



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1999

No. 63

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

MTBE USAGE

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this week in the Committee on Commerce we are going to have a hearing Thursday, May 6, at 9:30, concerning amendment to the Clean Air Act. I am going to paint a little bit what the problem is, and it is centered at the EPA. In their efforts to really clean up the air what has happened is they have polluted the water, and it is a very interesting, but sad, commentary, and the Governor of California is coming here to testify, and almost all the Members of Congress from California are on the bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), which is H.R. 11, and we are going to be holding a hearing on this bill. And let me just give my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, a little bit of background on this because this shows the unintended consequences sometimes of what we do here in Washington and what the EPA extends further to do.

So, if my colleagues will bear with me, imagine a city suddenly faced with contaminated drinking water. The elected officials desperately search for the responsible parties, they want retribution and justice, they want their

tainted water supply cleaned up, the guilty must be found, and they must be punished.

Now this perhaps sounds like a Hollywood plot, a Hollywood movie, but it is not, and for many communities across this Nation, they are facing this situation. The guilty party is none other than the supposed protector, the Environmental Protection Agency.

Tom Randall, a managing editor of the Environmental News, recently brought some articles to my attention. They detail a pollutant being forced upon the American public by the EPA. The pollutant is methyl tertiary-butyl ether, MTBE. Now this may not be a common household word to many, but the EPA, oil companies which were mandated to produce it and many communities across this country are all too familiar with this water polluting gasoline additive.

The problem began in 1990 with a misguided amendment to the Clean Air Act which led the EPA to mandate the use of oxygenates in gasoline sold in areas which are out of compliance with clean air standards. Many in this body assumed the EPA had done their homework. In California, they trusted the EPA enough to become the first to use MTBE statewide even in areas not mandated by the EPA. In doing so, they also became the first State to face a water pollution problem we may all face in this country all because the EPA did not do its homework and still has not to this day.

These are the facts: There are basically two types of oxygenates: alcohol-based and ether-based. Alcohols are generally used in the Midwest where they are produced, but since they cannot be shipped through pipelines because they pick up water ethers, primarily MTBE, are the only economically feasible choices for the rest of the country.

What the EPA apparently did not know back when their mandate went

into effect, and they still will not admit, is that MTBE is a powerful and persistent water pollutant and, from leaks and spills, has made its way into groundwater of nearly every State in this Nation; the problem, of course, being worse in California, the harbinger of what will surely come to pass in much of the rest of this country. It takes only a small amount of MTBE to make water undrinkable. It spreads rapidly in both groundwater and reservoirs, and so far attempts to remove MTBE from water have proven difficult and costly.

Has the EPA done anything to advance independent peer review research into this? Not at this point, Mr. Speaker. They have appointed a, quote, blue ribbon panel to study it, a panel composed in most parts in part of representatives of MTBE producers and environmental lobbyists which in my opinion have vested interest in protecting the use of this fuel additive.

In the meantime, States, universities and the courts are scrambling to clean up the EPA's mess. It is time, Mr. Speaker, we move to help them with meaningful legislation to end the mandates for oxygenates which, by the way, many scientists contend do nothing to reduce air pollution from the majority of cars on the road today.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, my friends and colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) have introduced corrective legislation. Mr. BILBRAY has introduced H.R. 11 which the Committee on Commerce will be holding a hearing on this Thursday. H.R. 11 allows for California to use alternative methods other than only using the oxygenates in gasoline. I applaud their efforts and encourage State engagement rather than federal mandates. The bill of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS), H.R. 1367, would effectively end the use of MTBE.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2555

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support both of these bills, and I urge my colleagues to support them also.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNITY SYSTEMS PRESERVATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as someone who came to Congress because I believe that Federal Government should do more to be a constructive partner with our communities to help promote livability, I could not be more excited about developments that are taking place this week in Detroit. I just left the conference, the town meeting, on sustainable development where there were over 3100 people from around the country and more still registering. It was not so much a wrap-up of the President's Council of Sustainable Development, but rather a hand-off to citizen activists, students, business, government, nongovernmental agencies to deal with specific activities that they could do to help promote livable communities. There were a variety of workshops with people learning from one another, and the administration has announced 70 specific commitments to help promote that more sustainable future.

One of the programs that I am most pleased with was the Transportation and Community Systems Preservation Act. This was a provision in our TEA-21 legislation, the Surface Transportation Act last year, that was born in the Oregon experience where a group of private citizens pushed the State and Federal transportation agencies to consider an alternative to simply constructing a traditional bypass to look at what would happen if we were more thoughtful about the ways that we put pieces together.

The results of their research was stunning. It proved conclusively that by dealing with the integration of land use, transportation being more connected and giving people more choices that we could, in fact, reduce congestion more than simply having a pavement-only solution.

That found its way into TEA-21. I was happy to have supported it in our House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The driving force in the Senate was my Senator, RON WYDEN, a former colleague here in the House, and it has opened the floodgates; over 500 applications from around the country totaling over \$400 million from people who understand the power of being able to plan their community. Sadly we are only able to award a small portion of those programs, approximately 39, although there are opportunities in the horizon to increase those in future years.

There may be some federal programs that obviously spend more money, but

I think there will be fewer that will have more of an impact than helping citizens sort out the right investments and allowing them to be part of framing those solutions.

The entire town meeting effort is an illustration of what livable communities are all about. It is not about Federal interference, but partnership. It is about giving people more choices rather than fewer and that will end up costing people less money rather than more.

It is not the solutions for livable communities that are pushing people to the edge financially. It is the consequences of throwing money at problems in an unplanned way, problems that were first created by not carefully planning and thinking about what we are doing.

A country that can put a man on the moon and bring him back safely over 20 years ago does not have to build a generation of failed infrastructure projects. It should not be illegal in most of America for a clerk working in a drug store to live in an apartment above that drug store rather than having to commute every day. The Federal Government should not pay people more to pave a creek than restore a wetland, especially if that wetland restoration will actually solve the problem as well or even better, and we should guarantee that people in communities, large and small, across America have a place at the table to discuss the impacts of infrastructure investments rather than being shut out by State bureaucracies.

Finally, the Federal Government itself should do more to lead by example, whether it is finally requiring the Post Office to obey the same laws and codes that the private sector or that local government itself needs to follow or, for that matter, having the House of Representatives do as good a job in our recycling efforts as a couple of ambitious Boy Scout troops do back home.

The bottom line is that the American public wants our families to be safe, economically secure and healthy. What is going on with the town meeting this week in Detroit is an example of how to do that. I hope that my colleagues will look at ways that each of us in Congress can do our best to help make our communities more livable.

THE CONTINUING STEEL IMPORT CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, the steel import crisis, which began in 1997, is still continuing today. The numbers tell the story. Total steel imports in 1998 were at the highest level ever, 41.5 million net tons of steel mill products. This was a 33 percent increase over imports in 1997, which also was a record year.

While the pressure was on as the House debated the steel issue earlier this year and overwhelmingly passed H.R. 975, we saw steel imports begin to come down in December 1998 and in January and February of this year. But as soon as the pressure let up with uncertainty over the fate of this legislation in the other body, steel imports shot up again in March. We saw a 25 percent increase in steel imports in March over the levels in February.

The U.S. market continues to be the market of last resort for many exporters. As markets overseas continue to face economic turmoil, exporters continue to ship unprecedented levels of steel into the United States, the world's most open market. In order to obtain hard currency, exporters have sent the world's oversupply of steel to the U.S., often at prices that bear no relation to the actual production costs.

In March we also saw some imports source and product switching, which all of us had feared. We saw an increase in imports of blooms, billets and slabs and in hot rolled sheet from countries not subject to the current trade cases.

The impacts of this steel import crisis cannot be overstated. Every single ton of dumped steel displaces a ton of domestic production. The United States industry is losing competitiveness because of these unfairly traded imports. Companies are finding that as prices drop and imports continue to increase, they cannot commit to future capital investments, they cannot commit to needed modernizations, and they cannot commit to additional research and development. These effects, if not reversed soon, could have a lasting implication on an important industry well into the 21st century.

Company by company the impact is also being felt in the short term. Four companies have filed for bankruptcy protection. Mills are dramatically cutting production in capacity utilization. Foreign producers that dump their products are now realizing the benefits of American companies' successful efforts to rebuild the market for steel products here in the United States, and most disturbing is the damage that is being done to many American families as steelworkers lose their jobs. As stated in the President's steel report in January, 10,000 Americans have lost their jobs because of this crisis. Many will never return to jobs that can provide the level of pay and benefits that were provided by the steelworker jobs that have been lost, and that does not take into account the impact on local community services where jobs are lost, the impact of suppliers. So the job number could be much larger.

□ 1245

Some workers may not lose their jobs, but short work weeks, reduced shifts and lost hours can also have a devastating impact on their families. Those laid off and those with reduced hours are struggling to pay rent and mortgages, to put food on the table and

to provide their children with the things they need.

As I have stated before, this crisis does not just impact steelworkers and their families. The shortage or the imports affect outside contractors, suppliers and everyone in the community that depends on these steel mills. I recently read a statistic that for every one million tons of domestic steel lost, nearly 5,000 U.S. jobs are directly or indirectly affected.

