

week in the rotunda of the Capitol. I urge all Members to attend, and I urge also the citizens of this country to join me in applauding both Jerry and Betty Ford, President and Mrs. Ford, for their selfless service to this country for all the good that they have done for all of us.

VOICES AGAINST VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I too rise today with great pleasure to stand and welcome the many young people who have come to Washington, D.C. to participate in Voices Against Violence, a congressional teen conference sponsored by the office of the Democratic leader and the Democratic Caucus.

However, these young people come from all over the country, and many of them come from so many different walks of life and, might I say, from different political parties. This is a bipartisan summit. Young people have come from across the country to talk about the issues of youth violence and how it impacts their lives.

I am pleased to have four students here from my district in Houston, and I met them at the airport this afternoon as they arrived in Washington, D.C. As they communicated with me their desires, each of them said they came to listen, but they also came to provide solutions.

They want to see more opportunities for parents and schoolteachers and counselors to listen to students. They want to find ways to help students who are concerned or have problems and pressures not to explode like what happened in Columbine, but to have resources where they can talk. These young people mean business, and they have come to work.

Young people live in a different world than what existed about 20 years ago. In this new era, young people have all the advantages of a new technologically advanced society as well as a new landscape of social interaction. Theirs is a future full of promise, and we are poised on a dawning of a new century that will bring even more.

However, in light of these changing times, we also have a society that seems to be more detached, more chaotic, more violent. We have seen a significant increase in violence against young people and violence committed by young people. These young people want the violence to stop.

There are many competing theories as to the causes of youth violence, from the increase in violence in popular culture to the lack of prayer in schools. Others will even say that the increase of youth crimes is the symptom of a larger breakdown of our society. But I believe these young people will be instructive as they come to Washington.

I welcome Jessica Abad from Booker T. Washington High School, Eric Del Toro from Barbara Jordan High School, Andrea Marie Garrity from Reagan High School, and Ashley Robinson from Jesse H. Jones High School, along with Dr. Alma Allen, the chaperrone, a member of the Texas Board of Education and school administrator from the HISD.

As I close, Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democratic leader, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), the caucus leader, for helping to sponsor this conference.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that we started out with a sense of hope for these young people coming here. I am disappointed, however, as I speak about another issue, that as the Commerce, State, Justice appropriation bill comes to the floor of the House, the conferees have decided or rejected the idea of adding to it the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999. What a travesty inasmuch as the Senate bill did have this legislation.

In the light of the tragedies that have occurred in Illinois, in light of the tragedies that occurred in my own State of Texas with James Byrd being dismembered by hateful acts, those who promoted racist provocations and acts, along with the activities of the killing of Matthew Shepard, but many, many others, these are just examples of hateful acts in America.

For those who would say that other crimes are equal to hateful acts, that any murder is hateful, they are absolutely wrong. I wish they would understand what the hate stands for. It stands for the intimidation of large groups of people.

When James Byrd was killed and dismembered, it was not intended just to say something to James Byrd. It was intended to tell African Americans that they do not stand equal in this country, that they can be dismembered in this brutal manner. When Matthew Shepard was killed, it was intended to show gays and lesbians that they are not equal in this Nation.

Hate crimes intimidate groups. When is this Congress going to understand that, in order to make a national statement about who we are as Americans as we go into the 21st century, we need a national position as we did with the Voter Rights Act in 1965 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, that we stand against hate crimes?

It is a travesty and a shame that this appropriations bill would not have the inclusion of the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999 similar to what the other body did. We are going to fight it, and we are going to prevail because good people in America will prevail over evil.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I stand tonight to welcome the many young people who have come to Washington, DC, to participate in "Voices Against Violence," a congressional teen conference sponsored by the Office of the Democrat Leader and the Democratic Caucus.

Young people have come from across the country to talk about the issue of youth violence and its effect on their lives. I am pleased to have four students here from my district in Houston.

