureaucrats.

ARTS AND EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEKAS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about one of the best things that we can do in education for our children. It has been proven over and over again what a wonderful effect it has on them.

Would it surprise you to know that a child in a school in the United States that has 4 years of arts programs, the verbal scores on the SAT's go up 67 points and the math scores go up 45? Would it amaze you to know that the most important thing we can do to cut the dropout rate and the absenteeism is to have children participate in art, proven over and over and over again.

One of the most important ways that we can give a child self-esteem, and so

many of them need it, is to give them the ability to create. And once again, we have learned over and over and over again that children who create do not destroy.

All this is done in simple programs in schools all over the United States. And every parent that has ever put on the refrigerator door the drawing brought from home or the little plaster cast of the hand, the things that we keep forever, I think probably everything that my children ever touched is stored away in a box somewhere where I like to take them out and look at them for my memories, every parent who has ever experienced that knows the wonderful feeling that that child has of being able to create and to express.

We are losing whole generations of children these days to violence, to absenteeism, to disinterest, the inability to learn.

□ 1900

What happens? A country faced with problems like that, that says at the same time we are going to turn our back on the one simple cheap thing that we can do to benefit these children. Does it work? You bet.

I wrote legislation to educate homeless children in the United States. It is an astonishing fact that every day in this country between 750,000 and 1 million children are homeless. It is not their fault. Their parents used to work; they just do not anymore.

A lot of people do not understand what homelessness means to a child. They can go to a shelter, but they can only stay there a certain number of days and then they have to move. Or they can live in a State park or a local park maybe 2 weeks, and then they have to move. It is in every respect a nomadic existence.

So we have these numbers of children in the United States unable to get their education, because many times they do not have their birth certificate. It was always a very important thing for us in the United States. No child went to school without their inoculations, their birth certificate, and a permanent address.

This was not an indigenous population in the United States. We had never really took any plans or even discussed any plans on what we would do about kids without a permanent address or who maybe lost their birth certificate in one of those many moves they had to make. So a family that is confronted, let us say, with putting food on a table or duplicating a birth certificate for \$10, logically and sensibly is going to opt for food on the table for the children.

So we wrote a little piece of legislation here that said we do not care whether they have their birth certificate or not. We know they are born, they are standing in front of us. We want them educated. The United States cannot go into the next century with children who are unhealthy, untrained, and uneducated.

One of the most important things, again, that has been important to this population and consequently to us is the arts programs, is that we were able to provide these children with the ability to be able to express themselves, to be able to deal with what had happened to them, for the first time to be able to open up to a stranger as they discussed the work that they had done.

So the United States over the years has decided that art may not be too important to us, or that maybe it is only for the rich people who want to go to the museums or the art galleries, and for the rest of us it does not really matter. Well, we could be meeting here in a Quonset hut but we are not.

We are here in a work of art that every day makes all of us who work here not only understand how lucky we are to have been elected, but how blessed we are to work in this building with the American eagle overhead and our first President's wonderful portrait by Stuart over there that every schoolchild knows. The first thing that occurred to me when I got here was that was the original. We have Lafayette over here on the other side and all the wonderful carvings of people who have come before us.

What is it that really tells us what kind of a nation, one that has disappeared off the earth, was like? When we excavate, how do we determine whether they were enlightened, whether they were civilized? Simple. By the art they left behind.

How do we explain to children growing up in the United States what it was like for the pioneers, the people in Conastoga wagons, the people who opened up the West, the patriots? By the art left behind. This Capitol is full of it. This city is full of it. This city is in many ways a work of art.

Can this country afford to be the only industrial country on the face of the earth that determines that art is not important? I do not think so. There is not an industrial country anywhere on the planet that does not have a national budget for the arts; sometimes 1 or 2 percent of their total budget.

What do we do? President Nixon started the National Endowment for the Arts because he thought the United States ought to make some statement as well. And over the years we have whittled away at the money and whittled away at it until now, this year, we are being asked to pay \$136 million for arts programs in every nook and cranny in the United States, \$136 million, which is a great deal less than the United States spends every year for military bands.

It does not amount to a whole lot in the scheme of things when we think about what it does. Let me give my colleagues some idea of what happens there. Let us talk not about the beauty of it but the economy.

The arts support 1.3 million jobs. The nonprofit arts community generates \$36.8 billion annually in economic activity. The arts produces \$790 million

in local government revenue and \$1.2 billion in State government revenue. And for the \$136 million that we hope we can vote this year to put in, we will get back almost \$4 billion in taxes paid into the Federal Treasury.

This is not an idle piece of work. I know of no other thing in this Government, and I have served three terms on the Committee on the Budget, I promise my colleagues I know of no other expenditure that we make that brings back that kind of monetary return. It just does not happen.

So if we add to that what we can do for the children in school, something that we struggle every day with, and we just heard the previous speaker talking about children not being able to read or to talk and all these kinds of things, we can see that some of these programs can open them up and help them to do that. Why would we not want to?

Now, I am not going to ask anyone to take my word for it, because I do not altogether understand it myself. But there is a direct correlation between dance and math. No two ways about it. Today, classical music is supposed to stimulate some part of the brain and that then that individual will have a better idea of spacial concepts. That is wonderful.

We do not know how all this works, but we are right now in the decade of the brain. All these wonderful studies have been taking place and we see how certain parts of the brain light up under certain stimulation and we have found out so much.

We have found out, for one thing, that we have to begin at birth, with a baby, to stimulate it, to educate it. We have a short window of opportunity, really, to open up that little mind to be everything that it can be.

It is critically important that we look at the United States and whether we are going to be a participant in this, in this decade of the brain, or are we again going to turn our backs on it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS]; and then we will next be joined by my colleague from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and my good friend from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] for holding this special order.

Mr. Speaker, in 1965, Congress established the National Endowment for the Arts. The idea behind the endowment was to create a climate for freedom, freedom of thought, freedom of imagination. Congress found that while no government can create a great artist or a great scholar, it is necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to encourage freedom of thought, freedom of expression. I believe that we must provide the resources to support these freedoms.