The highly competitive United States steel industry cannot compete with massive foreign subsidies, closed home markets and industrial cartels that protect an enormous worldwide overcapacity. It is now time for Congress and our government to step in and take the steps necessary to provide the U.S. industry a fair and level playing field in the global marketplace.

I urge the other body to complete action on H.R. 975. I further urge the House to take up other important trade law bills, including H.R. 412, which I introduced; H.R. 1120, which was introduced by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON); and H.R. 1505, which was introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH).

The current steel import crisis must be stopped, and we must ensure that such a crisis will not happen again in the future.

I might add, I thought it was interesting that President Clinton even took the time to take this subject up with the Prime Minister of Japan because of their dumping practices.

STEEL IMPORTS ONCE AGAIN ON THE RISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) is recognized during morning hour debates for 3 minutes.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the steelworkers in Northeast Arkansas and all over this country are frustrated, and they are the most productive steelworkers in the world. They have lost faith in their government's promise to uphold its basic trade laws.

The steel import figures for March show that imports are once again on the rise. Imports for March are 25 percent higher than the imports in February. Imports from Japan rose 36 percent; from Brazil, 54 percent; from Korea, 11 percent; from Indonesia, 339 percent. Compared to July of 1997, before the crisis began, Japan's imports are up 22 percent; Brazil's are up 25 percent; Korea, 77 percent; Indonesia, 889 percent.

Clearly, the steel crisis is not over.

Although they continue to assure us that they are negotiating and consulting with these nations, we continue to see higher rates of steel entering this Nation.

The President warned Japan Monday to reduce its steel shipments to the United States on a consistent basis or the government will act to block them. The President also said during a news conference that the U.S. would act to keep Japanese steel out of U.S. markets if those imports continued to exceed the levels existing before the Asian economic crisis.

How long does this crisis have to go on? Something must be done. We must take action now.

Arkansas steelworkers have lost faith in their government because we have failed them by failing to enforce our own trade laws.

The administration continues to sit on this problem without offering a substantive and timely remedy. Steelworkers need solid, immediate plans to end the flow of underpriced steel that is flooding our market. We cannot simply solve the world's financial crisis on the backs of the steelworkers of the United States. The time for action is now, as I have already said, strong and decisive action. For the sake of American steelworkers and their families, we must end this import crisis.

THE CONTINUING STEEL IMPORT CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 2 minutes.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I would like associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and also the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

We rise today to discuss the steel crisis that continues to grip the steel industry and its workers.

On March 17, this past year, 289 House Members passed the bipartisan Steel Recovery Act. This bipartisan legislation calls for quotas to be placed on foreign steel to get back to its pre-crisis levels of July, 1997.

The bill would also set up a steel monitoring system that would track the amount of steel imports into the United States by foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go into detail this morning about the reasons why our steel industry and its workers find themselves in this serious crisis. We have been through that in the months leading up to the vote on March 17. What I am here to say and to join the others in pointing out is that there still is a steel crisis in the United States and that we need something done immediately.

As many as four major steel companies are in bankruptcy right now, and we know that when those good-paying jobs disappear they disappear forever.

The need for our steel bill was clear on March 17, and today it is even more clear. 289 House Members believed that something must be done to stop these imports, as we continue to see higher rates of steel entering the country each and every day.

The administration may argue that the amount of steel imports for the month of March represents a 30 percent drop in imports since November of 1998; and, while that may be true, shipments from countries such as Brazil and Japan showed a significant increase.

It is important to point out that just yesterday the President warned Japan that the United States will take action if the steel imports are not returned to their pre-crisis levels. I believe that is an absolute positive step in the right direction, and I applaud the President for this action.

We must continue, though, in our action to make sure that passage of the bill that the House sent over is approved in the Senate and signed by the President of the United States.

On behalf of the American steelworkers and their families, I ask our administration and the Senate to act to end this crisis. This is not about free trade. It is about fair trade.

THE ITC SHOULD RULE DECISIVELY IN FAVOR OF THE U.S. STEEL INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 1 minute.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, today the International Trade Commission holds a hearing into illegal steel dumping. Well, let me report, I was in the northern panhandle yesterday. The pain, both economic and personal, continues from illegal dumping of steel in this country by foreign nations. Over 10,000 jobs have been lost nationwide. Weirton Steel alone has lost over 750 jobs. Net sales for Weirton Steel are down \$76 million this quarter over last year, and as of March of this year the level of steel imports from Japan and Brazil were up 22 and 25 percent. These numbers show clearly this crisis, this steel crisis, is nowhere near over.

The decision from today's International Trade Commission hearing will not be given until mid-June, but I am urging the ITC to rule decisively in favor of the U.S. steel industry and its \$70 billion contribution to our economy and to Weirton Steel and to many others.

When we see a crime, we call 911. Well, this time West Virginia steelworkers need some help from this international assault.

TIME TO TAKE DECISIVE ACTION IN YUGOSLAVIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, late last week this House took up a resolution to continue the administration's policy of bombing Yugoslavia, and by a

vote of 213 to 213 the measure failed to endorse that policy.

Many of those of us who voted against the policy made a deliberate, considered vote of protest against incessant bombings that have not accomplished much of anything except to kill innocent civilians and destroy the infrastructure of Yugoslavia that in the end the U.S. will likely be asked to spend billions of dollars to rebuild.

Forty-one days of intensive bombings have not been successful in removing Milosevic's forces from Kosova, nor has it achieved the stated purpose of the bombing and that is to stop the ethnic cleansing of the Kosovars. Even our own NATO commanders have stated clearly that, except for weakening the air defense system in Yugoslavia, the air strikes have not been successful; and Serb forces continue to commit atrocities; and hundreds of civilians, men, women and children, are being killed by these bombs.

Contrary to the wishful thinking of those who supported that resolution, the bombing has not stopped the murders. It has not stopped the violence. Instead, the bombings have exacerbated both.

Thus, the question is, how long will the world support a war in which the only victims are civilian men, women and children?

Now, Reverend Jessie Jackson returned from Yugoslavia and was successful in obtaining the release of three servicemen, and he brought a letter from Mr. Milosevic to give to President Clinton asking that they meet and talk about this issue. So I would say, Mr. President, the time has come to take a decisive action by stopping the bombs and initiate a committed, comprehensive effort to find a diplomatic solution to what is going on in Yugoslavia.

CHINA WANTS ACCESSION INTO THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION, BUT WITHOUT PLAYING BY THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself also with the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE), the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) in imploring the ITC to rule for the United States steel industry.

There is another trade issue that soon will be in front of Congress. Corporate jets are starting to land at National Airport one after another after another, filled with CEOs coming, descending on Capitol Hill to lobby on behalf of the Chinese Communist Government's accession to the World Trade Organization.

One prominent Chinese dissident who had spent many years in a Chinese jail

simply for exercising what he considered his right to speak out about oppression and speak out against the Chinese Government and its policies, this dissident said that American corporate executives were in the vanguard of the Chinese Communist Party revolution, arguing in this body for special trade advantages, so-called Most Favored Nation status for China, arguing in this body that China should be admitted to the World Trade Organization.

Let us step back for a moment, Mr. Speaker, and look at a little bit of the history of China's attempt to join this world trade body and play by the rules that the United States and other countries around the world play by.

For 5 years, the People's Republic of China has courted the United States, trying to convince the United States that China, the Chinese Communist Government, should be admitted, acceded into the World Trade Organization, but look what they have done in those 5 years as they in a sense have been courting the United States: illegal sales of nuclear technology to Pakistan; smuggling of AK-47s into the harbor at San Francisco; child labor; slave labor; shooting missiles into the Straits of Taiwan when Taiwan was holding its first free election, something that the People's Republic of China is very unfamiliar with.

As China has been courting the United States, this is the way they have been acting. They have violated every norm, every reasonable standard that is accepted in the international community, standards that our country lives by, standards that the great majority of countries around the world live by.

China, while she has been courting the United States, has acted this way, yet they want accession into the World Trade Organization.

At the same time, China has exported last year \$75 billion worth of goods to the United States. We have sold to China, exported to China, only about \$12 billion worth of goods. We sell to Belgium more than we do to China, because China simply will not let most of our goods and services in their country.

China takes that \$60 billion trade deficit, that surplus for them, in a sense that gift of \$60 billion, turns around and buys more or less \$60 billion worth of goods from Western Europe; generally, our western European allies. Then when we have a problem with China, when there is a human rights violation or some sort of theft of property rights or something that clearly China has acted not according to the rules of international trade, those European countries never are on our side in those trade disputes because they are such a big customer for China.

Understand that China has a \$60 billion trade surplus with us. They make \$60 billion in goods and services from us, turn around and spend that \$60 billion in Western Europe; in a sense, buying allies in their quest around the world in the trade arena.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, what we need to do before granting China World Trade Organization is not listen to what they say, because they always make promise after promise after promise saying that they will behave, that they will play fair, they will stop the human rights abuses, they will stop the forced abortions, they will stop the religious discrimination, they will stop their war against the Tibetans, they will stop what they do against Taiwan, they will stop the child labor, their slave labor.

