

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully point out that I did not attribute that to the President of the United States.

Now, we have the report. The Starr report is not only a matter of public record, it is a matter of congressional notice.

I am a little bit at a loss as to why I cannot refer to what is in the government report that probably the gentleman voted for to have released, and now is telling me and suggesting that there is something inappropriate about me discussing it on the floor of the House.

We are not the children of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman will suspend, the Chair would remind the Members that the House rules regarding proper decorum in debate were announced to the House earlier on September 10. Both the Speaker and the minority leader, in concurrence, supported this announcement. It said:

When an impeachment matter is not pending on the floor, a Member who feels a need to dwell on personal factual bases underlying the rationale in which he might question the fitness or competence of an incumbent president must do so in other forums, while conforming his or her remarks in debate to the more rigorous standard of decorum that must prevail in this Chamber.

With that understanding, the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire respectfully of the Speaker, may we refer to the Starr report referred to the Congress of the United States?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In general terms, yes.

Mr. CONYERS. In general terms, yes. And may we quote from the Starr report referred to the House of Representatives?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Sir, depending upon the exact verbiage being referenced, yes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, in other words, we can talk about it in the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. Starr can dump it into the public domain; but on the floor of the Congress it is not discussable because of what? I am sorry, I do not follow the distinguished Speaker's logic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman will suspend, the difference is what the specific reference is, and whether an impeachment resolution is actually pending. The House rules regarding proper debate are well established and cooperation is expected of all Members.

The gentleman may continue.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the Speaker, and I will not talk about the Starr report anymore, because nobody knows what is in the Starr report; nobody knows about how disgusting it has been to many Americans; nobody knows what the allegations are, and we do not want to talk about it in advance for any reason.

So I, with great reluctance, return the balance of time to the gentle-

woman from Texas and thank her very much for her important contribution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary very much, as I notice his very eloquent recounting of where we are. I see my good friend from New York on the floor of the House. I am hoping that we will be able to conclude this within a few more minutes.

But let me just speak to where we are as we started out constitutionally. I argued the case that we are attempting to frame this in a constitutional manner. The gentleman has made a very valid point. If any distinction can be made, what we are talking about is one, we have alleged facts, but we have no constitutional standards. On Friday or Thursday, we will present to this House a resolution by a chairman who has already said, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), that he too would like to see this end before January 1999, but yet, the resolution will now be an open-ended, anything-goes, White-water, Filegate, Travelgate, allegations against Mr. Foster, as well as the Monica Lewinsky-Gate, and no definitive time in which we would finish.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to tell the gentlewoman that the Speaker of the House has said just the opposite. He has said that this might go into the millennium. In other words, he has no intentions of working with the Committee on the Judiciary to bring this to a reasonable close within the end of the year. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding yet again.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we look at that point, and the gentleman is very right, we are faced with the dismal lacking of presentation by constitutional scholars who have said to us that high crimes and misdemeanors denote for the Founding Fathers the critical element of injury to the State. It was public and not private.

So we are leaping now to the floor of the House on Thursday to present an impeachment inquiry vote, quite contrary to Watergate, by doing so with no limitations and, of course, on the issues of a private incident.

I understand the Speaker is gaveling me. Might I turn to my good colleague, because we have much to say to conclude.

□ 2030

ISSUES SURROUNDING THE IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY of Texas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for her conclusion.

CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES REGARDING IMPEACHMENT

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I thank the gentleman from New York for his very fine kindness. What I wanted to emphasize is I started out this evening by offering a constitutional explanation as to where we are. And so I wanted to put into the RECORD the noted words of the legal scholar from Yale University, Professor Charles Black. And I want to pick up on what the very fine gentleman from Detroit, Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member, has so eloquently emphasized. That Americans are asking us to get a handle on this. Republican colleagues are asking us to get a handle on this. And we can do this if we collaborate.

Charles Black says to us: In the English practice, from which the framers borrowed the phrase, "high crimes and misdemeanors" denoted political offenses, the critical element of which was injury to the state. Impeachment was meant to address public offenses committed by public officials in violation of the public trust and duties. Because Presidential impeachment invalidates the will of the American people, it was designed to be justified for the gravest wrongs, offenses against the Constitution itself. In short, only serious assaults on the integrity of the processes of government and such crimes as would so stain a President as to make his continuance in office dangerous to the public order.

Mr. Speaker, this is the reach that we should be reaching to understand whether Mr. Starr has presented anything of substance to this committee. Not the reach in 24 hours to Thursday to an impeachment inquiry with no standards and, might I say, one meeting that would warrant the determination of constitutional standards that we now understand may be set by the chairman.

As I finish, let me simply say there is much to say here about how we proceed, but I certainly hope as we engage in this debate that we engage in it not classifying people for their party affiliation, for what part of the country they may have come from, but for nothing more than preserving this Constitution.

I hope that everyone will perceive this as an American issue, attacking the very sovereignty of this Nation. And might I simply say that there were many voices on this committee that joined the gentleman from Michigan in 1974, many fine persons; Father Drinan, in fact, who has written articles to suggest that his experience shows no impeachable offenses. And he admitted that he raised the Cambodian issue and that the committee in its goodwill in 1974 refused to put that as an article of impeachment. They refused to put the tax evasion that was alleged as an article of impeachment.