Young people live in a different world than what existed just 20 years ago. In this new era, young people have all the advantages of a new technologically advanced society as well as a new landscape of social interaction. Theirs is a future full of promise and we are poised on the dawning of a new century that will bring even more.

However, in light of these changing times, we also have a society that seems to be more detached, more chaotic and more violent. We have seen a significant increase in violence against young people and violence committed by young people.

There are many competing theories as to the causes of youth violence, from the increase in violence in popular culture to the lack of prayer in public schools. Others would even say that the increase of youth crime is a symptom of a larger breakdown in the moral fabric of society.

By now, we know that the problem of youth violence cannot be traced to a single cause or source. At the same time, we here in Congress have formed various working groups and task forces to address this issue, because we are all searching for some answers and solutions to youth violence.

It is now appropriate that we have now turned our attention to our children, and to take the time to hear from them. Not all of our young people are caught up in the cycle of violence. We know that 95% of all young people are good kids who want to do the right thing. Too often, we focus on the bad elements and overlook these children.

This conference gives us an opportunity to make up for our neglect of this 95%. The purpose of this conference is to go beyond pointing fingers at the various causes of youth violence, and to discuss tangible solutions. The solutions that will be offered these next 2 days will come from our children.

It is refreshing to hear the perspective of young people on solutions to youth violence. Last month, during the Congressional Black Caucus Annual Legislative Conference, some young people participated in the Juvenile Justice forum I sponsored and shared some unique insights into the problem of youth violence.

I was enlightened by the views of these young people, especially the views of the young men who were very articulate and insightful about their experiences. One young man spoke eloquently of what he thought were the negative perceptions he faced as a young Black man.

This is the type of dialogue I hope the young people will engage in as they discuss solutions to youth violence. The close to 400 participants will get to discuss these issues with the President and other policy makers to help us understand their perspective on this problem.

I hope that these teens will come away from this conference with a new understanding of each other that they can take back to their communities.

I am pleased to have four students from my district in Houston here to participate in the conference—Jessica Abad from Booker T. Washington High School; Eric Del Toro from

Barbara Jordan High School; Andrea Marie Garrity from Reagan High School; and Ashley Robinson from Jesse H. Jones High School.

I would like to thank the Houston community for assisting us in bringing these students to Washington. I would also like to thank Dr. Alma Allen, a member of the Texas State Board of Education and School Administrator from the Houston Independent School District who has accompanied the students as a chaperone.

I strongly urge my colleagues to participate in this conference to listen to the concerns of our young people. As I stated earlier, we have had many hearings, conferences, working groups and debates on this issue in which we relied on the expertise of trained adults to tell us about the problem. Now it is time to listen to our young people for their view.

I would like to thank the Democratic Leader DICK GEPHARDT and Caucus Leader MARTIN FROST for sponsoring this conference. Although the conference is being sponsored by the Democrat Party, we have bipartisan support in the form of Republican offices that have sent students. I thank everyone who has worked so hard since this summer to put this event together.

Finally, I thank the young people who came from all across the country to participate. I urge you to raise your voices against violence loud and clear—especially now because we are listening.

LANGUAGE AND COMMUNICATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, like no other creatures on Earth, human beings have the unique ability to communicate through language. We can communicate feelings of love or hope or anxiety or suspense or excitement, all conveying feelings of emotions, feelings of concern. We do that through language. We use the English language and all the other languages of the world which are spoken through human beings who try to convey those feeling accordingly.

We have over the years respected great writers like Shakespeare and people in politics like Lincoln and Kennedy and the poetry of Robert Frost, and the magic word of Byron and Keats and Shelley as poets. George Will in today's world is a master of the word, of speaking effectively and carefully and with great meaning.

□ 2000

The reason I mention this today, Mr. Speaker, is that over the years I think we have seen a reduction in the respect for the English language and what words mean, how grammar is expressed or not expressed, whether it is proper or not. And just last Thursday we saw, on CBS television, a new low in expression for millions of people to see and observe and listen to on national television.