They promise that every year. Every year this country gives them Most-Favored-Nation status. Every year they break those promises. Mao Zedong liked to quote his ideological communist mentor, Vladimir Lenin, the Soviet leader. He said, promises are like pie crust, they are made to be broken. That is what has happened with China as they have courted the United States to join the World Trade Organization.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the administration, I ask the President, I ask Republican leadership in this body, I ask the American business community, which is so strongly supportive of World Trade Organization entry for China immediately, I ask them to step back and let us see if China can behave for one year, if it can stop the human rights abuses, stop the slave labor and the child labor, can stop shooting missiles at Taiwan, can stop the nuclear sales to Pakistan, can stop the human rights violations.

Let us see if China can stop for 1 year and join the community of nations in its behavior for 1 year. Then let us talk about World Trade Organization accession. Do not let them in based on their promises, let them in based on their actions.

MARKING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WIC PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is recognized during morning hour debates for 2 minutes.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure today to rise to mark the 25th anniversary of the WIC program, the women, infants and children. I am proud to join my colleagues in support of this very valuable and extremely successful program.

Several years ago when I served on the Committee on the Budget I had the opportunity to hear several CEOs of Fortune 500 companies testify in support of the WIC program. These executives talked about the difficulties they had in finding a qualified work force and the amount of money they had to spend to educate and retrain their employees.

They told us that while improving our educational system was an important part of the solution, our educational system can only do so much if

the child is not prepared to learn by the time they reach school age.

These executives came to the conclusion that in order to find solutions to the problems they were facing and other problems facing society, we had to begin at the beginning and make sure children start out their lives with the nutrition they need to develop.

That conclusion is what brought these CEOs to the Committee on the Budget, and it is what brings me to the floor today. We continue to learn more each day about the importance of the first 3 years of life in the development of the brain. Common sense tells us that ensuring that children have proper nutrition at this critical period in their lives will reap benefits for all of us as these children grow into adulthood.

A child who has the proper nutrition at the beginning of his or her life in the womb through the first 3 years of its life is more likely to succeed in school, less likely to become involved in the criminal justice system, and more likely to become a productive member of society.

There have been numerous studies showing the effectiveness of the WIC program in improving health of newborn children. From a fiscal standpoint, studies have found that Medicaid costs for women and children participating in WIC were reduced by between \$1.77 and \$3.13 for every dollar spent on WIC.

But more important than any of these statistics or studies about the effectiveness of the WIC program is this: The WIC program helps give all children a fair start in life. That is why I am proud to support the WIC program, and encourage our colleagues to continue to support and expand upon this very valuable program.

ETHIOPIA AND ERITREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 1½ minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, recently I met with representatives of the Ethiopian and Eritrean embassies. The two countries are involved in a horrific border war that since May, 1998, has resulted in tens of thousands of casualties.

As family doctor who worked in a refugee camp near Kassala, Sudan, in 1985, and treated refugees from both Tigre and Eritrea, it is heartbreaking to see this war continue. Just a few years ago, the Horn of Africa was one of the most promising development storise on the continent. There was great hope for both Eritrea and Ethiopia in 1991, two countries with a great deal in common. Now, tragically, that promise is gone, swept away in war.

Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to ask the United States to take sides militarily in this war. It is not in our interests, or

in those of the warring parties, that we do. What I do ask is for the two warring nations, Ethiopia and Eritrea, to agree to a cease-fire and peace settlement. The OAU proposal seems to be acceptable to both countries, but for unclear reasons has not been signed.

A cease-fire and peace treaty must be agreed to. The war must end. New enemies must again become old friends.

PROBLEMS AMERICA IS CONFRONTING IN THE STEEL INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 2 minutes.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with the other Members who have been on the floor today to talk about the problems we are confronting in steel.

I recently had a chance to visit Bethlehem Steel's Sparrows Point division. I had a chance to meet with many of the 4,000 dedicated workers at this facility. I also had a chance to talk with management, to go over the investment that management is making in the most modern steel equipment, hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, at Sparrows Point our workers can compete with any worker around the world. All they ask from us is a level playing field. They are not asking us to protect the steel industry from competition, but they are asking us to protect the steel industry from illegally dumped steel that is still coming into this country.

Yes, what we need to do, we need to enact the legislation, that passed, that rolls back the level of steel imports to the pre-crisis level. We need to reform our antidumping and countervailing duty laws to protect from the surge of illegal steel or any product coming into this country, so we can act decisively. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) and I have filed such legislation. We also need the ITC to take decisive action in their meetings today.

This is sort of like a Whack-a-Mole game, where you hit one country on the head that is dealing with illegal steel and another country pops up. But for the 10,000 steel workers' jobs that we have lost, this is not a game. It is time for us to take decisive action.

THE CRISIS IN STEEL IS NOT OVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) is recognized during morning hour debates for 2 minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the crisis in steel is not over. The International Trade Commission of the U.S. Department of Commerce has ruled that foreign steel imports are coming

into this country at below-cost production in many cases, below cost of U.S. products, and are being, in the technical terms, dumped in the U.S. marketplace.

The Department of Commerce is now proceeding in the second phase of this unfair trade practice determining injury. The Clinton administration, through the Secretary of Commerce, Secretary Daley, and Secretary Rubin at Treasury, have moved smartly to impose countervailing duties and put companies on notice in this country to post bond or cash to cover the cost between the unfair price and the U.S. market price.

We are now in the injury phase of this proceeding, an excruciating fair, time-consuming process, the most fair process of any country in the world trade community for determining unfair trade. In fact, it is so fair that I am afraid that American steel mills and in Minnesota taconite plants will be out of business before they come to the conclusion, the Department of Commerce, that there is injury, that these countervailing duties should be imposed, and the level trading field re-established in steel.

We ought to act decisively now. The Senate ought to pass the bipartisan Steel Recovery Act, because imports from Japan in March were up 36 percent, Brazil up 54 percent, Korea up 11 percent, and Indonesia tripled its exports in March to the United States. Korea has increased their exports to the U.S. so much that they are up 77 percent over a year ago.

The crisis in steel is not over. More countries are finding that the most open, fair market in the world is the United States, and are dumping their unemployment on our marketplace. It is not fair.

AMERICAN STEEL COMPANIES AND STEEL FAMILIES REMAIN IN GRAVE DANGER FROM STEEL DUMPING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 2 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues today are point out, the latest trade figures are in and they confirm what we feared but also what we expected. They confirm, Mr. Speaker, that the steel dumping crisis is not over. In fact, just the opposite, they confirm that our American steel companies and our American steel families remain in grave danger.

It turns out that the recent drop in imports was not the start of a trend, it was only our trading partners catching their breath and then pumping up their March shipments by 25 percent. That includes a 39 percent increase from Japan and a 54 percent increase from Brazil, two of the main targets of complaints filed by our U.S. steelmakers.

It is clear that these countries are not very impressed with America's resolve to enforce our trade laws. What about our steelmakers? How are imports affecting them? Thanks to imports, LTV is reporting a first quarter loss of \$29 million; Bethlehem a loss of \$26 million, and in my district, Weirton Steel is reporting a loss of almost \$28 million, the worst in 6 years. Seven hundred Weirton Steel employees remain out of work, putting a terrible strain on communities all along the upper Ohio Valley.

Mr. Speaker, our trading partners do not care about our communities. They do not care about our families. They do not even care about following our trade laws. But this Congress and this administration must care, because when the playing field is level, we can compete with anyone on Earth.

This Congress must come full circle and pass tough trade legislation, and this administration must use every tool at its disposal to enforce basic, fair, trade laws. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the crisis is not over. We cannot afford to act like it is.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

In this world where life contains what seems to be so much turmoil and tribulation we long for that tranquility that lives beside the still waters of peace, and yet we know that grace exists besides turbulence and healing exists besides pain. O gracious God, the creator of everyone, we laud and praise those who use their ability to bring peace and healing to our communities and to all the neighborhoods of our world. May Your spirit, O God, unite each person so we share our concerns and our hopes as one people with one creator. In Your name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. RUSH led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

FRED STEFFENS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 509) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the personal representative of the estate of Fred Steffens of Big Horn County, Wyoming, certain land comprising the Steffens family property.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 509

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TRANSFER OF STEFFENS FAMILY PROPERTY.

(a) CONVEYANCE.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to issue, without consideration, a quitclaim deed to Marie Wambeke of Big Horn County, Wyoming, the personal representative of the estate of Fred Steffens, to the land described in subsection (b): *Provided*, That all minerals underlying such land are hereby reserved to the United States.

(b) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The land referred to in subsection (a) is the approximately 80-parcel known as "Farm Unit C" in the E½NW¼ of Section 27 in Township 57 North, Range 97 West, 6th Principal Meridian, Wyoming.

(c) REVOCATION OF WITHDRAWAL.—The Bureau of Reclamation withdrawal for the Shoshone Reclamation Project under Secretarial Order dated October 21, 1913, is hereby revoked with respect to the lands described in subsection (b).

With the following committee amendment in the nature of a substitute:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. TRANSFER OF STEFFENS FAMILY PROPERTY.