Mr. Speaker, might I just offer the words of my predecessor, Barbara Jordan. Many would want to say how she would be handling these events. I would offer to say her words exactly:

Today I am an inquisitor. I believe hyperbole would not be fictional and would not overstate the solemnness that I feel right now. My faith in the Constitution is whole, it is complete, it is total. I am not going to sit here and be an idle spectator to the diminution, the subversion, the destruction of the Constitution.

She herself noted by quoting the Federal papers that impeachment is limited to high crimes and misdemeanors, and discounted and opposed the term "maladministration." It is to be used only for great misdemeanors, as she quoted from the North Carolina Ratification Convention.

We must be reminded that we have a constitutional obligation to not be idle spectators and not to see the destruction of the Constitution and a subversion of the Constitution. If that is what my Republican friends are alleging against the President of the United States, the executive, then they must prove it. They cannot prove it unless we proceed in an orderly, fair manner, confined to what was referred; not a fishing expedition, and certainly within a reasonable time frame to understand what the Constitution says in order to match that with the allegations.

I am not sure the time has gone, but if the ranking member wants to finish, I am willing if the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) would yield to him. This is wholly important. I am frightened by the prospect of what we are about to proceed with and how we are handling it.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to comment on the continuing brilliance of the gentlewoman from Texas. She is a respected lawyer, an experienced litigator, a proven public servant, and she makes me proud of the fact that she is currently sitting as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

CONGRESS HAS MORE IMPORTANT BUSINESS TO CONSIDER

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank both of my colleagues from the Committee on the Judiciary and congratulate them on the magnificent job that they are doing. I am certain they are not here tonight because they want to be here, but because they feel a sense of duty to expound and further explain this very grave matter before us.

Like the rest of my Democratic colleagues, we do not think this is the most important subject in the world. We are not anxious to be plunged into the deliberations concerning this impeachment. There are many other matters, many other priorities, many other issues that are far more important. And the talent and the time and the attention of people like my two colleagues on the Committee on the Judiciary we would like to devote to addressing those problems.

Our problem is that we are trapped by the will of the majority. The pinnacle of global leadership, the set of profound priorities which we should be addressing have been overwhelmed and smothered by a blanket of trivialities and diversions which the majority wishes to expand and continue indefinitely.

We are supposed to adjourn at the end of this week. I suppose it might be some kind of recess instead of the usual adjournment process. But as of Sunday, we will be no longer focused on the business, the routine business of the 105th Congress.

We have the appropriations process that has been stalled, and only two appropriations bills have been taken through the entire process. We are going to have a monstrous continuing resolution which cannot do the business of the Nation and focus on the priorities as we should. We have a focus instead on the Committee on the Judiciary, which will absorb the time and attention of not only the people here in Congress, but the whole American public.

An impeachment is a serious matter. It is always serious, whether it is an impeachment that is based on sound reasons. If there really are some impeachable offenses, it would be serious then. It is serious even if we go forward with the impeachment process and we do not have reasons for impeachment. There are no impeachable offenses.

Either way, it is still serious. The time and the attention to be put into it is the same. The diversion of the decision-making powers away from more serious matters is the same. The divisions within the American public are likely to be the same. I think we have a procedure here that is without precedent. The Founding Fathers would have never dreamed of our being in this kind of predicament. We have an intensely partisan impeachment procedure going forward, an impeachment procedure based on personal blunders. The three Ps, partisan, personal. And finally we have an impeachment procedure that has been made pornographic by the release of certain kinds of information it is highly unusual for government documents to be concerned with.

So, we are going down, down, down into a bottomless pit, and it seems to me that somebody ought to seek to try to get us out of this. I hope that better judgment will prevail and prevail soon, before we go deeper into the pit.

We have a constitutional procedure being used as a camouflage for extremism. The Republican credo that "politics is war without blood" is underway here. We can see it manifest, war without blood. That means one goes all out to destroy his opponent. Go for the jugular. You want to gut the hog. That is what is driving the process here in Washington with respect to this impeachment procedure. Future generations will look back on us and really be ashamed of the kind of performance that we are setting forth here.

The procedure goes forward despite the fact that the American people and their common sense have a different opinion. Obviously, it does not agree with the intensity we feel about certain things that are being set forth here. What we are doing represents an insult to the intelligence. It is contempt for the common sense. Polls are not supposed to govern us, but I think we ought to pay attention as Members of Congress to the flood of mail, the calls, e-mail.

It is very interesting, my district is unfortunately a district where I have always had a problem of turnout for votes. The number of people who are registered never turn out more than 50, 55 percent. It is a great problem, and I have labored with it for years. And it has gotten worse really over the last few years, the number of people who bother to come out to vote. And we conclude that it is because they are so disappointed because of the fact that so much that is promised and so much that is needed never happens.

In my district, we have a large number of schools that still have coal-burning furnaces. That has been the case for years and years, and I have been in office for quite a number of years, and I have been highlighting the fact and working hard to try to make something happen. But the coal-burning furnaces are still there. We have 275 in the whole city and a hundred in the borough of Brooklyn and 20 or 25 in my congressional district. They are still there.

So I assume people are discouraged that nothing is happening. Unemployment has always been high in my district, and it is still high. It is true that as a result of the improvement in the economy, unemployment has gone down, employment has gone up, and people are grateful for that, I am sure. But I assume by that lower turnout that they have lost faith and they are not coming out because that problem was not being solved.