Since that time, our Nation has changed dramatically. We have witnessed what I like to call a nonviolent

revolution with the civil rights movement. We have seen a technological revolution in all areas of society. We have seen our Nation grow and really change.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up in rural Alabama, in an area without a telephone, without running water, without power. My father was a tenant farmer, a sharecropper. He was not allowed to vote or sit in some public places. But today we can fly through the air like a bird and swim through the water like a fish. We put a man on the Moon. We communicate by satellite, by computer on the Internet.

These revolutions are social revolutions, our cultural revolutions, our revolutions in science and technology, are the results of our collective imagination as a Nation, our sense of direction and our need for growth and change.

Throughout history, as the Nation has grown and changed, it is imagination, it is art, that has uplifted us and guided us and defined us. It is imagination that has made our dreams come true.

Just 2 weeks ago I had a great experience, a wonderful experience. I visited an elementary school in Atlanta called Mary Lin Elementary. I was impressed and amazed by all of the students at this little school. Children as young as 4, in kindergarten, 4 years old, but also children of all ages had drawn pictures of what they understood to be the civil rights movement. These young students, these young bright minds, had decorated every hall in every building with their colorful vision, each drawing different, each drawing unique. Every student was involved. Every student understood something about history through their imagination, through art.

Just yesterday I had lunch with an art teacher from the Atlanta public schools, Ms. Deborah Laden. She told me that she received less than \$100 for each student in her class for art education. It is a shame and a disgrace that in a Nation as rich and as powerful as the United States, in a Nation, yes, that has put a man on the Moon, we do not invest more in our children, in their ability to dream dreams and to share and express those dreams.

In the same way children learn through art, we all are inspired by professional artists and others who have taken time to explore human existence and human history. It was President John Fitzgerald Kennedy who once said,

Behind the storm of daily conflict and crisis, the dramatic confrontations, the tumult of political struggle, the poet, the artist, the musician, continue their quiet work of centuries, building bridges of experience between people, reminding man of the universality of his feelings and desires and despairs, and reminding him that the forces that unite are deeper than those that divide.

President Kennedy went on to say, I see little of more importance to the future of our country and our civilization than full recognition of the place of the artist. If art is to nourish the roots of our culture, so-

ciety must set the artist free to follow his vision.

Today, more than 35 years later, these words are more important than ever. We are in the midst of the information age. Our workers must be able to learn quickly. They must be imaginative thinkers and creative individuals. They must handle the tools of technology with a sense of philosophy, a sense of history, a sense of vision, a sense of community.

With a modest investment, just a little bit, a modest investment, we can help fill in the gaps of American education and encourage art education in our schools. With a very modest investment, we can help decorate every hallway of every school in every State with creative vision of our youngest minds, uplifted and inspired by their own imagination and the imagination of each other.

These young children, because of art, because of their imagination, may grow up to be visionaries, to be scientists, artists, doctors, lawyers, ministers. These young children will lead us into the 21st century.

Some of my colleagues today may ask if we can afford to invest in the arts. Our answer must be, how can we afford not to? Free the artists, provide the necessary resources, let the imagination, the minds run wild. It is what our country, it is what our society is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman again for holding this special order on the arts.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. And, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his participation. That was wonderful and I appreciate that very much.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would yield to my colleague from California, [Mr. FARR] and we will have a few discussions here on this same subject.

□ 1915

Mr. FARR of California. I thank my distinguished colleague from New York for yielding, and the Speaker tonight. We spent a wonderful weekend in his beautiful State of Pennsylvania.

Walking over to the Capitol tonight to join in this colloquy on the arts, I could not help but think as I looked up at the sky and saw the crescent Moon up there, just the wisp of a crescent Moon over the Capitol, how this building is indeed a living museum of art. It is a living museum of history, a living museum of democracy in the United States. Yet more than ever what this building demonstrates is the creative talent, the historic talent of this country displayed in paintings, displayed in photographs, displayed in works of sculpture in Statuary Hall, displayed in the architecture of the building, displayed as a symbol to the greatest democracy in the world.

And yet Members who serve in Congress like to think that there is an option in this country, that arts are essentially a disposable commodity, that it is something frilly. I cannot help but

think, as we talk so much about the need for this country's underlying security and its economic creativity, that the most creative aspect of America is in the diversity of its arts. It is the engine of our economy, and where that begins is in schools. It also begins in the home. It also begins in the political families that we live with.

This weekend when we went on the retreat, the bipartisan retreat to talk about how we can bring more civility to Congress, to this House, to this very Chamber we are in tonight, I could not help but think that as the families engaged in this discussion with their children there, that what the leadership of this House provided was essentially a weekend of arts for the children. That is what they chose, as we discussed among ourselves. They chose to give the children art so that the children could be very creative, and every parent blessed that.

And yet some of those parents come here at the same time the next day or this next week or the next month and will do everything they can to discourage the funding of arts through the public sector. What we are about is education in America. What education is about is an educated work force. And what a work force is about is building an economy. And what that economy is about is in a global, competitive society, is being a little bit more creative. It is not just the creative mind. It is the creative fingers, it is the creative toes. Therefore, if we really want this country to be strong and independent, we have got to invest in the arts.

When I was in the State legislature in California, I cochaired the Joint Committee on the Arts. We invested in the arts in California. Why? Not because it was an optional thing to do; it was because industrial development in California demands it. The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce demands that we invest in arts because they sell arts very well in Los Angeles. San Francisco demands that you invest in the arts because San Francisco is known for its arts.

New York, where you come from, what would New York be without the arts? What would the city of New York be? Look how much money the city puts into it, private sector and public sector money. And yet again where we fail to really commit ourselves to the arts is in our public school education program.

In California we have made it so important that we require that in order to graduate from high school, every student must take at least a year of arts, or we give them the option of a year of foreign languages. Both of those are, we think, skills necessary to compete in the 21st century.