(a) CONVEYANCE.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to issue, without consideration, a quitclaim deed to Marie Wambeke of Big Horn County, Wyoming, the personal representative of the estate of Fred Steffens, to the land described in subsection (b): *Provided*, That all minerals underlying such land are hereby reserved to the United States.

(b) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The land referred to in subsection (a) is the approximately 80-acre parcel known as "Farm Unit C" in the E½NW¼ of Section 27 in Township 57 North, Range 97 West, 6th Principal Meridian, Wyoming.

(c) REVOCATION OF WITHDRAWAL.—The Bureau of Reclamation withdrawal for the Shoshone Reclamation Project under Secretarial Order dated October 21, 1913, is hereby revoked with respect to the lands described in subsection (b).

Mr. BALLENGER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN R. AND MARGARET J. LOWE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 510) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to John R. and Margaret J. Lowe of Big Horn County, Wyoming, certain land so as to correct an error in the patent issued to their predecessors in interest.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 510

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TRANSFER OF LOWE FAMILY PROPERTY.

(a) CONVEYANCE.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to issue, without consideration, a quitclaim deed to John R. and Margaret J. Lowe of Big Horn County, Wyoming, to the land described in subsection (b): *Provided*, That all minerals underlying such land are hereby reserved to the United States.

(b) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The land referred to in subsection (a) is the approximately 40-acre parcel located in the SW¼SE¼ of Section 11, Township 51 North, Range 96 West, 6th Principal Meridian, Wyoming.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 509 and H.R. 510, as introduced in the House, mirror the bills introduced by Senators MIKE ENZI and CRAIG THOMAS that passed last year in the Senate by unanimous consent.

The first bill, H.R. 509, transfers eighty acres of public land in Big Horn County, Wyoming, to the estate of Mr. Fred Steffens.

The property outlined in the bill has been a part of the Steffens' family working farm since the land was purchased in 1928. Mr. Steffens was issued a warranty deed to the property by Mr. Frank McKinney, predecessor of interest.

Unfortunately, Mr. McKinney knowingly had neither title to the property nor an assignable right of entry. However, the fact that Mr. McKinney did not own the land did not stop him from selling the property or issuing the warranty deed.

In good faith, Mr. Steffens purchased the property and, according to the Big Horn County Assessor's office, paid taxes since the date of purchase in 1928.

Upon Mr. Steffens' death, in an attempt to settle his estate, it was discovered that a patent had never been issued for these lands. Mr. Steffens' sister and representative of the estate filed a Color of Title application with the BLM's Wyoming state office, but the title was rejected.

The reason given was that the lands at issue were, and continue to be, withdrawn by

the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) for the Shoshone Reclamation Project. Regulations specifically preclude claims under the Color of Title Act when lands are withdrawn for Federal purposes.

The only option to remedy this situation is to pass H.R. 509. Both the BOR and the BLM support the transfer of title to the Steffens' estate. The bill preserves the rights of the federal government to own the mineral interests and transfers the right, title and surface estate to the Steffens.

Mr. Steffens' and his family occupied this property in good faith. I believe it's time for the issue to be resolved and ask my colleagues to favorably report the bill to the House floor.

H.R. 510 is another bill that the BLM supports which transfers forty acres of public land in Big Horn County, Wyoming, to John and Margaret Lowe.

Although there is a confusing history to this particular parcel, there is abundant evidence that the Lowe's claim to the land is justified.

The latest evidence comes at the hand of a Big Horn County assessor who wrote that based on other entries in the county records, the legal description of the land being transferred by the original patent should have included the forty acres under consideration.

The Lowe family, since acquiring the land in 1966, have paid taxes on the land since that time.

H.R. 510, although not the only alternative the Lowe's have in acquiring the forty acres, is the only alternative that will bring minimal additional expense to either the Lowe family or the BLM.

As I mentioned before, the BLM supports the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 30, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 30, 1999 at 10:21 a.m. that the Senate passed S. Res. 88.

Appointment: Advisory Commission on Electronic Commerce

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk.

AMERICANS AND THREE RE-
CENTLY RELEASED SOLDIERS
OWE REVEREND JESSE JACKSON
THANKS

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, there are three American soldiers who are celebrating freedom today. These young men have now been reunited with their families and are receiving needed medical care in Germany.

America is very proud of Steven Gonzales, Andrew Ramirez, and Christopher Stone. Like so many others now in harm's way, they served at considerable risk to their own personal safety. They suffered physical harm at the hands of their captors, and they emerged from captivity with crisp salutes to their superior officers with their heads held high.

As we celebrate their safety, let us not overlook one fact: These soldiers were released through the efforts of Reverend Jesse Jackson.

While I will continue to support our troops in their actions abroad, I applaud any potential avenue for peace. Reverend Jackson is not our Secretary of State, but in recent days he has achieved diplomatically what had not before been possible. America, like these three young men, owes him our thanks.

RESIDENTS IN NEW YORK BANNED FROM FLYING FLAG

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, residents of Brookshire Condominiums in Washingtonville, New York, have been banned from flying the American flag. Banned, ladies and gentlemen. In fact, they will be charged \$25 for every day that they fly the flag beyond the five holidays allowed. Unbelievable.

The sad fact is in America today we can burn the flag, but we may not be allowed to fly the flag. Beam me up. Is it any wonder America is so screwed up?

I yield back the lives of thousands of heroic Americans who gave their lives in battle while carrying Old Glory into battle.

HONORING AMERICA'S TEACHERS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of America's teachers, those people who rise every day to open up the world of learning to our children.

As a former public high school math and science teacher myself, I can attest to the amount of time, energy, creativity, and patience that it takes to take our students to the next step of discovery, be it in literature, calculus, music theory or physics.

Today, I would like to especially honor one teacher from my district in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania,

Elaine Savukas, from Hempfield High School.

Year after year, Ms. Savukas has brought a winning team of civics students to Washington to take part in the "We the People, The Citizen and the Constitution" 3-day academic competition on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, as is shown in this picture of her class.

Her students know the Constitution probably better than many Members of Congress know it. She has instilled in her students a love of our history and brings civics alive. She stirs her students to excellence.

Mr. Speaker, there are excellent teachers like Elaine Savukas all over this country, and we are compelled to honor them not only this week but throughout the year as they help shape the minds and motivation of our leaders of the next millennium. I thank all our teachers.

SUPPORT JOINT EFFORT OF CON- GRESSIONAL MEMBERS AND RUSSIAN DUMA COUNTERPARTS TO FIND SOLUTION TO BALKAN CRISIS

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, a window of opportunity to find a peaceful solution to this conflict in Kosovo was opened this weekend in Vienna, Austria.

For my congressional colleagues and my Russian Duma counterparts who participated, those meetings represent a real and attainable step toward a lasting peace.

Obviously, this conflict represents one of the most serious challenges to international security since World War II. Most Members realize the power that many constructive Russian-American efforts can offer in finding a solution.

In that light, this bilateral conference agreed on a course of action which would withdraw Serbian troops from Kosovo, cease all military activities of the KLA, and end NATO bombing.

Once these measures are complete, the repatriation of the refugees, administered by an international peace-keeping force and the international community, can begin the healing and rebuilding process.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to support this joint effort to find a diplomatic solution to the Balkans crisis because, in my mind, peace is an exit strategy everyone can understand.

PASS EMERGENCY SUPPLE- MENTAL AND HELP DESPERATE, DESERVING FARMERS

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, how many times do we have to come to the floor asking for help on behalf of the American farmer? How many more farmers have to go bankrupt before we pass the emergency supplemental? When is the Speaker going to stop holding America's farmers hostage and stop playing politics?

This could have been done months ago. The time to act is now. It is the right thing to do. America's farmers deserve to be treated better than this. Let us pass the emergency supplemental.

H.R. 1503, CAPITAL GAINS EXPANSION FOR FARMERS

(Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a week ago I introduced a bill to correct a flaw in the Tax Code. H.R. 1503 would allow family farmers to take advantage of the \$500,000 capital gains tax break that many other Americans can take when they sell their homes. This bill expands the \$500,000 capital gains tax exclusion for principal residences to cover the entire farm.

Most family farmers are unable to take advantage of the capital gains tax break because they do not spend extra money investing in their principal residence, they spend it investing in their whole farm. As a result, the capital gains exclusion is of little help to farmers selling their land. It simply makes sense. Farmers should enjoy the same capital gains exclusion as other Americans.

Agriculture producers are faced with many challenges these days, and we need to look at a variety of issues to improve the situation in rural America. I believe this bill begins to correct one that we can control, an inequity in the Tax Code.

I ask my colleagues to join me along with the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) in supporting H.R. 1503.

URGENT NEED FOR SUPPLEMENTAL AGRICULTURE FUNDING

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, since the Congress began in January, all have acknowledged the need to enact emergency legislation to assist our small farmers and ranchers.

The emergency supplemental appropriation for farm loans was the result of unprecedented demand for agricultural credit due to the persistent low commodity prices across our Nation.

The Department of Agriculture's Farm Service Agency, FSA, needs an additional \$152 million in fiscal year 1999 to provide credit and to deliver much-needed services to farmers and

ranchers because of the low prices and bad weather.