But, Mr. Speaker, they are, in my district, concerned about what is happening here with the process of impeachment. I have a flood of mail, unprecedented. I have a flood of phone calls. I have a great amount of e-mail. It contradicts the theory that I formulated in my own head that people have given up on government, that hope has been abandoned. Obviously, they have not given up on government. There is still some basic expectations from government that makes them concerned about what happens with the office of the Presidency, who is going to occupy the White House. They are very concerned, very intense, very angry.

I hope that they will translate that anger into some appropriate conduct, political action. People in my district want an end to the preoccupation with personal misbehavior, an end to magnifying personal blunders into high crimes and misdemeanors. They can see that there is no bribery or treason involved here. They can see that there is no conspiracy of note here.

Conspiracy occurs whenever a group of people get together to try to accomplish a particular end. We can call it a conspiracy. I looked it up in the dictionary to make certain that I was on sound ground. Any kind of action taken by a group of people, a set of plans made by a group of people to accomplish a certain end is a conspiracy.

There are good conspiracies and bad conspiracies. Unlawful conspiracies, I suppose is what is meant by the counsel for the Committee on the Judiciary majority yesterday when he added conspiracy as a charge. Yes, I suppose he can find evidence of a conspiracy. There are all kinds of conspiracies, as I said before.

When I was much younger, before I even became a teenager, I had a great love for peanut butter, and we were very poor. With a family of seven and the father is on minimum wage, you are very poor, and you have to stretch in a thousand ways to survive. Peanut butter was very important. Peanut butter was not a snack food in my house. It was the food that my mother put in our lunches. Peanut butter with crackers is good because the bread does not get soggy. And if you use graham crackers instead of regular crackers, it becomes a combination entree and dessert.

It was a big deal. She had a big jar of peanut butter that she used for our lunches, and we could not raid the jar for snacks. Well, my siblings and I, we had a great love for peanut butter, so we conspired. The peanut butter was on a shelf at the top of the cabinet, and we learned very early that if we would go in the center of the jar to get our peanut butter out and not scrape the sides, our mother could not tell that we raided the jar unless she was very observant.

So, together we could quickly get on a chair and get the jar down, scoop out a good scoop from the middle, and get away with spreading it and getting out of there. It took three of us to do it. It was a conspiracy.

The "peanut butter conspiracy" is not equal to the conspiracy that took place in the basement of the White House with respect to Iran-Contra.

□ 2045

In the basement of the White House we had a group of people who were directly involved in disobeying Congress and plotting, conspiring, to obliterate the will of Congress, to disobey it, to secretly sell guns to a power they had declared a hideous enemy. They were going to sell the guns, get the money, and use it to fund the Contras in Nicaragua against the will of Congress, after many years of deliberation had shown that Congress desired that we take that course of action. So we had a conspiracy.

And when the conspiracy was uncovered, finally exposed, there was another conspiracy to help cover it up. They were actually shredding papers in the basement of the White House, and

everybody knew about it for a long time before the Attorney General bothered to secure the site and make certain that evidence was not destroyed. And we had all kinds of other things that took place with respect to Iran-contra. It was a conspiracy. That is one kind of a conspiracy.

We had a conspiracy when Benedict Arnold betrayed his own revolutionary army forces. He was a magnificent general, who had really performed quite well in the Revolutionary War on the side of the colonies, but he was upset and bitter and, for whatever reason, he decided to sell out. That was a conspiracy, too. Probably, unlike the peanut butter conspiracy, which had no serious repercussions, it could have had the greatest of repercussions. If Benedict Arnold had succeeded and not been discovered, it could have meant the end of the Revolutionary War. It could have been a blow that changed history entirely.

So the consequences of Benedict Arnold's conspiracy were much more serious than the consequences of the peanut butter jar conspiracy, or even the consequences of the Iran-contra conspiracy. Iran-contra, if we had pursued it with vigor and had a special prosecutor who cared about what he was doing, as much as some others lately care, it would have been clearly a situation where we would have had an identification of a conspiracy.

But would that conspiracy have merited an impeachment proceeding? I do not think so. I think it would have been very embarrassing, very serious, but the country was not placed at risk. The country's policy was violated, laws were disobeyed, felonies were committed, but I still think, as serious as Iran-contra was, it probably would not have merited impeachment. It was not Benedict Arnold, engaged in an activity which could have brought the country down. It certainly was not the peanut butter conspiracy.

What happened at the White House with respect to the personal blunders there I will let others place on that continuum from the peanut conspiracy on one the hand to Benedict Arnold on the other. What happened at the White House, I will let others place it somewhere there and tell me if we have an impeachable offense.

What the problem is here, and I do not want to go on, because I am certain that most Americans are quite tired of listening to the matters which are surrounding this impeachment process, the problem is that the people in my district want an end to the preoccupation with personal misbehavior or an end to the magnifying of personal blunders into high crimes and misdemeanors. But we cannot govern the agenda. We do not set the agenda. We are compelled by the majority in control to remain on this topic. But even though we are compelled to do that, we have a duty to place it in a larger, more urgent, and more important context.

At this critical moment in history, as we approach the year 2000, the ques-

tion that Americans ought to be asking is what is the overwhelming preoccupation of this indispensable Nation? What are we doing at this critical moment in history? Can we justify what we are doing in terms of what is at stake at this particular moment?