We are here tonight to remind our colleagues that the arts are not a frivolous, disposable commodity in America. They are essential not only to our cultural well-being but to our economic well-being.

I applaud the gentlewoman for her dedication to the arts, for forming the

Arts Caucus, for allowing high school children from all over the United States to be in competitive contests in their districts and hang their art here in the Capitol so that they can be role models to the thousands, to the millions of students who walk through this Capitol and see children their own age being able to promote the arts.

I thank the gentlewoman for allowing me to join in on her colloquy on the arts, and I would remind all our colleagues that the arts are some of the most essential products of American freedom in a democratic society, an expression of one's self, of community and of nation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of the arts in our Nation and our communities.

The National Endowment for the Arts, the NEA, and the National Endowment for the Humanities, the NEH, serve important educational, cultural and economic roles in our society. The benefits of the Endowments for the Arts and Humanities have often been overlooked. While much attention has been paid to a few controversial grants, most NEA money goes to support important community programs such as museums, libraries, schools, and orchestras. The NEA is a great investment in the economic growth of every community and country. The nonprofit arts industry alone generates \$36.8 billion annually in economic activity and supports 1.3 million jobs and returns \$3.4 billion to the Federal Government in income taxes.

In terms of dollars and cents, the United States spends only 64 cents per person to support the arts each year, a level 50 times lower than other industrialized countries. The arts industry attracts tourist dollars, stimulates business development, spurs urban renewal, and improves the total quality of life for our cities and towns.

Additionally, the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities broaden public access to the arts so all Americans can participate in and enjoy and learn from the arts, improving the quality of life of our children and families. The NEA supports educational programs such as teacher institutes, museum exhibitions and advanced study grants that enrich the cultural livelihood of our communities and our Nation.

Not only do these programs ensure accessibility to our museums, universities and libraries, but they also serve as a vital link to our children's education. These programs are an integral part of our comprehensive education that help broaden the horizons of our children and instill in them a love of learning. They represent our Nation's cultural heritage, creativity, and pride.

Without the assistance of the NEA, various programs vital to my district

would not be possible. The Museum of Fine Arts of Houston, the Alley Theater of Houston, the Dance on Tour Program and the Houston Grand Opera would be in jeopardy.

Young Audiences of Houston is another valuable organization which works in my district, that demonstrates the beneficial impacts and contributions the arts have in our communities. Celebrating its 40th anniversary this year, Young Audiences of Houston is 1 of 32 independent chapters of Young Audiences, Inc. that form the Nation's largest nonprofit arts and education organization and the only arts organization to be a 1994 recipient of the National Medal of Arts. Young Audiences is dedicated to educating children through the arts and to making the arts an integral part of the school curriculum.

Young Audiences' highly participatory, curriculum-related arts programs reinforce classroom instruction, foster creative thinking skills, awaken interest in learning and broaden student understanding of world arts and cultures. Emphasis is placed on multicultural programming and on serving children at risk in schools with high need. The arts provide positive role models, enhance self-esteem, foster academic achievement, encourage students' sense of ownership in the educational process and help young people elect to remain in school. Furthermore, Young Audiences contributes to the economic vigor that a healthy cultural climate brings to the city and helps keep Houston in the forefront of arts education reform.

I congratulate Young Audiences on their 40th anniversary and commend them for their dedication to educating children and communities through the arts. The NEA and the NEH are at the forefront in the preservation of our historical and cultural heritage, encouraging the use of technology, strengthening education, and broadening access to the arts for all Americans to participate in and enjoy. Our continued support of the arts will enhance our children's future, their educational development, economic growth and their quality of life.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] for coming and joining us this evening. That was a very important message. We are trying to reinforce what art means to children in making better students, cutting out the dropout rate, all the wonderful things we want for the children at risk.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN], the co-chair of the Congressional Members Organization for the Arts.

Mr. HORN. I thank my colleague from New York. She had done just a splendid job when she chaired the arts caucus a few years ago when I first came here in 1993, and I am delighted that she is reinvigorating it, because there are many Members in this Chamber that have strong support for the arts.

Increasingly in our communities, there is stronger and stronger support for the arts. One of the reasons there is stronger support is that the National Endowment for the Arts has done, on the whole, a splendid job. So has the National Endowment for the Humanities. So has the Institute for Museum Services. These are minusculely funded by the Federal Government, but they make a difference, because we have the opportunity to engage with partnerships at the local level. The match money is very effective in involving people.

I am fortunate in my district, which includes Long Beach to Downey in southern California, Los Angeles County, that we have vigorous arts groups, and we have had excellent support from the NEA. That is very important to our museums. The Long Beach Museum of Art, the California State University Art Museum. All of those have been recognized as having high quality, that involve people, involve young people.

The symphonies in several of the cities in my district go out and reach out into the schools so young people can see what I had the opportunity to see when I was 5 or 6 years old. I did not know much about music at the age of 5 and 6 except the piano and singing around the table with everybody else. But one night in Hollister, CA, population 3,500 at that time, in San Benito County whose total population even though it was 60 miles long was about 13,000 people, to the high school came a wonderful musical organization, a symphony. Everybody dressed in the magical black tie and their instruments shiny. How did they end up in Hollister, CA, where there were not too many people? It is because the Works Progress Administration, the WPA, had funded them to go into the rural areas of our State where all of us were growing up pretty much on ranches, a few grew up in the towns, and they performed some of the great music that night. It made a difference in my life. I decided I wanted to be a music major, which I was through high school. I did not pursue it that much in college because I realized I did not have the world's greatest talent on the French horn. I was OK, but not the greatest talent, and that my desire to be a conductor would probably be a dubious desire, although I had been the conductor of all the student orchestras. But that made a difference in my life, and that has made a difference in millions of young people's lives.

A dean I had at California State University Long Beach when I was president, I made her Dean of Fine Arts, Maxine Merlino. She is in her eighties. She holds the world's swimming championship for her age group. She was doing murals here in Washington, DC in what we know as the Old Post Office down a few blocks from the White House, and those murals are still here, and they are bringing joy to people as they look at those murals.