The conferees have yet to resolve the differences in the emergency agriculture supplemental so this desperately needed legislation can be brought to the floor of the House for passage of the conference report.

My colleagues, we truly, truly have an emergency. We must act now. The situation is urgent. Let us pass the emergency supplemental so our farmers of America can continue to provide the food and fiber we desperately need.

PRESIDENT HAS CREATED NATIONAL SECURITY EMERGENCY

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I call my colleagues' attention to this graph I have here. It shows that the President has neglected the defense budget for the past 6 years, while stretching our troops around the world. There has been laxity, inattention, and actual negligence in guarding our most valuable nuclear secrets.

I believe the President has created a national security emergency. There have been truly massive cuts in the defense budget in the area of weapons procurement, all this while using American troops in the role of social workers on humanitarian missions around the world. It is a recipe designed to leave our proud military in a state of emergency, unable to match resources with demands.

American servicemen deserve better. Those who serve our Nation should not be put in harm's way when our national security interests are not at stake, and they should be provided with the resources necessary to carry out our mission in a dangerous world.

The war in Kosovo has exposed for all the world to see our national security emergency.

□ 1415

WEAPONS OF WAR ON OUR STREETS AND IN OUR SCHOOLS

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the Littleton, Colorado, tragedy yesterday, the gentleman from California (Mr. HENRY WAXMAN) and I sat at a hearing on the GAO report on the 50-caliber, state-of-the-art military rifle that is of Persian Gulf vintage.

The problem is that this armor-piercing sniper rifle, meant to bring down tanks and jeeps, has now infiltrated the States. GAO investigators went undercover in the National Capital area region and found dealers willing to sell the rifle even when the agent said he was interested in taking down a helicopter and in piercing a limousine.

All that is needed is an 18-year-old ID and no felony conviction. In contrast, you have to be 21 to get a handgun. Amazingly, there is no regulation of secondhand assault weapons.

Some of the weapons used at Columbine High School were bought at a gun show. Let us fill this loophole and keep the weapons of war off our streets and out of our schools.

WIC

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children, better known as WIC, a program that has been providing short-term, low-cost preventive health services to young families who are at risk due to low income or nutritionally-related health conditions for 25 years.

Studies have shown that pregnant women who participate in WIC have longer pregnancies leading to fewer premature births, have fewer low-birth-weight babies, experience few infant deaths, and seek prenatal care earlier in their pregnancy.

And when I say it is cost effective, let me point out some real numbers to my colleagues. It costs \$22,000 a pound to raise a low or very low-birth-weight baby to normal weight, costs that are often covered by Medicaid. It costs only \$40 per pound to provide WIC prenatal benefits. These figures show that WIC is making a real difference.

I want to thank those who have made the program a success and wish WIC a happy 25th birthday.

TAX REFORM

(Mr. DEMINT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Tori Smith, a senior at Dorman High School in Spartanburg, South Carolina. She wrote:

I think you take out entirely too much money for tax. That is my dad's money. He worked for it, not you, he should keep it all for himself. Also, young teenagers who have part-time jobs, trying to make a little spending money pay taxes too. I do not think you should take taxes from us until we are 18. That is my opinion, which should count.

Well, Tori, your opinion does count. And Mr. Speaker, she is exactly right. That is their money and they deserve to keep a lot more of it. They should not be punished for working hard for some extra money or saving for college.

On behalf of young women like Tori and the students at Dorman High School, I ask my colleagues to find the courage to reduce taxes and get rid of the oppressive Tax Code. Let us say, enough is enough. Let us replace it

with a national sales tax that rewards hard work and allows these young people to make their dreams come true.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Tori for writing me. I believe we are on the way to giving her a more secure future.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Without objection, and pursuant to section 2(b) of Public Law 98-183, and upon the recommendation of the minority leader, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following member to the Commission on Civil Rights on the part of the House, effective May 4, 1999, to fill the existing vacancy thereon:

Mr. Christopher F. Edley, Jr., Cambridge, Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO NATIONAL SKILL STANDARDS BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 503(b)(3) of the National Skill Standards Act of 1994, (20 U.S.C. 5933) and upon the recommendation of the minority leader, the Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment of the following members to the National Skill Standards Board on the part of the House for a 4-year term:

Ms. Carolyn Warner, Phoenix, Arizona; and

Mr. George Bliss, Washington, D.C.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

If a recorded vote is ordered on House Concurrent Resolution 84, relating to the Disabilities Education Act; House Concurrent Resolution 88, relating to the Pell Grant Program; or House Resolution 157, relating to teacher appreciation, those votes will be taken after debate has concluded on those motions.

If a recorded vote is ordered on any remaining motion, those votes will be postponed until tomorrow.

URGING CONGRESS AND PRESIDENT TO FULLY FUND INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) urging the Congress and the President to fully fund the Federal Government's obligation under the Individuals With

Disabilities Education Act, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES 84

Whereas all children deserve a quality education, including children with disabilities;

Whereas Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 334 F. Supp. 1247 (E. Dist. Pa. 1971), and Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia, 348 F. Supp. 866 (Dist. D. C. 1972), found that children with disabilities are guaranteed an equal opportunity to an education under the 14th amendment to the Constitution;

Whereas the Congress responded to these court decisions by passing the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (enacted as Public Law 94-142), now known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.), to ensure a free, appropriate public education for children with disabilities;

Whereas the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act provides that the Federal, State, and local governments are to share in the expense of educating children with disabilities and commits the Federal Government to pay up to 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities;

Whereas the Federal Government has provided only 9, 11, and 12 percent of the maximum State grant allocation for educating children with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in the last 3 years, respectively;

Whereas the national average cost of educating a special education student (\$13,323) is more than twice the national average per pupil cost (\$6,140);

Whereas research indicates that children who are effectively taught, including effective instruction aimed at acquiring literacy skills, and who receive positive early interventions demonstrate academic progress, and are significantly less likely to be referred to special education;

Whereas the high cost of educating children with disabilities and the Federal Government's failure to fully meet its obligation under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act stretches limited State and local education funds, creating difficulty in providing a quality education to all students, including children with disabilities;

Whereas, if the appropriation for part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.) exceeds \$4,924,672,200 for a fiscal year, the State funding formula will shift from one based solely on the number of children with disabilities in the State to one based on 85 percent of the children ages 3 to 21 living in the State and 15 percent based on children living in poverty in the State, enabling States to undertake good practices for addressing the learning needs of more children in the regular education classroom and reduce over identification of children who may not need to be referred to special education;

Whereas the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act has been successful in achieving significant increases in the number of children with disabilities who receive a free, appropriate public education;

Whereas the current level of Federal funding to States and localities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is contrary to the goal of ensuring that children with disabilities receive a quality education; and

Whereas the Federal Government has failed to appropriate 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure per child with a disability as required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

to assist States and localities to educate children with disabilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) the Congress and the President—

(A) should, working within the constraints of the balanced budget agreement, give programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) the highest priority among Federal elementary and secondary education programs by meeting the commitment to fund the maximum State grant allocation for educating children with disabilities under such Act prior to authorizing or appropriating funds for any new education initiative; and

(B) should meet the commitment described in subparagraph (A) while retaining the commitment to fund existing Federal education programs that increase student achievement; and

(2) if a local educational agency chooses to utilize the authority under section 613(a)(2)(C)(i) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to treat as local funds up to 20 percent of the amount of funds the agency receives under part B of such Act that exceeds the amount it received under that part for the previous fiscal year, then the agency should use those local funds to provide additional funding for any Federal, State, or local education program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, this is an old topic for me, 25 years, speaking on the same subject, trying to encourage the Congress to put their money where their mouth was 24 years ago, when school districts were promised that if they participated in the Federal Individuals With Disabilities Education Act they would receive 40 percent of the excess cost in order to fund special education programs to educate a child with a disability, which may be two, three, five, ten, twenty times greater than to educate a non-disabled student.

Obviously, that was not done. We got up to 6 percent. In the last 3 years, fortunately, we have been able to get huge increases, which gets us all the way up to 12 percent. And, hopefully, by the end of this year, it will be 15 percent, and we still have a long way to go.

What does it mean when we do not fund what we promised? It means that the local school districts must raise millions of dollars in order to fund a mandate that came from the Federal level, a mandate if they decided to participate.

I realize that no matter how much money we put up, we can never fully fund even our 40 percent unless we deal with the number of people who are placed in special education programs, many of which only have a reading problem and, therefore, really should not be there.

I hope that some of the early childhood programs that we have put into effect on the Federal level will help eliminate those who get into special ed simply because of those reading problems.

So, again, I am here today asking, as I have asked every year for 25 years, for Congress and the President to put their money where their mouth was before we talk about funding new programs.

Center cities particularly stand to get all sorts of money to deal with pupil-teacher ratio, to deal with maintenance of their buildings. All we have to do is get that 40 percent of excess costs back to those local school districts and then they can help all students. That is what this is all about, helping all students, not pitting one against another.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring House Concurrent Resolution 84 to the Floor. This Concurrent Resolution urges full funding of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) before creating and funding any new education initiatives. The co-sponsors and I believe that the Federal government cannot continue to ignore the commitment it made over 24 years ago to children with disabilities.