There are serious matters related to race relations, and the President had the vision to appoint a Race Relations Commission. That Commission, in the final days of its deliberations, was totally ignored. Its report came out. I have already, on this floor previously, criticized that report as being weak in spirit. It represents tiny spirit, in that the people who were there had a golden opportunity.

The President never intended for it to solve major problems, but it was a golden opportunity to make a statement about the profundity of the race relations problem in America. The race question, the race problem, racism in politics, demagoguing the race issue is a major issue in American politics. It sets up a situation where people who should have common interests are divided. It is part of a divide-and-conquer strategy which is seriously affecting the ability of the Nation to govern itself. We let race issues get in the way.

George Wallace, who recently died, and some people have sort of chosen to forget what he did in American politics, he took the race issue, the demagoguing of the race issue, and made it a fine art that many unscrupulous politicians could later never ignore. There was a time when both the Republican Party and the Democratic party, certainly at the national level, refused to tolerate on the floor of their conventions and in their deliberations open and blatant racist proposals. There was a time when they would not accept it. Even though the Democrats had to wrestle with holding together the coalition of southerners and northerners, there was a kind of respectability that prevailed; that did not go into certain areas. That all ended with George Wallace, and people started to follow in his footsteps.

Richard Nixon followed in his footsteps with his southern strategy. When Ronald Reagan got ready to run for office, he went to Philadelphia, Mississippi, the site of the killing of Schwerner, Cheney and Goodman. He wanted to send a clear message to the south by going to that awful place where that awful set of murders had taken place and launching his campaign. So race became, from then on, a major part of the strategy of the Republican Party in terms of its divide and conquer strategy, and it continues to be.

So race relations are very important, and we have sort of pushed that report of the Commission off to the side and it is like it never happened. There was no Commission; there was no report. The Commission itself did not live up to its potential. It at least could have been a scholarly pronouncement of what is at stake with respect to the problem.

At the beginning of the Commission I had said I hoped that they would conclude that here is a serious problem which a Commission, in existence for 12 months, or 18 months, cannot resolve, but the Commission could set out a series of other steps that need to be taken. And one of the steps that should be taken is that a set of scholars, made up partially of Nobel prize winners, should be convened. And with the financing of the major foundations in this country and the rest of the world, that set of scholars should do a thorough study on race relations in the United States.

And if they do not want to deal with race relations because that is too current and controversial, at least do a history of slavery and how the legacy of slavery has impacted on current race relations in this country and in some other parts of the world. Let us at least have a scholarly treatise, a scholarly encyclopedic approach to establishing what the facts are with respect to slavery and slave trade. Some of us think it is the greatest crime ever committed in the history of mankind. The obliteration of a set of people, in terms of their humanity, was at stake, and we think it deserves that kind of attention.

But the race relations report did not come out with any kind of proposal to profoundly continue the exploration of the problem. They even backed away from saying that at least the country should, the official government that exists now, should foster an effort to have an apology for slavery. That is a horrible thought. Let us not apologize in America. We have had some polls taken which shows that overwhelmingly the American people are against any apology for slavery.

It is a strange set of conduct when we consider the fact that apologies are breaking out all over. Every month there is some new apology. The Swiss apologizing over and over again for the fact that they swindled the poor refugees from Germany, Jewish refugees from Germany, out of great amounts of money. They are not only apologizing, they are compensating. They have set up some funds to restore.

That is like reparations. That is another word we do not mention in America with respect to slavery. Reparations is a terrible dirty word. How dare we ask for reparations for 232 years of labor that was not paid for. How dare we make that kind of demand on the American people today when, after all, none of us lived at that time. We are not guilty.

The Germans could say the same thing and the Swiss could say the same thing. But, recently, the Germans at Volkswagen, and Germans at another plant, without confessing that they used slave labor in their plants, the slave labor of the Jews and the other prisoners of war that resulted in an accumulation of wealth, which the allies allowed them to keep and they continued, so that wealth that was accumu-

lated partially with the slave labor of prisoners of Jews and other prisoners during the war is still a part of that corporate set of assets. So without fully admitting it, they have started funds at Volkswagen to compensate for those prisoners and Jews and other prisoners who can be identified. They have started, I think \$12 million at one plant, and since they started it there, Volkswagen followed with \$12 million. So they are not only apologizing, they are compensating. They are providing reparations.

In June of last year, the Pope apologized to the Jews for the Catholic church's silence during the holocaust. Last year the Japanese apologized to the Comfort Girls in Korea. Apologies are breaking out all over. So why is it that it is such a horrible thought to have the present government of America apologize for the American government's historic involvement with slavery?

I really am trying to emphasize the fact that there is unfinished business here. We have unfinished business in several major places which we should be addressing in the year 1998 and at the close of this 105th Congress. As we go toward the next century, the year 2000, we are going to be greatly crippled as a Nation if we do not address these kind of problems.

Another set of problems that are obvious, and probably less intense emotionally, is the mushrooming set of global economic problems. They are very serious, the problems that are mushrooming around us. We still have unprecedented prosperity. We have a budget surplus that has been recently announced. But consider 10 years ago where the Japanese economy was and where it is today. We are not invulnerable, and the things that are happening around us already are having an impact.

There was a multibillion dollar investment company, long-term investment, I do not have the exact name, but a multibillion dollar hedge fund, they called it. I do not understand what hedge funds are all about, so I will not try to describe it. But the hedge fund was of no significance to me until I heard that an agency of the United States Government, the Federal Reserve Board, had helped to rescue this private bank. Now, that concerns me greatly.