We can replicate that, in towns, in communities, in rural areas, in moun-

tain areas, and in our great urban areas. It is tremendously important to continue these endowments. We have got a few critics. Yes, they object to 10 grants out of the 100,000 made. That is not bad. That beats baseball's scoring. It beats football's scoring. Obviously when you are in the arts, some things are going to be controversial. That does not mean we need to approve them. Just do not go see them. Go look at something else. Art has different tastes for different people. We have got to remember, this is a country of great diversity, and we need to bring out in the various immigrant groups, as we have in Long Beach with the Cambodian group, the groups from Laos and their beautiful work that is on display in the various museums in the city of Long Beach.

Arts are also increasingly entrepreneurial. Yesterday my colleague from New York and I had the pleasure of sponsoring with several of our colleagues the visit of Bill Strickland from Pittsburgh. He has been awarded the Genius Award of the MacArthur Foundation, and he truly is a genius. He was a young man who could barely read, who dropped out, who took up ceramics and from that artistic career he gained the self-esteem that he needed, and by one chance after the other, he incrementally has built one of the major centers of not only the arts but a number of other things, because one thing led to the other. And he has worked with out-of-work members from the steel mills, welfare mothers and others, and, as we all know, we are talking about the welfare bill in here and how do you get people into the job market that have never had an opportunity to be in the job market? He has shown it can be done.

□ 1930

What has he developed? As I say, he started with ceramics, and pretty soon people sold some of the ceramics work. He trained them as artists. Then he worked with industry, and he had pharmaceutical training, he had television training, he had a whole series of things: flower gardens, horticulture, a catering service developed to feed the students that came to his school, an integrated thing, a small community in one of the worst districts in Pittsburgh where people would often be afraid to even go to an event at night. And in his beautifully designed buildings, which have been the work of both corporations, individual philanthropists and just plain knowing how to make the money in your food operations and your sale of art he has developed a marvelous pinnacle and vista where young people and young and old can come and appreciate what has happened.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the time she has given me, and I wish her well in this endeavor.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. HORN, you know one of the things that he told us yesterday that really stuck with me

was that he has this wonderful building and all these students who come there, and they have been there for 10 years, and 2 blocks away is the school that he went to as a youngster, and it has bars on the windows and police cars outside and people patrolling the perimeter. But in his facility two blocks away he said that he needs no guards in the daytime, there has never been any graffiti, and despite all of the important and expensive equipment and things he has inside that building nothing has ever been touched.

Mr. HORN. That is right, and he also said that since he happens to be African-American and the African-American black students that go there, and white students go there, there has never been one incident, not one.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Once again we just find that arts brings people together and does the kind of thing that we want for human beings, and it really would be dreadful if we made a statement here on this floor that it did not matter to us.

Mr. HORN. And it seems to me that whether it be the WPA Orchestra in 1935 that I saw or the hundreds of orchestras that have benefited from grants from the endowment and their outreach into schools they can change people's vision, and we all know about the books.

One of the professors at California State University Long Beach wrote a best seller called "Drawing on the Right Side of the Brain"; Dr. Betty Edwards of our department of art, and another one on "Drawing on the Artist Within." A million copies of the first book, half a million copies of the second.

People can learn to be artists not necessarily for the commercial aspects but for their own enjoyment, and I have felt for 30 years at least that if we stress the right side of the brain in the schools, not just the left side of the brain, important though that is with mathematics and all the rest, we would build self-esteem in these children, and we would then transfer them into success in some of the mathematical, history, whatever subjects, languages, all the rest. But we need to help people develop their creative talents, and it has made a difference.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. And we find that once that right brain is developed it spills over on to the left-hand side, and, as I pointed out earlier, that just 4 years of art, the verbal scores on SAT's will go up 65 points, and math, 45, and I know of no other thing we can do for these students to get that kind of result.

Mr. HORN. I happened to go to a high school where we had an outstanding music department. We had a 100-piece concert band, a 60-voice choir and a 60-piece orchestra. Now that was in a school of 500 where only maybe 10 out of the 110 graduates went on to college, but it made a difference in peoples' lives to hear Tchaikovsky, to hear Brahms, to hear Beethoven, to have

tears come to your eyes. It makes you a human being, and that is what we ought to be encouraging in this country.

Think of this kind of this or that country had not been funding money to Beethoven or to Mozart. Those were the patrons of their day two centuries ago. What a difference their music has made in our lives. Mozart died, as we all know, at a very young age, in his thirties, and Tchaikovsky and others had patrons.

Well, there are still patrons for our symphonies, and some large symphonies frankly I do not worry about; they can get the money in a major city. But it is those middle-sized cities and those very small cities that are just beginning in a musical adventure that we need to give encouragement and stimulus to.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. That is the best thing about the NEA. It wants to make sure that every nook and cranny from sea to shining sea has the same opportunity.

I yield now to my colleague, CONNIE MORELLA, from Maryland.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York, my good friend, Mrs. SLAUGHTER, for yielding to me and for the special order on an issue that we all believe is so very important.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to express my support for the arts and to highlight the important world of the arts and the educational development of our children and the economic growth of our country.

The arts and humanities have absorbed their fair share of budget cuts over the past 2 years. Funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities has been slashed by 40 percent. I oppose any efforts to eliminate or make further cuts in funding for the NEA and the NEH.

I wholeheartedly believe that Government should support the arts, and according to a Lou Harris Poll I am in sync with most of the Nation. The latest Lou Harris public opinion poll concludes that 79 percent of the American public favors a governmental role in funding the arts. Sixty-one percent would pay \$5 more in taxes to support the arts, and 56 percent would pay \$10 more in taxes for the arts.

