

Representative Payne, by a vote of 24–21, to retain the schoolwide threshold at 50%. Later in the markup, the Majority inexplicably reversed itself and passed an amendment to move the threshold back to 40%. For the life of me I cannot understand why after approving an amendment to raise the schoolwide threshold, the Committee took a step backwards and reversed itself.

I also strongly oppose the elimination of the gender equity provisions in current law and the Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA).

By eliminating a current, long-standing program that ensures fairness and equal opportunities in schools, the Majority is ignoring the different educational needs of girls and boys. WEEA represents the federal commitment to ensure that all students' futures are determined not by their gender, but by their own interests, aspirations, and abilities.

Since 1974, WEEA has funded the development and dissemination of curricular materials; training programs; guidance activities; and other projects to combat inequitable educational practices. WEEA provides a resource for teachers, administrators, and parents and provides the materials and tools to help schools comply with Title IX, the federal law prohibiting sex discrimination in federally funded education institutions. Through an 800 number, e-mail, and a web site, the WEEP Publishing Center makes these materials and models widely available to teachers, administrators, and parents.

WEEA has funded over 700 programs since its inception, and the requests for assistance and information are growing. From February to August of this year, the WEEA Resource Center received over 750 requests for technical assistance. Past and current WEEA-funded projects include making math and science opportunities more accessible to girls, and programs such as "Expanding Your Horizons" expose girls to women to non-traditional careers.

The Majority cited the results of a 1994 GAO study as its reason for eliminating this very important program. It argued that the Womens' Educational Equity Center lacked the staff to implement this program. The majority also argued that a small percentage of the grants made its way to the state and local levels.

It is no wonder. During the 1980s, WEEA fought a constant battle with funding and authorization. It has only been since the GAO report was printed and a Democratic president was elected, that the Womens' Educational Equity Center has been able to grow and improve. The Majority must not rely on a dated report that is no longer relevant to justify the elimination of this program.

The Majority also argues this program is not needed. Girls are doing better than boys in school in reading and writing. Although there has been much improvement in girls accomplishments, this does not justify the elimination of the program that added to these gains. Girls are achieving now because of the federal government's focus and attention on these inequities.

Moreover, although there has been gains, girls are still lagging behind boys in many important subjects, such as math, science, and technology.

WEEA helps girls acquire the skills and self-confidence they will need to support themselves and help support their families. Efforts to improve education will fail unless we ad-

dress the different needs of different students. Excellence and equity go hand in hand. The repeal of this critical program undermines this country's commitment to equity in the classroom.

And last, I am appalled that this bill repeals the Native Hawaiian Education Programs from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

The Native Hawaiian Education Program has been in effect since 1988, when it was first included in Title IX of ESEA together with funding for Native American and Native Alaskan education programs. Native Hawaiians are Native Americans, and like Native American Indians, they have suffered greatly at the hand of the U.S. Government, most significantly due to the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian Monarchy by military force in 1893. As a result, Native Hawaiians were disenfranchised from their land, their culture, and their ability to self govern. Eliminating this program negates the steady progress that has been made in recent years to make amends for the terrible travesty of the overthrow.

From 1826 until 1893, the United States recognized the Kingdom of Hawaii as a sovereign, independent nation and accorded her full and complete diplomatic recognition. During this time, treaties and trade agreements were entered into between these two nations. However, in 1893, a powerful group of American businessmen engineered the overthrow with the use of U.S. Naval forces. Queen Liliuokalani was imprisoned and over 1.8 million acres of land belonging to the Crown, referred to as Crown lands or ceded lands, were confiscated without compensation or due process.

This takeover was illegal. There was no treaty of annexation. There was no referendum of consent by the Native Hawaiian people. Recently, the National Archives disclosed amongst its treasures a 556 page petition dated 1897–1898 protesting the annexation of Hawaii by the U.S. It was signed by 21,259 Native Hawaiian people. A second petition had more than 17,000 signatures. Historians advise that this number of signatories constitutes nearly 100% of the adult Native Hawaiian population at that time.

Today, out of a total of 211,033 acres of land occupied by the military, the ownership of 112,137 acres can be traced to the royal family. No compensation was ever paid for these lands.