We ought to be concerned about a precedent being set now, which is similar to what happened with the savings and loan swindle. Not quite exactly, because the money used to bail out the hedge fund was private money. The effort to organize it was the authority and the brainpower and the intimidation power, I guess, of the Federal Reserve. So it is not quite as bad yet as the savings and loan swindle.

In the savings and loan swindle we had the American taxpayers, through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and an individual who was head of the corporation, taking the initiative

to bail out big banks because they were too big to fail. Now we have an investment fund, a hedge fund, that was considered too big to fail. Americans, wake up. We need to take our eyes off the impeachment proceeding and take a look at the Federal Reserve's action with respect to this multibillion dollar hedge fund. American taxpayer money is next.

They have used taxpayer money already because we pay the salaries of the Federal Reserve Bank. The whole apparatus of the Federal Reserve is a government apparatus. So we have already used the resources of the American government to bail out these big private multibillion dollar funds. What comes next?

□ 2100

What comes next? Which hedge fund will next be in trouble and when will they start using the taxpayers' money to help bail out some of these investment companies that are too big to fail?

By the way, the reason they want to bail out the hedge fund is because the hedge fund owes the banks a lot of money. So we are right back to where we were with the savings and loan swindle. It is the banks, the banks that are private and do not want anybody to interfere with them and their private authority, they are private powers to govern themselves until they get in trouble. When they get in trouble, our banking system suddenly becomes a socialist system, where the taxpayers are commanded, without anything much to say about it, the taxpayers' representatives in Congress go forward to devise schemes to bail out the banks.

We are in a situation now where the banks have collapsed in Indonesia, Malaysia, they are in serious trouble even in Japan. There was an article that appeared in today's New York Times on the front page that said the banks of Japan are now admitting that the amount of capital they have is far less than they have represented today. So the banks all over the world are collapsing and we are concerned with focusing on an impeachment procedure related to personal blunders at the White House and an overzealous investigation by the special prosecutor. Where are we, Americans, and what will our children say when they examine our behavior at this critical point in history?

Let me just conclude by saying, there is one more set of concerns that I would like to invite you to consider. We are the indispensable Nation. We are the great global power. We have responsibilities that probably God has placed on us that no other Nation has. God has been very generous to us. Our beautiful skies and spacious plains and bountiful production of grain and food and natural resources, our long periods of peace, all the things that add up to making our Nation prosperous, we ought to be thankful to God that we have that, and try to give back something to this earth which indicates

that we are grateful, we feel ourselves blessed and we want to do something for the rest of the world. We ought to be concerned.

Let me invite you, take your mind off the impeachment, take your mind off the personal lives of people here in Washington and for a moment consider a report that was done by the United Nations Human Development Fund, the United Nations Human Development Report, which every year comes out and looks for new ways to measure the lives of people throughout the world, what is happening with people.

This year the report put out by Kofi Annan puts aside faceless statistics like the per capita gross domestic product or the export-import figures and puts aside the report, those kinds of things, it burrows into the facts about such things as what are children eating across the world, who goes to school across the world, whether there is clean water to drink, how women share in the economy, who does not get vaccinations against diseases that go on killing people even though we know how to prevent diseases, even though we have vaccinations that prevent the diseases, they keep going on and killing people because the medicine is not available.

This year the report takes its first look at what people have, from how many people have simple toilets or family cars, and what proportion of the world's goods and services are consumed comparatively by the rich and what proportion are consumed by the poor. The report concludes that the pie is huge. The world's consumption bill is \$24 trillion a year. Let me repeat that. The world is consuming \$24 trillion a year worth of resources. But the servings that go on from one part of the world to another are radically different. Let me repeat. I am summarizing from the United Nations Human Development Report issued by the head of the United Nations Kofi Annan. I could not get the full report in time. It was supposed to get here today but it was not here, so when I get it, I certainly, probably next year, want to quote directly from it, give you the pages and tell you where you can get it. I am sure you can get it yourself from the United Nations. What I am reading from is a summary, a few highlights. It is not a summary, a few highlights from the New York Times, the Sunday Times of September 27 of this year, 1998. The New York Times had a set of highlights with a few photographs. I am going to read a few of those so that you can come back to where we ought to be in this world, on this planet earth, where we as the indispensable Nation, the most fortunate Nation that has ever existed in the history of the world, where we ought to be contemplating what we can do about these problems and where we are here, how does it affect the future existence of our children. Are our children going to be able to survive in a world where there are such gross injustices and

such great unevenness in the way resources are distributed? Are human beings, by their very nature cunning, scheming, brainy, crafty animals, are they really going to sit by in three-quarters of the world and let one-quarter of the world have everything indefinitely? Can that go on? Can you deal with that? Or should you worry about whether some future leaders of our Nation might seek some kind of final solution by getting rid of all the have-nots instead of trying to make certain that the world deals with the problems of the have-nots in a different way.

Let me just read a few of these highlights that appeared in the New York Times and think about it. Put aside the impeachment characters, the Peyton Place scenario, put it aside and consider what citizens of the indispensable Nation ought to be considering at this hour in our history.