Mr. Speaker, 86 percent of America's adults participate in one or more of the arts. Frankly you know that is 33 percent more than participate; by that I mean vote in Presidential elections. Cultural funding is a mere two one-hundredths of 1 percent of our multi-billion-dollar budget. We spend 70 cents per person on the humanities, 64 cents per person on the arts, on history, English literature, foreign languages, sociology, anthropology, and other disciplines. Seventy cents a person buys teacher training programs. These programs provide professional development opportunities for our teachers to increase their knowledge in their field

and pass it on to their students. It is estimated that the 1,000 teachers who participate each summer in NEH-funded summer institutes directly impact 85,000 students per year.

In Maryland the arts are an important part of the economy. In 1995, for example, the arts contributed \$634 million to the State's economy through direct spending by arts organizations and audiences. More than \$21 million was generated in State and local taxes paid by arts organizations and audiences, and 19,000 jobs were generated. On our National Arts Advocacy Day, March 11, 1997, members of the Maryland Citizens for the Arts visited Capitol Hill and brought with them a special message: "The arts stimulate economic growth." For every dollar the NEA invests in communities there is a twenty-fold return in jobs, services and contracts.

The arts invest in our communities, the arts develop in our citizens a sense of community, and they contribute to the liveability for families in that community.

The arts are basic to a thorough education. Student achievement and test scores in academic subjects can improve when the arts are used to assist learning in mathematics, social studies, creative writing and communication skills, and I am particularly proud that the chairman of the Maryland Citizens for the Arts is Eliot Pfanstiel who is a constituent of mine.

Mr. Speaker, our legislative agenda could have far reaching implications for the cultural vitality of our Nation. Art is the symbolic expression of who we are. It is how we remember. It is important, even vital, that we support and encourage the promotion of the arts and humanities so that the rich and cultural story of our past can be made available to future generations.

I have often liked the expression that the arts are the border of flowers around the pot of civilization, but I would say they are more than the border of flowers. They really are also the border of nutrients, what we really need for our subsistence and for our cultural vitality and for the greatness of our country.

I thank the gentlewoman from New York again for arranging this special order, and I know she is so important to all of us.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank you so much for being here, and I appreciate your message.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close with two very brief examples of what we were talking about with the revitalization of towns' economy through art. The Northeast has suffered out migration, as you know, over a number of years, and one little town in New York State called Peekskill was really in very bad condition. The downtown area was basically dead, theatres had closed, restaurants closed. It was not much happening there until a sort of spillover from New York City. A famous artist came into Peekskill, and a well-known sculptor took over the old movie thea-

ter. It was perfect for his massive work, and galleries began to open, and then there was a massive change in Peekskill. People began to come in droves. The restaurants opened up again because people needed someplace to live, they needed a place to stay, they needed a place to buy gasoline, they needed a place for snacks, they needed things for souvenirs for their children, and that economy was brought back because of the art that was in Peekskill.

Providence, RI has just recently embarked on the same kind of an adventure in their downtown area. They have turned parts of abandoned factories and other buildings into places where performing artists and other artists can work in a group in one square mile of downtown Providence. It has been absolutely an amazing revitalization. It has brought back that city of 160,000 people to life and has stopped the out migration to other parts of the State and to the country.

Art speaks for itself, but I do think it is important for me and for my colleagues to say to you that we are not asking here for anything that is frivolous, for anything that does not pay its own way, for anything that does not help our children in incalculable ways. So, Mr. Speaker, when art reauthorization comes to the floor of the House, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I hope that everybody in America will as well.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to celebrate the arts in America and to call on my colleagues to fully fund the National Endowment for the Arts [NEA], the National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH], and the Institute of Museum and Library Services [IMLS].

Whether it is visual art, performance art, music, poetry, literature, or historical preservation, the NEA, the NEH, and the IMLS have all served our Nation well, and America is stronger because of them.

I am proud that my district includes most of the Broadway theater and many of the non-profit theater institutions, including Lincoln Center and the New York Shakespeare Festival. It also includes the SoHo art galleries, museums, radio and television studios, record and film companies, and hundreds of individual artists, writers, dancers, and musicians. The positive economic impact of this arts community has long been documented. The contributions they make to the economy and to the quality of life in New York is immense. In fact, when people nationally and internationally think about New York City, they often think about its cultural richness.

Other cities are beginning to realize that the arts draw people into the city and provide a valuable economic boost to the local economy. As a result, mayors across the country are rushing to build arts and cultural centers in their own cities and are seeking national support for their efforts. Just as the arts community in New York receives a portion of Federal support, so too should these newly emerging artistic centers. That is just one reason why we will need to increase arts funding to expand the reach of the arts to people throughout the Nation.

Another reason to support the national endowments is the nature of the projects they fund. Let me give you some examples. The NEA supported a consortium project to expand Alvin Ailey's summer dance camps for inner-city youths in Philadelphia and Chicago; the NEA supported a program to create a national model for an integrated kindergarten through sixth grade arts curriculum to improve learning in all subjects and offer new ways to engage students; the NEA supported an initiative to provide music instruction for financially disadvantaged minority children in New York City public schools; the NEA supported a program to teach playwriting to young people ages 9 to 13 in one of New York City's toughest neighborhoods; and the NEA supported a project to produce and broadcast telecasts of the public television series "Live from Lincoln Center." Now it is possible for folks in Wyoming and Indiana, not just New York City, to enjoy Lincoln Center performances. Helping children learn, reaching out to disadvantaged communities, boosting the economy, and providing national access to great performances—this is what the NEA is doing in 1997 to support the arts and to improve America, and that is why we in Congress must continue our bipartisan support for the arts. In fact, more projects like these deserve to be supported by the Federal Government to inspire our young people, to encourage them to nurture their natural talents, and to live up to their potential.

Therefore, not only must we preserve our cultural agencies, but we must increase their funding substantially, so that they can better serve our people.