At the time IDEA was first enacted, Congress committed that the Federal government would provide States and local school districts with 40% of the average per pupil expenditure to assist with the excess costs of educating students with disabilities. Where are we on that commitment? We are at 12% and it is this high only because Republicans have insisted and fought for increased Federal funds for IDEA. Since Republicans took over control of Congress in 1995, funding for IDEA has risen over 85%.

Failing to live up to our IDEA funding commitment fails our students, parents, schools, and communities.

Where do we stand on IDEA spending right now? Here's what we know about the President's thoughts on IDEA funding. Under his budget request, President Clinton wants to cut spending for students with disabilities from \$702 per child in FY 1999 to \$688 per child in FY 2000. We also know Secretary of Education Riley's top priorities. According to an article in the Washington Post of April 20, 1999, increasing funding for IDEA does not make the top three priorities of the Department.

The Committee on Education and the Workforce stated its funding priority quite clearly. In a bipartisan vote of 38-4, the Committee approved this resolution to give IDEA programs the highest priority among Federal elementary and secondary education programs.

What will giving IDEA the highest priority in Federal funding for K-12 education programs do for students and schools? It will allow schools to increase and improve services for all students, including students with disabilities.

Meeting the Federal IDEA funding commitment benefits every student by allowing the local school to fund the services needed by all students—everyone wins. Once the Federal government begins to pay its fair share under IDEA, local schools will no longer be forced to redirect local funds to cover the unpaid Federal share. Local funds will be freed up, allowing local schools to hire and train high-quality

teachers, reduce class size, build and renovate classrooms, and invest in technology.

Every student will benefit, regardless of whether the student receives services under Title I, limited English proficiency programs, or IDEA.

We must fully fund IDEA before Washington creates new education programs. We do not need to spend our limited education resources on new, unproven Federal programs. Let's first live up to the promises we made over 24 years ago and fund a program that we know works.

House Concurrent Resolution 84 urges Congress to fully fund IDEA while maintaining its commitment to existing Federal education programs. We do not want to take funds from the Federal education programs currently serving students. However, year in and year out under both Democrat and Republican control, Congress must set priorities and we believe that funding the federal commitment to IDEA must come before funding new untested programs.

We can both ensure that children with disabilities receive a free and appropriate public education and ensure that all children have the best education possible if we just provide fair Federal funding for special education.

I urge everyone to support this important concurrent Resolution. Congress must fulfill its commitment to assist States and localities with educating children with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the beginning of my remarks that I am going to support this resolution.

However, the resolution that is before the House today is not as simple as it may seem. Unfortunately, this resolution tends to place the needs of disabled children and nondisabled children in conflict rather than to seek to recognize our commitment to all children.

Full funding for the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act is a goal which is vitally important to the education of the disabled children of our Nation and one that I have been committed to since I arrived in Congress 23 years ago. We need to provide 40 percent of the excess cost of educating a child with a disability, and this should be done and this should be one of our top priorities for Federal education funding.

In fact, as my chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) knows, I have joined him and many other of my colleagues in demanding additional funding for special education so we can meet this goal now rather than later.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) has been a real and long time leader for full funding of IDEA. I can recall several years ago, when we both served on the Committee on the Budget, the courage he took to be the one Member over there who joined me in trying to secure more funding for this program.

Supporting the needs of disabled children and providing them with a chance to become productive, participating

members of society is extremely important, and there has been no greater champion than myself in this issue.

In fact, many years before the passage of 94-142, I, as one of its principal authors, helped enact Michigan's special education law. My commitment and experience in this issue has spanned three decades of my career in public service, and I understand and support the need to fully fund IDEA.

However, in our desire to provide full funding for IDEA, we should not do so at the expense of other Federal education programs or pit the needs of disabled children against those of nondisabled children. The resolution which we are considering today tends to do that, accentuate the politics of division rather than recognizing what has become a bipartisan goal, the full funding of IDEA.

The issue of IDEA funding is not a Democratic or Republican concern. There has been strong bipartisan support for substantial increases in funding for IDEA in recent appropriations bills, and I strongly believe this will continue.

In the past 3 years we have provided sizable increases for both IDEA and other Federal education initiatives, recognizing the need to build a total Federal commitment to education. IDEA alone has received over \$1.5 billion in additional funding since 1996. The growth and funding for all Federal education programs that have a positive effect on student achievement should be the goal we set our sights on regardless of party or parochial interest.

It is my hope that we commit ourselves to the spirit of cooperation on the issue of educational funding.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of my colleagues to this headline. It says they are going to cut 60 non-tenured positions in my hometown, in my hometown paper.

The reason for that is that we are going to have to increase classroom size and reduce our gifted and talented programs because we cannot access dollars from any of the other Federal education programs. Specifically, we cannot access the dollars from the President's new initiative for new teachers and smaller classes. And that is a problem with our existing school funding programs.

So what we can do? What we can do is fully fund special education, living up to the commitment that Congress has made. What happens if we do that? First of all, it is going to take the pressure off of local taxpayers in my home State, property taxpayers. But, more important than that, it will provide more funding for the general fund budget for education.

By underfunding special education, we are forcing schools to go take money from their general education account and put it into their special education account.

□ 1430

By fully funding special education, we will reverse that process. It will address the area of greatest uncertainty and the area of greatest cost to most of our school districts. I would urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, like so many of all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I am hearing constantly from parents and educators at home about the importance of meeting the Federal commitment to fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA. Parents of children with special needs are absolutely frantic about their children's access to public education. They often feel like the schools are giving them the runaround, but schools are equally as worried about having the resources to do the job that they need to do. And the parents of students without special needs are more than fearful because they believe that special needs students are taking precious resources away from their children.

This cannot continue. Congress must step up to our responsibility, and we should do it this year while the economy is good and we have a surplus. If we cannot do it now, we never will.

But we should not be pitting one education program against another as this particular resolution does. When we do that, we pit students against students, parents against schools, and we pit schools against each other.

However, there is a way that we can in this Congress meet the Federal commitment to fund IDEA. We can do this while continuing our support for other important education programs. We can do this by using some of the funds that have been set aside under the Republicans' balanced budget agreement for tax cuts to fund IDEA.

The balanced budget agreement sets aside \$778 billion for a 10-year tax cut. We would only need \$11 billion additional in funds to fully fund IDEA this year.

When this resolution was marked up in the committee, I offered an amendment that urged Congress to fund IDEA before funding tax cuts. It lost on a partisan vote. 100 percent of the Democrats voted for it; 100 percent of the Republicans voted against it.

While I realize that no amendment can be considered on the floor this afternoon, I do want to point out that we can fully fund IDEA and we can do it without taking away from other education programs. Once again, I urge my colleagues to put education for our

children with disabilities before tax cuts. Work with me. We can fully fund IDEA without taking funds from other important education programs.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, as I go around my district in southwest Missouri and ask school administrators or teachers what is their biggest problem with the Federal Government, I always get the same answer, IDEA. And so now I ask what is their second biggest problem with the Federal Government, and I get a variety of answers, but there is no question their biggest challenge is in the way IDEA is funded, the way IDEA is administered, the way that the rules and regulations are set up.

We cannot do anything today about the administration and the rules and regulations. That needs to be in another, bigger debate later. It needs to happen. But we can do something about the funding.

In 1974, when this program was conceptualized and put into law, Congress said they would pay 40 percent of the cost. Twenty years later, we were paying 6 percent of the cost. In the last 4 years, we have been able to double that, to 12 percent, so we are headed in the right direction. But we need to keep our word.

This is about the Federal Government, not just conceptualizing some new obligation but paying their share and keeping their commitment to make those programs work.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) a member of the committee.

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for yielding me this time.

I want to, first of all, preface my comments by indicating to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that I intend to vote for this resolution. I believe that there has been a sufficient gap between what the Federal Government has promised with respect to funding individuals with disabilities and what we have actually paid for.

When I am in town meetings in my home State of Indiana, IDEA problems come up over and over and over again. Concerned parents, very upset about getting their children a sufficient and fair education, getting their children opportunities to learn in the classroom and having the Federal Government come through with the funding. So I will support the Goodling resolution.

There has also been a three-part series on the difficulties in special education done by the Washington Post here in Washington, D.C. I would ask at the appropriate time unanimous consent for these articles to be entered into the RECORD to show that we need to do more in special education.

But I do have two concerns about this resolution. One is that we do not pay for this resolution by taking money away from other good education programs, that we need to fund Head Start, that we need to fund Pell grants, that we need to make sure that we are not taking money away from education. And this should come from the Republican 10 percent across-the-board tax cut that everybody knows is not going to be out there, anyway.

And, secondly, I just end on the note of, there was a battle cry in 1988 of "Where's the Beef?" Where is the substance? This is a resolution. This does not mean anything yet. Let us get a bill. Where is the bill? Let us go forward with a bill that funds IDEA for our children and for our parents.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting sometimes that we do not read the legislation since it says, "should meet the commitment described in subparagraph (A) while retaining the commitment to fund existing Federal education programs."