There was a show called Chicago Hope, and there was a headline in USA

Today following that show entitled Chicago Hope Breaks the Barrier. Well, this is the barrier that Chicago Hope broke. It was the barrier of obscenity and foul language that I think we have not seen in any time in our history on television, on network television.

The actor involved, Mark Harmon, plays a doctor, apparently, and he was before a medical review board to explain why a promising teenage baseball pitcher had to have his arm amputated, the story says, when an infection set in and, following a series of operations, was unable to play, apparently. So this doctor on television, a revered profession in our society, by the way, said "blank happens." The USA article says, "Blank happens," Harmon said, using an epithet for excrement. Neither a CBS spokesman nor Henry Bromwell, executive producer of the series, could remember a time when censors had allowed the word to be used. "It's nothing I haven't tried a couple of times before, except this time I won," Bromwell said."

Apparently the word was expected to be used for artistic truthfulness. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the American public has, I hope, had a bit of enough about artistic expression on national television with a captive audience that breaks new barriers, not new high barriers but new low barriers. What a distinction for CBS television. How proud they must be that this barrier has now been reduced even lower. The standards for conduct, for language, for propriety, for dignity, for expression has now reached a new low for CBS and this so-called entertainment show.

Now, it is one thing to pay money and go to the movies and watch trash, which there is plenty of in today's society. If individuals want to do that, people have the right in a free society to do that. But on national television, before a national audience, to somehow be proud of the breaking of this new low barrier, I fear, says volumes about television today and the entertainment industry.

Are there no bounds in the entertainment industry on television? I suspect there may not be, as these new lows keep being reached by people who are somehow proud of this low-class artistic expression as defined by some producer who feels that he is somehow trying to make his mark. He has made his mark all right. He has made a low mark.

I would urge Americans who are disgusted with this kind of language and the lowness of it and the failure of the language to be expressive in a dignified and acceptable societal way to write CBS News and give them all that they can express about their disapproval for this kind of activity.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS VETO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Cali-

fornia (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there was not time allowed in the debate on foreign aid, and I wanted to make some comments, and so I will do so now.

First of all, the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), made a statement that more money was available to Ronald Reagan for foreign aid. Well, that is because the Democrats controlled spending. There was always more money available, without any regard to a balanced budget. Ronald Reagan decreased taxes, he did not increase taxes like the President plans to do, \$74 billion worth. And he only had control of the Senate for one term. The Democrats controlled Congress, where spending is originated and voted for.

After Ronald Reagan, the Democrats continued spending with no regard for a balanced budget. All additional revenue that the tax decrease brought in, they spent. And that was not enough, they raided the Social Security Trust Fund and used it as a slush fund to pay for such things as welfare, that was wasted in many cases. There are many families that need welfare, but not the 40 percent that was eliminated, and now the President lauds, after he vetoed our bill twice.

They are trying to do the same thing now that they did when they had control of the House, spend more than the balanced budget. To do so, they have to take it out of Social Security or the President has to identify where he would take the money from. He will not do that, because in each of his budgets he has said, I will make cuts in the fifth year, when he would not even be here. And then he refuses to tell where those cuts would come, except for defense, because he knows it would make people mad at him.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said that the Democrats did more for Social Security. I think that is a joke. In 1993, they increased the taxes on Social Security. For 30 years they stole the money out of the Social Security Trust Fund. There is zero money in that fund, but they will say, oh, there are notes in there and they are guaranteed. But they are not backed up with gold; they are only backed up by the U.S. Government. And the only way to make those Social Security notes valuable is to put the money in there. When there is a surplus, the money can be put back in there. The Republicans have said we are going to put a lockbox on it and make it a trust fund not a slush fund, but yet the President wants to take the money out.

Remember, in 1993, he not only increased the taxes on Social Security, he increased the taxes on the middle income. I think using the term middle class is a terrible term to use. There are no middle-class citizens in this country. They may be low income,