Without these cultural agencies many beneficial projects would not exist, and America would be weaker without them. Think about how the arts touch and improve all of our lives. One way to do this is to imagine what the world would be like without art. Some have suggested to me that we ought to have a national arts awareness day. A day when we try to live without art. When we wake up without music, when we work in offices without wall hangings, when TV's don't work, when the theaters and opera houses are closed, when museums and libraries don't open their doors, and when even the reading of books is not allowed. A day when all of our national monuments are cloaked in black and art is taken out of our public spaces. The Capitol building itself would have to close down, because in every corridor and on every wall there are examples of public support for the arts—statues, paintings, and historic documents all serve to enrich this building and those of us who work here. Even the thought of a day without art is frightening. So, we must all recognize how integral the arts are to our life experiences, how they serve to improve the lives of Americans, and how they enrich us as a people and as a nation.

The Congress must continue its support for the arts if America, as President Clinton noted in his State of the Union Address, is to remain as a beacon, not only of liberty, but of creativity.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise to denounce the shameful war being waged on the arts and humanities. The National Endowment for the Arts [NEA] and National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH] have had fundamental impacts on our lives and our children's lives over the past 30 years. It is dif-

ficult to comprehend reasons behind vicious attacks on the very things that enrich our lives through music, art, dance, history, and other means of celebrating culture.

The appropriations process of the 104th Congress severely cut funding for the NEA and NEH. The NEA suffered a cut of 39 percent from \$162 million in fiscal year 1995 to \$99.5 million in fiscal year 1997, and the NEH, a cut of 36 percent from \$172 million in fiscal year 1995 to \$110 million in fiscal year 1997. These cuts have forced the NEA and NEH to reduce staff and grants to States, which has hurt local communities in every congressional district.

Some would have gone farther and had these agencies slated for termination—the NEA by September 30, 1997, and the NEH by September 30, 1998. Fortunately, such proposals were eliminated before final passage of the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act of 1997. We must keep them from ever becoming law and prevent the NEA and NEH from being eliminated.

Legislation to reauthorize the NEA and NEH—only to have them phased out—was rushed last year through the formerly named Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee. The arguments used then against both agencies were skewed. Those wanting to eliminate the NEA overemphasized a few, select projects believed improper for the Government to fund. Efforts to typify these projects which make up a very small percentage of all projects handled by the NEA jeopardized all other educational and meaningful theater, dance, orchestra, literature, folk arts, arts education, and many other activities enjoyed in our communities. The NEH was likewise brought into the mix.

Such tactics are still being employed particularly by NEA opponents, despite several changes in the operation of this agency under the leadership of its Chair, Jane Alexander. Throughout 1994, the NEA performed a comprehensive review of grant review and monitoring procedures, tightened guidelines, and eliminated subgranting to third party entities which had allowed projects to bypass strict NEA application review. In 1995, the NEA conducted a reduction-in-force by 40 percent, while being threatened with further restrictions by Congress to eliminate grants to individual artists and abolish seasonal operating support to organizations. These additional restrictions became law in April 1996, following weeks of an unprecedented Government shutdown, included in the omnibus appropriations bill. At the end of 1996, the NEA released its first round of grants under a newly revamped grant structure, approving more than 300 projects totaling almost \$18 million.

The NEA has clearly been responding to direction from Congress to rework the way it operates. It is wrong for this agency to be further subjected to unreasonable scrutiny and criticism.

Similar hostility toward the NEH is unwarranted and unjustified.

This Congress must approve President Clinton's request to restore funding for the NEA and NEH to adequate levels at \$136 million for each agency. Many State budgets are already strained and cannot substitute for Federal support from the NEA and NEH.

In fiscal year 1997 in the State of Hawaii alone, the NEA funded the Hawaii Alliance for Arts in Education at \$50,000 for Hula Ki'i—a

complex of Hawaiian traditional arts to be integrated into school curricula on the islands of Moloka'i, Oahu, and Kaua'i. The NEA has also funded the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts in Honolulu to support a 2-year statewide traditional arts apprenticeship program and production of a radio series featuring documentary interviews with apprenticeship participants. I find these and other projects given grants in the past to be very worthwhile and valuable to residents of Hawaii, as well as tourists visiting my State.

The NEH has, since 1977, approved challenge grants to Hawaii totaling \$910,700, which has allowed humanities institutions to raise more than \$2.7 million in private funding.

For example, Hawai'i Pacific University is using a \$575,000 NEH challenge grant to raise more than \$1.7 million in private gifts for a self-sustaining endowment that will support a visiting professorship in the humanities, a senior chair in world history, and information technology acquisitions. NEH also helped in the wake of destruction caused by Hurricane Iniki by making eight emergency grants to damaged libraries, archives, and museums totaling \$202,000.

We must continue to support the NEA and NEH on the merits of positive impacts these agencies have in our local communities. I urge my colleagues to support restoration of funding for both agencies, and continued dedication to arts and humanities.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in expressing my support for continued Federal funding for the arts, which play a critical role in our communities and our schools. I would like to thank my colleague from New York, Congresswoman SLAUGHTER, for scheduling this special order.

As a member of the Congressional Arts Caucus, I take a special interest in protecting the future of art programs. Because most cultural programs cannot survive solely on private funding, we must continue to ensure they receive adequate public support.

The arts play an essential role throughout our Nation, in both rural and urban areas. In my district of Queens, I am pleased to represent a number of theaters, museums, and dance groups who enrich our neighborhoods with their talents. Funding cuts would be devastating for these organizations. In fiscal year 1997, I was pleased to see 12 cultural groups in my district received Federal grants for their projects. In addition, I have been pleased to participate in the congressional art competition, where one of my young constituents, Ji Mi Yang, was the most recent winner from the Seventh District. I look forward to participating in this competition again in 1997.

Art programs play a vital role in our communities and in our schools. By enhancing art programs in our schools, we encourage the creative side of students while producing more well-rounded, self-confident individuals. Art programs enhance our communities. People of all social classes enjoy music, theater, art, and dance. Bringing these enjoyments to our neighborhoods strengthens the local economy while enhancing cultural understanding.

President Clinton articulated his strong support for the arts and humanities during his State of the Union speech. Recently, the President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities released a report, "Creative America," which reemphasized the need to support

art programs and made several recommendations for strengthening cultural support in our society.