In 1920, Congress answered the cries of injustice by decreeing that 200,000 acres of land confiscated by the federal government be returned to the Native Hawaiians as an act of contrition. Unfortunately, these lands were in places where no one lived or wanted to live. They were in the most remote places—isolated without any infrastructure or access to jobs. Today, Native Hawaiians live in segregated reservations much like the Indian tribes. Their current despair is due to this forced isolation.

The Native Hawaiian Education Act was established out of our moral and legal responsibility for the destruction that occurred to this community. The \$20 million that funds this program to help educate Native Hawaiian children can't begin to make up for the loss of a nation, of an identity, a culture, and a heritage, but it can help fulfill our moral and legal obligations.

Justice requires that we fulfill our trust obligations to the Native Hawaiian community.

This modest program has helped these children, who suffer the lowest reading and math scores, whose families suffer the highest percentage of poverty, and whose health statistics and mortality rates are alarming by all measures. We do this for the Native American and Native Alaskan communities. The Majority would never dream of eliminating the funding for these equally important programs. We must not repeal this important program for the Native Hawaiian population.

I want to support this bill. Some good reforms and improvements were incorporated in this legislation. But unless the three areas that I have addressed are fixed, H.R. 2 will be a travesty on girls and women, on Native Hawaiians and on the poor children who need all the help this nation can muster.

STUDENT RESULTS ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2) to send more dollars to the classroom and for certain other purposes:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I rise today to show my support for the Mink/Woolsey/Sanchez/Morella amendment to H.R. 2, the Student Results Act. This amendment would place much needed gender equity language into this bipartisan legislation.

Madam Chairman, I know firsthand how difficult it is for women to compete in today's world. As a woman of many firsts, I know that it is not always assumed that anything boys can do, girls can do, especially in the sciences. Let me give you some statistics to illustrate my point. Only 25 percent of female students have taken computer science courses in high school. Only 20 percent of female students take the three core science courses in high school. Also, only 19 percent of girls earn a math SAT score of 600 or above vs. 30% of males. These statistics are alarming.

We need to create a strong workforce for technology jobs in our country so that we can continue to compete with other countries. Therefore, it is important for us to not only include, but to also encourage every student to excel in the maths and sciences. That means encouraging girls as well as boys to take courses in math and science. We cannot afford to limit our technology workforce and training based on gender.

Studies have proven that teachers and other influences in children's lives still do not equally encourage girls as well as boys to study math and science. Until we see more improvements in these statistics, gender equity language will be necessary.

This amendment will train teachers in gender equitable methods and techniques and require the identification and elimination of gender and racial bias in instructional materials. It will continue the progress that was started with the passage of Title IX in 1974 to close the gender gap which still exists in today's schools.

I wish that I did not have to speak about this gender gap and hope that a day will come when we will no longer need this type of legislation. Until that day, let us do the right thing and prove to everyone that this Congress cares about girls as much as we do boys by adopting this amendment.

PRESIDENTIAL SPOKESMAN'S
COMMENTS ON THE BUDGET

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1999

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, last week, Joe Lockhart, the Presidential spokesman, made a number of erroneous statements regarding the budget. Mr. Lockhart called "absurd" the notion that President Clinton has finally come around to the Republican way of thinking by not wanting to touch the Social Security surplus—yet—the facts state differently.

The President's original fiscal year-2000 budget asked to spend some 41 percent of the Social Security surplus.

The President's State of the Union address specifically stated that the President would only commit 60 percent of the surplus for Social Security.

And now, the President tells the bipartisan delegation meeting over the budget that he wants to save 100 percent of the surplus. If that isn't a turnaround to support the Republican position of "lock-box," protecting Social Security, I don't know what is.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD this information and other erroneous statements made by Mr. Lockhart last week in his presidential press conference, showing how these inaccuracies have attempted to bias public information against the real facts.

RAPID RESPONSE FROM THE SPEAKER'S PRESS
OFFICE—WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1999

"JUST THE FACTS, MR. LOCKHART"

Joe Lockhart says that the idea that President Clinton finally came around to the Congressional Republican's plan of protecting 100 percent of the Social Security surplus is an "absurd notion."

Fact: The President's original budget for FY 2000 spends 41 percent of the Social Security surplus. Also, the President specifically proposed in this year's State of the Union to only commit 60 percent of the budget surplus for Social Security. He told the bi-partisan delegation yesterday that he now wants to save 100 percent of the Social Security surplus.