The haves. The richest fifth of the world's people consume 86 percent of all goods and services, while the poorest fifth consumes just 1.3 percent. The richest fifth of the world's people consumes 86 percent of all goods and services while the poorest fifth consumes just 1.3 percent. Indeed, the richest fifth consumes 45 percent of all meat and fish, 58 percent of all energy used and 84 percent of all paper. The richest has 74 percent of all telephone lines, and owns 87 percent of all vehicles. The richest fifth of the world's people consume 86 percent of all goods and services. The ultrarich, the three richest people in the world have assets that exceed the combined gross domestic product of the 48 least developed countries. The ultrarich, the three richest people, three rich individuals in the world, have assets that exceed the combined gross domestic product of the 48 least developed countries.

In Africa, the average African household today consumes 20 percent less than it did 25 years ago. The average African household consumes 20 percent less than it did 25 years ago. There are more African households. There is terrible leadership. You cannot blame it all on colonialism. Twenty-five years ago colonialism's remnants were still there. People lived better. Has the leadership that has resulted after colonialism was ended decreased the standard of living? Or did resources get pulled out by the colonial powers? Whatever, the fact is that the average African household now is living much worse. They consume 20 percent less than they did 25 years ago.

Consider the fact that the world's 225 richest individuals, of whom 60 are Americans, with total assets of \$311 billion, have a combined wealth of over \$1 trillion, equal to the annual income of the poorest 47 percent of the entire world's population. Let me repeat that. The world's 225 richest individuals, of whom 60 are Americans, with total assets of \$311 billion, have a combined wealth of over \$1 trillion, equal to the annual income of the poorest 47 percent of the entire world's population.

Americans alone spend \$8 billion a year on cosmetics. That is \$2 billion more than the estimated annual total needed to provide basic education for everyone in the world. Americans spend \$8 billion a year on cosmetics, \$2 billion more than the estimated annual total needed to provide basic education for everybody in the world.

The have-nots. Of the 4.4 billion people in developing countries, nearly three-fifths lack access to safe sewers, a third have no access to clean water, a quarter do not have adequate housing, and a fifth have no access to modern health services of any kind. Of the 4.4 billion people in developing countries, nearly three-fifths lack access to safe sewers, a third have no access to clean water, a quarter do not have adequate housing, and a fifth have no access to modern health services of any kind.

Smoke is an interesting topic in this set of highlights. Of the estimated 2.7 million annual deaths from air pollution, 2.2 million are from indoor pollution. 2.7 million annual deaths from air pollution. Of that total, 2.2 million are from indoor pollution, including smoke from dung and wood burned as fuel, which is more harmful than tobacco smoke. Eighty percent of the victims of this kind of death by smoke are rural poor in developing countries.

Telephone lines. Sweden and the United States have 681 and 626 lines per 1,000 people respectively. Afghanistan, Cambodia, Chad and the Democratic Republic of the Congo have one telephone line per 1,000 people.

Ice cream and water. Europeans spend \$11 billion a year on ice cream—\$11 billion a year on ice cream—\$2 billion more than the estimated annual total needed to provide clean water and safe sewers for the world's population.

AIDS. At the end of 1997, over 30 million people were living with HIV, with about 16,000 new infections a day, 90 percent in developing countries. It is now estimated that more than 40 million people will be living with HIV in the year 2000.

Land mines. More than 110 million active land mines are still scattered in 68 countries, with an equal number stockpiled around the world. Every month more than 2,000 people are killed or maimed by mine explosions. In a world where poverty is rampant, we still are spending large amounts of money on weapons, and land mines is one of the most devastating spread throughout the entire world.

Pet food and health. Consider the fact that Americans and Europeans combined spend \$17 billion a year on pet food, \$4 billion more than the estimated annual total needed to provide basic health and nutrition for everyone in the world. \$17 billion a year spent on pet food by Americans and Europeans. That is \$4 billion more than we need to provide basic health and nutrition for everyone in the world.

I am reading from highlights of the United Nations Human Development

Report. These highlights appeared in the New York Times on September 27 of this year. I will close with the last one of the highlights. I want to leave this with you to consider over again and I will repeat it. I assure you, in the next few years over and over again and update it because it sums things up in a very dramatic way. \$40 billion a year, the key figure, \$40 billion a year. Remember, our defense budget is more than \$250 billion a year. \$40 billion a year. It is estimated that the additional cost of achieving and maintaining universal access to basic education for all, basic health care for all, reproductive health care for all women, adequate food for all and clean water and safe sewers for all is roughly \$40 billion a year, or less than 4 percent of the combined wealth of the 225 richest people in the world. I repeat. It is estimated that the additional cost of achieving and maintaining universal access to basic education for all, basic health care for all, reproductive health care for all women, adequate food for all and clean water and safe sewers for all is roughly \$40 billion a year, less than 4 percent of the combined wealth of the 225 richest people in the world.

□ 2115

Take your mind off the impeachment proceeding, the diversion away from real problems, and consider the fact that a lot of these statistics have some implication even in America where people are not getting the appropriate health care. More than 10 million people are not getting or have no health care coverage. Take your mind off and consider the fact that large amounts of children still go hungry, even in America. Take your mind off the impeachment procedures and the trivialities related to it, and consider the fact that we are not focused on problems that could be solved.

The most important thing about these highlights of the United Nations report is that they tell us that the problems of the world are soluble with the resources that we have available in the world right now. The doomsayers who said that the overpopulation of the world would guarantee that it would be impossible for everybody to survive, they are not correct. You can use \$40 billion a year and provide for the survival and a decent life for all the people of the world, just \$40 billion distributed in some kind of intelligent way.