During the 105th Congress, we will continue to debate the future of Federal funding for the arts and I urge my colleagues to join me in continuing to support funding for vital cultural programs.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, what I have found to be most inspiring in my life is the act of giving from people and organizations that have very little for themselves. This exemplary behavior is often exhibited by citizens in our nonprofit groups who, despite serious budget constraints, seem to be able to reach down deep and come up with a little more for those around them. The NEA and NEH are two such agencies.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors has again written a letter urging the President, Speaker NEWT GINGRICH, and Speaker LOTT to consider that,

The arts and humanities serve as an essential and forceful vehicle to educate our citizens, help our struggling youth, spur economic growth in our communities, and bring us together as a nation.

And I could not agree with this sentiment more.

As a proud Representative of one of the world's most celebrated cultural centers, I am appalled that this body would consider zeroing out funds for two of the most judicious and economical organizations by any business' standards. The fact is, that since the 40-percent reduction in arts funding, the American public spends only 38 cents per person to fund the largest cultural voice in America. The fact is, all other developed nations spend more than 2 to 10 times as much as the United States. The fact is, through its public-private partnerships, the NEA draws roughly \$12 for every \$1 in Federal funding it is awarded. The fact is, the arts have generated billions of dollars through many of our industries and return over 10 percent of what it earns through taxes. The fact is, the nonprofit arts industry represents nearly 1 percent of our work force.

There are many, many more economic reasons to support the NEA and NEH—we all know them, and yet the Republican leadership is still on the warpath to kill Federal sponsorship of the arts. As far as I am concerned, the fight to end our Federal arts institutions is yet another assault on children. These are not the children of the privileged as the Republican leadership would have us believe, but the kids who are, at their best, culturally deprived, and at their worst, at-risk youth with little in their life to keep them going.

I am extremely honored to serve and be served by what I consider the single greatest arts region in the world. New York City is not only revered for its famous collections and prosperous operas and dance productions, but because it has a rich tradition of sharing these treasures with those less fortunate within the community and throughout the United States. The wealthy will most likely always have their cultivation, but Federal dollars through the NEA and NEH provides access for those who would not. And even though Harris polls still show that Americans want higher investment in the arts, I think that we have no idea how these agencies touch our lives.

We can find so much waste in our Government departments, not least of all Defense, but the NEA and NEH have the most flawless

budgetary records. The radical right has been very clever in distorting small glitches in NEA grants and have purposely misled the public. In reality, the NEA and the NEH are the greatest gifts we can offer our children and future generations and one of the most generous outreach services we can provide to the public.

I think it is important to remember that only positive energy comes from these programs. We cannot lose when we invest in the arts. This meager investment helps us to learn more about our history and ourselves and conveys to us our common humanity and I would loathe to see the dying of this outstanding legacy.

I fully stand by the President's decision to restore funding to these agencies to what they were a few years ago and am pleased to stand with my colleagues from across the aisle who understand what the value of these agencies is to the greatest Nation in the world. I would also like to thank my friend and colleague, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, for her tireless efforts in defending the arts and for her most recent undertaking in rejuvenating the Congressional Member Organization for the Arts.

Please support including the arts in our national agenda by fully funding the NEA, NEH, and IMLS at the President's suggested levels.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, we often lose sight of the positive effect that music, painting, theater, and dance have on our lives and the lives of our children. With that, I rise today as a reminder of the importance of the arts.

Beyond the metropolitan theaters and museums, the arts touch our remote suburbs and rural areas through dance troupes and local choirs. Folk art festivals across the country provide an arena for creative expression that might be overlooked by the commercial arts industry. These local initiatives, in turn, spur the economy through increased tourism, and encourage a sense of community.

In my home county of Suffolk, NY, approximately 100 arts organizations employ 400 full-time employees and over 2,000 part-time employees. The arts generate nearly \$150 million in revenue for that county alone.

However, exposure to the arts does much more than expand the job market. Support for the arts carries over into the classroom and the workplace. Recent studies have shown higher SAT scores among high school students with an art background and stronger math skills among children who study music at an early age.

Perhaps more important are the analytic and creative skills developed through involvement with the arts. These skills not only help children excel in our classrooms, but help adults excel in the workplace. Think of your own office. Just as we in Congress expect innovative thinking from our staff, all industry relies on resourceful and imaginative workers to remain strong.

The arts have the potential to enrich the lives of all Americans. Without our support, they may simply become the privilege of an urban elite. I urge my colleagues to consider the many benefits of the arts.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior will receive testimony on fiscal year 1998 appropriations for the National Endowment for the Arts. These are very important deliberations. I believe they will provide a very important ba-

rometer as to whether the 105th Congress will return this body to a course of bipartisan sanity and civility.

I believe those who pursued a strategy of defunding and dismantling the NEA in the 104th Congress made a mistake. I believe those who seized upon a few questionable grants to attempt to undo what has been achieved in 31 years, with consistent bipartisan support, were misguided. I hope that this Congress will reverse that course and support the President's proposal to strengthen the NEA.

I believe efforts to defund the NEA in the 104th were bad public policy. It was bad public policy because it was indiscriminate in its effort to correct a perceived wrong. If indeed the peer panel review system, in a few instances, made decisions of questionable taste with regard to what the American people would want to support with public funds, that was not a sufficient reason to reduce the NEA's appropriation by nearly 40 percent.

When we reflect on what the arts mean to this society, I think we will all see that supporting the NEA is something on which we should all agree. We need to reflect on the power of the arts to bring the many ingredients of the American melting pot, or as Marc Morial, the mayor of New Orleans, recently called it, the American gumbo, together in savory harmony.

This harmony is not always easy or obvious. Nevertheless, I can't think of anything else that is more in the national interest than the promotion of understanding and the exploration of the complexity of our identity. As the agency best equipped and most directly tasked to encourage the purposes of art, the NEA should be treated as a budgetary priority, not as a budgetary luxury. The NEA should not be viewed as expendable because it is, in fact, essential.