Joe Lockhart says that CBO says that the Republicans have already spent the Social Security surplus.

Fact: In a September 30 letter to Speaker Hastert, CBO Director Dan Crippen clearly states that the final GOP budget plan "will not use any of the projected Social Security surplus."

Joe Lockhart says our budget is full of "gimmicks" such as using advanced appropriations.

Fact: The President's own budget used \$18.8 billion in advanced appropriations. Furthermore, advanced appropriations simply means that money not spent next year will not be counted towards next year's budget. If the money is not being spent until 2002, it should be counted against the 2002 budget, not the 2000 budget. That's just common sense.

Joe Lockhart says that the Republican budget doesn't make the investments in education that the American people expect.

Fact: The Republican budget has \$300 million more for education than the President's budget. In addition, the Republican budget would let local communities spend this money how they best see fit—including hiring more teachers, if that's what the community needs.

COMMITMENT TO MILITARY
RETIREEES

HON. SILVESTRE REYES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1999

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a request made by the Texas State Legislature asking that Members of Congress maintain its commitment to America's military retirees over the age of 65; to enact legislation that affords military retirees the ability to access health care either through military treatment facilities or through the military's network of health care providers, as well as legislation to require opening the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program to those uniformed services beneficiaries who are eligible for Medicare on the same basis and conditions that apply to retired federal civilian employees; and to enact any other appropriate legislation that would address these concerns.

Military retirees who have served honorably for 20 or more years constitute a significant part of the aging population in the United States. These retirees were encouraged to make the United States Armed Forces a career, in part by the promise of lifetime health care for themselves and their families.

Prior to age 65, these retirees are provided health services by the United States Department of Defense's TRICARE Prime program, but those retirees who reach the age of 65 lose a significant portion of the promised health care due to Medicare eligibility. Many of these retirees are also unable to access military treatment facilities for health care and life maintenance medications because they live in areas where there are no military treatment facilities or where these facilities have downsized so significantly that available space for care has become non-existent.

The loss of access to health care services by the military has resulted in the government breaking its promise of lifetime health care. Without continued affordable health care, including pharmaceuticals, these retirees have limited access to quality health care and significantly less care than other retired federal civilians have under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program.

It is necessary to enact legislation that would restore health care benefits equitable with those of other retired federal workers. Several proposals to meet this requirement are currently under consideration before the United States Congress and the federal Department of Defense and Department of Health and Human Services; of these proposals, the federal government has already begun to establish demonstration projects around the country to be conducted over the next three years, which would allow Medicare to reimburse the Department of Defense for the costs of providing military retirees and

their dependent health care; this project would allow a limited number of Medicare eligible beneficiaries to enroll in the Department of Defense's TRICARE Prime Program and receive all of their health care under that program.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reaffirm the necessity in enacting legislation for military retirees health coverage over the age of 65. These individuals are entitled to fair and equitable access of health care. The principle resources for this to be done would be through proper military treatment facilities supplemented with a choice in a network of health care providers. Opening the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, which already applies to retired federal civilian employees, should be offered to uniformed services beneficiaries in order to ensure equitable benefits for all federal employees.

A CONSUMER PROTECTION
PROPOSAL

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1999

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleague and friend, Rep. ANNA ESHOO, in introducing important consumer protection legislation. This legislation addresses the safety of medical devices which are designed to be used once but which are reprocessed for further use.

In correspondence to Rep. ESHOO, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) "agrees that the reuse of disposable medical devices and devices labeled for a single use is a very important public health issue." The agency further indicates that cleaning and sterilizing these devices can be very difficult and that material properties and device performance can be affected by reesterilization. Yet single use device reproducers, which may be companies specializing in this practice or hospitals or other health care facilities, are unregulated. They are not required to register with the FDA or to provide convincing evidence that the processes they use are appropriate and that the reprocessed devices are safe and effective.

Our legislation would correct this loophole in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by requiring single use device reproducers to register with the FDA and to demonstrate the safety and effectiveness of reprocessed devices. The bill will also require device users to obtain informed patient consent for the use of the device and establish a system whereby the safety and effectiveness of the devices when actually used in patient care may be tracked.

I urge my colleagues to join me supporting this important consumer protection measure.

THE LIFE AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF
DR. CHARLES STANISLAW

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1999

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a tragic accident in Macedonia October 16