Indeed, you know, never blame God for the travails of mankind. You know, God has put on this earth a bountiful supply of resources, food, energy. You know, it is all here. You know, when you consider the fact that so much is being wasted, all you have to do is take it and distribute it a different way.

God must spend many days weeping about the ingratitude of the American leadership of his Earth, of this planet. What other Nation at any time in history has enjoyed so many benefits, been so blessed by God, and yet we trivialize our role, and we ignore our

destiny. We have a duty to see to it that the distribution of these resources should take place in some kind of way to relieve all this massive suffering.

One thing about God is that He is not a dictator, He is not a tyrant. God does not intervene into the affairs of mankind. What a pity that He is not setting the order and forcing the distribution. What a pity that He has so much stake in the free will of mankind. What a pity that He blesses certain nations at different times in history, and He waits for them to follow through.

The Roman Empire once commanded all the known world. China commanded the world that the Romans did not know much about. Those empires did not, the leadership did not behave in ways which spread the benefits of their empires and guaranteed that they would continue.

We are in the same position, probably more so than the Roman or the Chinese ever were. We are the indispensable Nation now abandoning our responsibilities. We have an indispensable Nation that chooses to turn away even from domestic matters which have an impact on the rest of the world.

If we were to educate our own populous, guarantee that every youngster in America had his talents fully developed, we would have a priceless resource to send out for the rest of the world. I mean we would be able to deal with these medical problems, we would be able to deal with the education problems, the sewer problems, the various problems. We alone have enough resources, human resources, if they were fully developed, if we would just use our resources to develop our own.

I often talk about computers and technology in the schools, and back in my district people say that, well, you know, we think you have become some kind of aficionado of computers. You lost your bearing in terms of the importance of technology in the schools. And my answer is that when I talk about computers, I am not an aficionado. I do not even know how to handle my E-mail well. I mean I assure you nothing personal about it, computers are the way of the future. Just as the automobile created a whole culture, computers are creating a whole culture for America and for the rest of the world.

When I talk about computers, I am not talking about a plaything or a luxury. I am talking about putting computers in schools so that every child has the exposure as early as possible to computer literacy, computer learning, because that is the way the world is going, that is where the jobs are going to be. That is definitely where the jobs are going to be.

Already we have a shortage, and we had on the floor of this House a bill which tried to solve the immediate problem of the shortage of computer information technology working by bringing in foreigners. We are going to bring in 90,000 per year and increase that up over the next few years, and

yet the Department of Labor says that the shortage will be even worse. Five years from now we are talking about more than 1 million, 1.5 million vacancies that exist.

So this is not a luxury, this is not a hobby. I am talking about a culture that is being created.

You know, when the automobile was being developed, I suppose all the schools in America looked at the automobile and said, do not teach any kids about auto mechanics. I mean, you know, that is a luxury, this is a plaything. You know, the automobile has a place in our culture which provides millions of jobs from the engineers that produce them, the workers in the factory, the salesmen, the mechanics; you know, from A to Z people who have high school education, some who do not have a high school education, all kinds of people are employed in the automobile industry. The computer industry will be the same in a very few years. It is moving, mushrooming, at a much more rapid rate than the automobile industry was built, and that has implications for the whole world and all of these problems throughout the world. You can educate the whole world if you were to computerize centers across the world and you did not have to depend on them creating their own teachers, locally first, but you could have physics and science and math and literature, whatever you want, piped in by long distance learning. You could do it in a matter of 10 or 20 years using the technologies that are now placed at our disposal by the computers and the Internet. You know, you could revolutionize the way the world takes care of itself.

All of that is possible, you know, if you focus first on educating your own population.

You know, school construction makes it possible for you to have buildings that can be wired, hopefully, for computers and be wired for the Internet. The E-rate, which was a magnificent stroke by Congress requiring that the FCC come up with a plan for providing discounted services to schools, that is about to go down the drain because of the fact that some very narrow-minded, tinny-spirited people, greedy people will not go forward and let the E-rate provide the discounts to the schools that they should provide.

We are the indispensable Nation with tinny minds, major experience, and at a points where we could revolutionize and turn the world on its axis and move it in a new direction. We refuse to do it.

The present quagmire. In the present quagmire our only hope is to accelerate the timetable and move out of the mud back to a set of priorities worthy of this indispensable Nation. We either move back to a set of priorities worthy of a Nation, or we can be plunged deeper down. We go into the pit with Larry Flynt who put an advertisement in the Washington Post calling, offering a million dollars for anybody who has information about an illicit affair with a

Congressman or any other member of the government. That is the direction which leads to total chaos, but that is the downhill motion that we are now in. That is the direction we are going. Let us not sink deeper into the quagmire, but instead move rapidly.

We are into an impeachment process. The committee has voted, the Committee on the Judiciary. The only way out is to accelerate the timetable, move it, get out of the mud, get back to a contemplation of the real problems that matter most to America, to most of our people. Listen to the American people and their common sense. Listen to the American people instead of having contempt for them. Their intelligence has risen to the occasion. Our democracy can be saved if you listen to the American people, their sense of balance and justice.