Do we really want to jeopardize programs like the Mosaic Youth Theater of Detroit, an afterschool program that develops young theater talent in a multicultural setting? Through this program young people receive movement and voice training. They are instructed in scriptwriting and technical production. They create original works and apply what they have learned in performances at community centers, hospitals, and nursing homes. Through a 1-week residency at a college campus, these youth are exposed to university life. I submit to you that this program is far more typical of what the NEA supports than the handful of grants that were used to shock the 104th Congress into reducing support for that agency.

The American people have made it clear that they want change, and that they expect this change to spring from bipartisan efforts. Americans want thoughtful change. In the 104th Congress, NEA funding came under indiscriminate attack. Fortunately, these attacks were moderated, and I look forward to working with my colleagues in the 105th Congress to further show our support for the arts.

As a result of NEA funding cuts in the 104th Congress, my district, the 14th District of Michigan, received exactly zero in direct funds for fiscal year 1996. NEA funding for Michigan went from \$697,000 in fiscal year 1995 to \$520,000 in fiscal year 1996, a reduction of 25 percent. By the way, these levels of funding demonstrate just how specious the budget-busting argument is when applied to the NEA. One needs the most powerful of electron microscopes to find such amounts in a Federal

budget that has topped \$1.5 trillion in the last several fiscal years.

As many of you know, I have had a long-standing and deep commitment to American music, especially jazz. The downsizing of the NEA, dictated by the 104th Congress, led to an elimination of the NEA's music program and of all individual grants to jazz artists, with the exception of the Jazz Masters Awards.

How does that sound? The world's greatest democracy eradicates its music program? The world's greatest democracy eliminates funding for individuals who travel the globe as cultural ambassadors, demonstrating in their very art the superiority of the democratic form of government? I would say it sounds like the Nation's leading arts agency was forced to virtually abandon what the 100th Congress, in House Concurrent Resolution 57, which "designated as a rare and valuable national American treasure * * *."

I am sure that there are thousands of artists and creative workers of all disciplines who feel similarly abandoned. I hope that the 105th Congress will be remembered for many positive achievements, foremost among them, the restoration and strengthening of the NEA.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

INTRODUCTION OF THE JAMES GUELF BODY ARMOR ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] is recognized for 13 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, before the gentlewoman from New York retires from the floor I would just like to add that as a member of the congressional arts caucus I certainly do support her position here tonight, and I enjoyed listening to her special order, and I would just like to add that I think that the arts signify the heart and soul of a nation and its people, and the U.S. Congress should continue its funding of the arts and humanities, and I join with you in that effort.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to announce that last week I reintroduced legislation which would prohibit the mail-order sale of bulletproof vests and body armor to all individuals except law enforcement or public safety officers. My legislation, H.R. 959, would require that the sale, transfer, or acquisition of body armor to anyone other than law enforcement or public safety officers be conducted in person. In essence, what my bill does, it prevents the mail order of body armor. You can still purchase it, but you would no longer be able to purchase it through the mail.

My bill is entitled the James Guelf Body Armor Act of 1997 and is named for a San Francisco police officer named Guelf who was killed in 1994 by a gunman wearing a bulletproof vest and Kevlar helmet. More than 100 police officers of the San Francisco police department were called to a residential area where the gunmen fired in excess of 200 rounds of ammunition. Several officers actually ran out of ammunition in their attempt to stop the heavily armed gunmen and heavily protected gunmen. Mr. Guelf, who was killed, was raised in my northern Michigan district in Marquette, MI.

□ 1845

As a former law enforcement officer, I know all too well the challenges confronting those who serve to protect public safety and fight crime. We all saw the vivid and terrifying film from the botched California bank robbery last week, demonstrating that body armor gives criminals an unfair advantage during gunfights with police. Eleven Los Angeles police officers and six civilians were injured in that gunfight. Thousands of rounds were fired by two criminals, both of whom were wearing full protective body armor.

Witnesses from the crime scene reported that the bullets fired from the police officers' guns bounced off the bank robbers and mushroomed as they fell to the ground. Had my legislation become law in the 104th Congress, it would have made it more difficult for those criminals to obtain body armor that protected them during the gunfight with police.

We just do not have to look to California for examples of the way criminals use body armor. Last year in Michigan a 14-year-old driving a stolen car in the early morning hours was dressed in body armor from head to toe. You do not need body armor to steal a car, and police believe that the youth was going to kill an individual. It was a contract murder.

I have heard from law enforcement officers all across America about the increasing occurrences of drug dealers and other suspects who possess and use body armor in their confrontations with the police. Criminal elements are being transformed into unstoppable terminators with virtually no fear of the police or other people who are trying to apprehend them. These heavily protected criminals are capable of unleashing total devastation on civilians and police officers alike, and the increasing availability of body armor in the wrong hands portends a future of greater danger to America, greater danger to the American people, and a growing threat to our institutions.

For the past 3 years now I have advocated the passage of this legislation. Despite some verbal assurances, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, the gentleman from Florida, has not allowed a hearing on my bill. I hope he will now reconsider.

So tonight I urge my colleagues and the folks listening at home to support

and urge their Members of Congress to cosponsor my new bill, H.R. 959. It is a good step toward making our streets safer for America and the law enforcement community. Let us quickly pass my new bill, H.R. 959, and prevent these kinds of gunfights from happening in the future.

I would like to give special tribute tonight to police officer Kurt Skarjune for his continual efforts in helping me in our effort of trying to ban the sale of mail-order body armor. I hope the U.S. Congress will join with me and Officer Kurt Skarjune in this 3-year fight, and hopefully we can have the mail-order body armor banned so no one can obtain it through the mail.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST). The Chair would remind the gentleman that his remarks should be confined to the Chair and not to the listening audience.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KAPTUR (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for March 11 and 12, on account of personal business.

Mr. COBLE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today until 3 p.m. on account of Committee on the Judiciary business.

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 Mr. CAPPS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HINOJOSA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKAGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAMPSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIND, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, on March 13.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes each day, on March 13 and 18.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH, 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 Mr. CAPPS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. SCHUMER.