Get out of the quagmire and back to the business of the indispensable Nation.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3874

Mr. GOODLING submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 3874), to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to provide children with increased access to food and nutrition assistance, to simplify program operations and improve program management, to extend certain authorities contained in those Acts through fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes;

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 105-786)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3874), to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to provide children with increased access to food and nutrition assistance, to simplify program operations and improve program management, to extend certain authorities contained in those Acts through fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “William F. Goodling Child Nutrition Reauthorization Act of 1998”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—SCHOOL LUNCH AND RELATED PROGRAMS

Sec. 101. Provision of commodities.

Sec. 102. Nutritional and other program requirements.

Sec. 103. Special assistance.

Sec. 104. Miscellaneous provisions and definitions.

Sec. 105. Summer food service program for children.

Sec. 106. Commodity distribution program.

Sec. 107. Child and adult care food program.

Sec. 108. Meal supplements for children in afterschool care.

Sec. 109. Pilot projects.

Sec. 110. Training, technical assistance, and food service management institute.

Sec. 111. Compliance and accountability.

Sec. 112. Information clearinghouse.

Sec. 113. Accommodation of the special dietary needs of individuals with disabilities.

TITLE II—SCHOOL BREAKFAST AND RELATED PROGRAMS

Sec. 201. School breakfast program authorization.

Sec. 202. State administrative expenses.

Sec. 203. Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children.

Sec. 204. Nutrition education and training.

TITLE III—COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS

Sec. 301. Information from recipient agencies.

Sec. 302. Food distribution.

TITLE IV—EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 401. Effective date.

TITLE I—SCHOOL LUNCH AND RELATED PROGRAMS

SEC. 101. PROVISION OF COMMODITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 6 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1755) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (c) and (d); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—The National School Lunch Act is amended by striking “section 6(e)” each place it appears in sections 14(f), 16(a), and 17(h)(1)(B) (42 U.S.C. 1762a(f), 1765(a), 1766(h)(1)(B)) and inserting “section 6(c)”.

SEC. 102. NUTRITIONAL AND OTHER PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.**—Section 9(f) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “subparagraph (A)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”; and

(2) in paragraphs (3) and (4), by striking “this paragraph” each place it appears and inserting “this subsection”.

(b) **WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT FOR WEIGHTED AVERAGES FOR NUTRIENT ANALYSIS.**—Section 9(f) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT FOR WEIGHTED AVERAGES FOR NUTRIENT ANALYSIS.**—During the period ending on September 30, 2003, the Secretary shall not require the use of weighted averages for nutrient analysis of menu items and foods offered or served as part of a meal offered or served under the school lunch program under this Act or the school breakfast program under section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773).”.

(c) **REQUIREMENT FOR FOOD SAFETY INSPECTIONS.**—Section 9 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) **FOOD SAFETY INSPECTIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a school participating in the school lunch program under this Act or the school breakfast program under section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773) shall, at least once during each school year, obtain a

food safety inspection conducted by a State or local governmental agency responsible for food safety inspections.

“(2) **EXCEPTION.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a school if a food safety inspection of the school is required by a State or local governmental agency responsible for food safety inspections.”.

(d) **SINGLE PERMANENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN STATE AGENCY AND SCHOOL FOOD AUTHORITY; COMMON CLAIMS FORM.**—Section 9 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758), as amended by subsection (c), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **SINGLE PERMANENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN STATE AGENCY AND SCHOOL FOOD AUTHORITY; COMMON CLAIMS FORM.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If a single State agency administers any combination of the school lunch program under this Act, the school breakfast program under section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773), the summer food service program for children under section 13 of this Act, or the child and adult care food program under section 17 of this Act, the agency shall—

“(A) require each school food authority to submit to the State agency a single agreement with respect to the operation by the authority of the programs administered by the State agency; and

“(B) use a common claims form with respect to meals and supplements served under the programs administered by the State agency.

“(2) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.**—The agreement described in paragraph (1)(A) shall be a permanent agreement that may be amended as necessary.”.

SEC. 103. SPECIAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) **SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PAYMENTS.**—Section 11(a)(1) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1759a(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) in clause (i)(I), by striking “3 successive school years” each place it appears and inserting “4 successive school years”; and

(B) in clauses (ii) and (iii), by striking “3-school-year period” each place it appears and inserting “4-school-year period”;

(2) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) by striking “3-school-year period” each place it appears and inserting “4-school-year period”; and

(ii) by striking “2 school years” and inserting “4 school years”;

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) by striking the first sentence;

(ii) by striking “The school” and inserting “A school described in clause (i)”; and

(iii) by striking “5-school-year period” each place it appears and inserting “4-school-year period”; and

(C) in clause (iii), by striking “5-school-year period” and inserting “4-school-year period”; and

(3) in subparagraph (E), by striking clause (iii).

(b) **ADJUSTMENTS TO PAYMENT RATES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 11(a)(3)(B) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1759a(a)(3)(B)) is amended—

(A) by striking “(B) The annual” and inserting the following:

“(B) **COMPUTATION OF ADJUSTMENT.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The annual”;

(B) by striking “Each annual” and inserting the following:

“(ii) **BASIS.**—Each annual”;

(C) by striking “The adjustments” and inserting the following:

“(iii) **ROUNDING.**—

“(I) **THROUGH JUNE 30, 1999.**—For the period ending June 30, 1999, the adjustments”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) **JULY 1, 1999, AND THEREAFTER.**—On July 1, 1999, and on each subsequent July 1, the national average payment rates for meals and supplements shall be adjusted to the nearest lower