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I also rise in support of H. Con. Res. 84, the Individuals with Disabilities Act.

Let me tell Members that the meat is there now. The bottom line is that we are obligated by statute to pay 40 percent of the education of those with disabilities in this country. We have unfortunately in this Congress over the years not gotten anywhere near that level. In fact, we are probably about 11 percent right now with about a \$14 billion deficit that we have to make up.

Some people have gotten up and they have said, and I can understand it and I do not disagree with this, that we cannot do this at the expense of other programs. I will tell my colleagues that we will not do it at the expense of other programs. I am talking about Federal programs.

But if we paid that money into the local governments, into the local school districts, then they would be able to free up the money which they presently have to build schools, to hire more teachers and to help with all of the other programs, because they are funding the deficit which we created by mandating that they do this. We have an obligation to educate everybody in America if we possibly can. This legislation would do it. We should pass it.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS).

(Ms. RIVERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, Clement Atlee once said, "Democracy means government by discussion, but it is only effective if you can stop people from talking." I agree.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop talking about special education funding. It is time to do something.

In 1972, the Federal Government did the right thing by enacting a national guarantee for education for special needs children. Before this action, far too many handicapped children never saw the inside of a schoolhouse.

As someone who served on a local board of education for nearly a decade, I know the positive impact of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. But as someone who struggled to pass local school district budgets, I also know that the Federal Government has never come close to funding at the promised level of 40 percent. In fact, it has been mentioned before, we barely reached 12 percent. In fact, the National Association of State Boards of Education point out that underfunding since the day the bill was passed totals \$146 billion that was promised to local public schools over the last 22 years that was never delivered upon.

Schools need real help, not rhetorical soothing, real help. This proposal, the one we have before us, will not do anything. It is a sense of Congress, an opinion without the force of law. A sense of Congress will not pay teachers' salaries. It will not buy textbooks. It will not put school buses on the street. In short, it will not address any of the very real financial pressures facing America's schools every day.

This has been an issue for me from the beginning of my time in Congress. I have introduced bills and amendments to fully fund IDEA to the promised 40 percent. It is highly ironic to me that those proposals have repeatedly been voted down or tabled, in some cases, by Members who are today promoting what is no more than a reaffirmation of the 1972 promise.

Someone mentioned earlier, where is the real bill? Here is the real bill. I will soon be introducing this bill to fund IDEA at the promised 40 percent. I would invite every Member who has taken to the floor today to talk about the importance of meeting this obligation to actually act and become a cosponsor. I would invite all Members who recognize the value of IDEA and the value of keeping promises to join me in cosponsoring this bill.

This is real action, not soothing rhetoric, real action. Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop talking about special education.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this measure. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, in his efforts to obtain full funding for individuals with disabilities.

In adopting this measure back in 1975, IDEA, Congress required the Fed-

eral, State and local governments to share the cost of educating children with disabilities. When enacted, the Federal Government was to assume 40 percent of the national average per pupil. It was never done. We need to fund this properly. We are only funding it for 11 percent this year. It is time we acted. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker. I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 84 and I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Chairman of the Education and Workforce Committee, Mr. GOODLING and his efforts to obtain full funding for the individuals With Disabilities Act (IDEA).

In adopting IDEA in 1975, Congress required the Federal, State and local governments to share the cost of educating children with disabilities. When enacted, the Federal Government was to assume 40 percent of the national average per pupil expense for such children.

While Congress has authorized this amount since 1982, the appropriation has never come close to the stated goal of 40 percent. Last year, it reached the highest level ever at 12 percent and now the President has requested that the program be cut to 11 percent for fiscal year 2000.

The result has been an enormous unfunded mandate on State and local school systems to absorb the cost of educating students with disabilities. In doing so, local school districts must divert funding away from other students and education activities. This has had the unfortunate effect of draining school budgets, decreasing the quality of education and unfairly burdening the taxpayers. Local school districts are spending as much as 20 percent of their budgets to fund IDEA.

Since 1995, educational funding levels have jumped 85 percent and have demonstrated Congress' commitment to help States and local school districts provide public education to children with disabilities. It is now time for this Congress to make good on its promise to fully fund IDEA at 40 percent. We can no longer let the States try to make up the difference between the funds they have been promised and the funds that they actually receive.

In my district, the schools are definitely feeling the negative effects of the lack of IDEA funding. East Ramapo School District in Rockland County should receive \$2.04 million for IDEA but according to 1995 figures, they only saw \$398,000. That is a difference of \$1.6 million. Similarly, the Middletown City School District in Orange County was expecting \$1.6 million but actually only saw \$316,000. A difference of \$1.3 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Congress to show that they are truly committed to our Nation's children's education. By fully funding IDEA, Congress will simultaneously ease the burden on local school budgets while ensuring that students with disabilities receive the same quality of education as their nondisabled counterparts.

Once the Federal Government begins to pay its fair share, local funds will be available for school districts to hire more teachers, reduce class size, invest in technology and even lower local property taxes for our constituents.

I proudly stand here today in support of H. Con. Res. 84 and I hope that this Congress will keep its word and fully fund the Individuals With Disability Act.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), a member of the committee.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and other members of the committee for bringing forth legislation which will in fact put more Federal funding and more emphasis on education. The presentation of this resolution marks an acknowledgment that all aspects of government, Federal, State and local, must step up to the plate and support education.

What is particularly notable is that the majority, which in the past has not been willing to do that, which has in fact been stepping back and saying that the Federal Government should get out of education, now is stepping forward and agreeing with us that, in fact, we all must participate.

The Constitution is what obligates people to fund IDEA. There is not a Federal legislative mandate. The Constitution told States that they have the obligation to fund this program, and the Federal Government stepped forward and made an offer to assist, and we said we would do it to the extent that we could, hopefully up to 40 percent.

We are moving toward that goal. This resolution entitles us to move even more so forward. But in no way should we be pitting one education program against another. We still need more teachers and smaller classrooms. We need more technology. And we need more teacher development. We need to make sure that we do this.

I thank the chairman for accepting the language into this bill that says that local communities that have funds freed up by virtue of additional Federal funding must keep that money in educational programs so that in fact Federal, State and local governments all participate in smaller classrooms, more teachers, teacher development, technology and all the needs of education.

□ 1445

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say it was awful lonely for 20 years in the minority trying to get some funding for IDEA.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), another subcommittee chair.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker I would like to join my colleagues in support of H. Con. Res. 84 which calls on the President and Congress to fulfill our obligation to our Nation's neediest children, those with disabilities.

In my home State of California, the cost of educating an estimated 600,000 children with disabilities is a staggering \$3.4 billion, but the Federal Government contributes only \$400 million,

which translates to only 11.7 percent of the total cost. I believe before we look at creating new programs with new Washington mandates we need to ensure that the Federal Government lives up to the promises it made to the students, parents and schools over 2 decades ago.

Mr. Speaker, I am not the only one who thinks so. I recently met with all of the superintendents in my district. Each and every one of them stated that we must increase funding for IDEA before we create a new Federal program. If the President would first fund a special education mandate, our States and local school districts would have the funds to do the things the President proposes.

This Congress will continue to work to provide fair Federal funding for special education so in the end we can improve education for all our children, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), another subcommittee chair.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, in our markup we heard from the Democrats that this bill, if enacted, would rob Peter to pay Paul. A more accurate way for the Democrats to look at this resolution is from the perspective of paying what we promised Paul before we begin to give new money and make other promises to Peter. We simply cannot neglect the fact that we promised to help pay for the education of these special-needs children and put scarce funds into other programs that do not have the same mandate.

It is also important to note that if the Federal Government had begun funding IDEA appropriately, schools would have more State and local money freed up to handle local school demands like teacher/pupil ratios and school construction.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ), a member of the committee.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I was listening to the debate, and I had not really planned to speak on this, but I think we lose touch with reality here.

Now the reality is that the responsibility for educating these children is really not the Federal Government's; it is the local school district's responsibility.

The reason that the Federal Government got into it at all was because there was a court case brought that proved that the local people were not educating those children with disabilities because it was so much more expensive to do so.

Now I understand that. So when the Federal Government got into it, they made a commitment that they would fund 40 percent of that extra cost of educating these children with disabilities. I do not like to call it disabilities; I think it is more challenges to them. It is disabilities in our mind, Mr. Speaker.

But the fact is that when we did, we made that commitment, and, like a lot of people here, I have felt badly that we have never lived up to that commitment. But we never lived up to the commitment of full funding Head Start or full funding a lot of other programs that are doing equally responsible jobs.

But remember this, that the responsibility for educating children lies at the local level. Our colleagues on the other side constantly remind us of that, that that responsibility lies there so the decisions should be made there. So how about the decisions to funding the cost of educating these children? They did not want to make that decision, so we made it for them. We said that they will educate those children.

Then I think magnanimously we offered to fund 40 percent of it. Now all of a sudden that becomes a burden to us. Not that I disagree with the fact that we ought to live up to that commitment because we made it; because we do not want to be people who go back on promises as elected officials and leaders of the communities.

So, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the idea, and I will vote for the resolution, but I am really disturbed by the constant reference to the fact that somehow or another this is the Federal government's responsibility. It is a responsibility the government has accepted for itself, but originally it was not. It was local.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Correcting the facts, yes, the court said all will be educated. However the Federal Government said: Do it our way and we will give you 40 percent of excess costs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS).

(Mr. BASS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution before us today which is essentially the same as one which I introduced last year which passed by voice vote, and I certainly hope we have a recorded vote on this resolution this time, and I would like to say that I support it for four reasons:

Number one, it is plain good education policy to provide full funding for special education.

Secondly, it is meeting the worst unfunded federal mandate that this government currently has, 10 percent of a 40 percent obligation. Bearing in mind that it is up from 5 percent 4 years ago, still 10 percent is not acceptable.

Thirdly, it is an issue of local control, local control of education, letting local school boards make decisions for themselves whether they are going to have new teachers, build new classrooms or spend the money on other areas. The Federal Government should make this a top priority.

Lastly, this is an issue that is extremely important for disabled individ-

uals, for families, for school boards, for administrators.

If my colleagues want to do something for education in 1999, support this resolution, and then move forward and fully fund special education.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

(Mr. BALDACCI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member and the chairman for bringing this resolution to the floor.

I am a strong supporter of the Individuals with Disability Education Act or IDEA. I strongly agree that every child deserves the opportunity to benefit from a public education. We must do all that we can to ensure that every child reaches his or her fullest potential, but we also must recognize the tremendous cost of this endeavor.

In fact, the cost of educating a disabled student is on average more than twice the cost of educating a non-disabled student. If our schools are truly to serve all students, the Federal Government must increase its commitment to IDEA funding.

When it was first passed, Congress committed to spending 40 percent of the cost. However, the Federal Government has consistently fallen far short of this goal. As a result, special education costs continue to rise, and we fall further behind. Currently we fund less than 12 percent of the cost, leaving State and local governments to pick up the rest.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution demonstrates Congress' commitment to stand behind our promise. It shows that we recognize the impact that special education costs are having on our State and local budgets and that we are committed to providing leadership and resources for our schools and their students.

Let me give my colleagues just one example of a city in Maine. Lewiston schools currently receive about \$233,000 in special education funding. If we were meeting our 40 percent commitment currently, Lewiston schools would be receiving nearly \$1.2 million, a difference of \$1 million. Imagine the impact that freeing up \$1 million for other educational needs could have on the education of all of Lewiston's young people, and then multiply that across every school and every district in the State of Maine, in every school district in the country.

As I traveled throughout my district, this is probably the concern I hear most frequently:

School budgets are rising and taking property tax rates with them.

I am often told that schools have to cut art and music programs, eliminate field trips and cancel extracurricula. I know that this situation is the same throughout the country.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I thank him for his leadership on IDEA and for his help to our States and the children that they are trying to educate.

Mr. Speaker I have spoken with our Governor, Christie Todd Whitman, in New Jersey about what fully funding IDEA would mean to my State.

In New Jersey alone there are over 210,000 students in special education programs. According to our Governor, if the Federal Government paid its full 40 percent share last year, the State would have received an additional \$300 million to pay for these children's education.

Our States are paying too great of an amount of our government's legal obligation to IDEA with money that otherwise could be spent to hire additional teachers, expand or maintain school facilities, pay for athletics or extracurricular activities. Mr. Speaker, until we pay our existing mandates, we should not consider paying for any new and expensive programs, any new entitlements.

I support this resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I want to thank him and the committee for their support and for their work toward the fulfillment of a commitment that has been made by the Federal Government to fully fund special education made many years ago. It was a beautiful civil rights law saying every child ought to have access to education, and yet that beautiful law has been consistently underfunded ever since.

Mr. Speaker, that puts pressure on local taxes, that puts pressure on local control of education. It puts pressure on local control, it puts pressure on other education programs, general education programs, talented and gifted programs, and it puts cross pressure in a way that is totally unintended for the very people that we are trying to help.

For Iowa alone it would mean \$80 million of additional funds for the kids, for the programs that make sure that Iowa's children are available and ready to learn, ready to meet the commitments of a continuing and growing economic demands for those kids, Mr. Speaker.

Let us not have new programs, Mr. Speaker. Let us fulfill our commitment to the existing programs first.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, what we have before us today is really a get well card, and it is a very nice get well card.

If I have a friend who is ill, I will send my friend a get well card, and that is very important. It expresses my sentiment and my hope for him. But what my friend really needs, besides

that get well card, is the Blue Cross card to pay the bills, and that is why the Committee on the Budget and Committee on Appropriations could do a much better job. Mr. Speaker, we will solicit our colleagues' support over there to get money for that Blue Cross card, send a get well card which is nice, but it does not do enough.

So I am going to vote for this because it is an encouraging, hopeful get well card. But upon receipt of that we must do more, and I would hope that each and every one of my colleagues over there would encourage the Committee on the Budget, encourage the Committee on Appropriations and indeed encourage the Committee on Ways and Means to do its job.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDEE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Michigan aware that the Committee on the Budget put an extra billion dollars in the House proposal for special education this year to fund IDEA? I do not know if the gentleman voted for that, but that was an important priority from the Committee on the Budget. We did hear that. We were not trying to send just a get well card. We wanted to try and fully fund those programs, and we did not get a lot of support from the gentleman's side. That concerns us.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Iowa: I served on the Committee on the Budget very well. I know how the Committee on the Budget relates to the Committee on Appropriations. I referred to three committees. The real legislative committees here are the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means, and they hold in their hands really the hope for any of these programs. If the Committee on Ways and Means cuts revenue, that makes it more difficult for us to fund these programs. Unless the Committee on Appropriations acts, these funds will not be appropriated.

So they are the ones who really control that Blue Cross card we are debating.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDEE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Michigan in trying to answer the inquiry from the gentleman from Iowa is also saying that we have a billion dollars in our budget and we are really concerned about these physically challenged kids and their families, where is the bill? Where is the beef? Where is the money?

Now we are going to vote on this side for this resolution, but where is the bill, the statutory authority, to follow through on what they said in their budget to provide funds for these families and these children?

□ 1500

We are going to get a Pell grant resolution, which I intend to vote for. We

will do a resolution maybe on our teachers, which I intend to vote for, but I would hope that the Republican majority would come forward with a bill that we can debate that is fairly paid for and not just a resolution that does not have any money in it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I will say where the beef is. The beef is where we put it the last 3 years while we were in the majority. \$800 million one year, \$600 million the next year, another \$500 million the next year for a total of almost \$2 billion over 3 years, not where it was for 20 years prior to that when I sat in the minority where we got zero, zero, zero and the majority was overwhelming at that particular time.

So we are putting the beef there. We know where the beef is, and we are getting it there, and we are getting it out to the children who can eat that beef.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES).

(Mr. FORBES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 84; and I would reiterate what the chairman has just said. Under the Democrats, we did not get any increases in this program, a valuable program that is working. It is working in this country. And I appreciate the leadership of the chairman in the last 25 years trying to raise the consciousness of this Congress to adequately fund this program.

We are asking our States to come up with better standards for our students, and they are doing that. In my own State of New York, they have raised the standards, which were already high standards.

Where are they getting the money? Where are they going to get the money? In New York State alone, we are \$581 million short of this Federal mandate. This Federal mandate is asking my school districts to come up with the extra money. And who pays? The property taxpayer.

This is a Federal mandate. It should be fully funded at the 40 percent that Congress dictated over 25 years ago. In my own Longwood School District on Long Island, New York, in Middle Island they get \$484,000 when they should be getting \$2.4 million; \$1.9 million short. I urge support.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

(Mr. WELDON of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as an original cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 84 which would make fully funding special education one of the highest priorities in the Federal elementary and secondary education funding. It is imperative that we meet the objective of paying the 40 percent of the average per pupil expenses associated with educating children with disabilities.

I encourage all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to not only support this resolution but as well to vote for the funding when we do the appropriations bills.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING).

In 1975, IDEA, which mandated every child, regardless of disability, would be given a free public education, Congress promised to fund up to 40 percent of the cost. Mr. Speaker, Congress and the President have not kept their part of the bargain. Today we fund 12 percent of the cost to educate children. Twelve percent is not 40 percent. Twelve percent is not enough.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who would say that increased IDEA funding will come at the expense of other high-priority programs, but if we in Congress fulfill our promise by picking up the slack, these other educational priorities will be funded on the local level, where they belong. Illinois alone would receive four times more than the \$103 million we received last year.

I urge Members to support the resolution on behalf all of our Nation's children.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The beauty of this resolution is, there are several, as a matter of fact. First of all, the resolution says that we do not take money from existing programs to fund this program. We heard a lot about how we will take money from existing programs to fund this. Well, if one reads the resolution, it does not do that.

Secondly, the resolution does not say fund immediately. What it says is, continue the drive that we have had the last 3 years. Forget the 20 years prior to that, where nothing was done, but continue the drive that we have had going the last 3 years, getting two billion over the last 3 years.

Then the beauty also is we do not pit one child against another child. As a matter of fact, by trying to get this money for special ed, we make sure that we take away that battle that is going on out there at the present time because the local districts have to use their money in order to fund special ed. They must take it away from other students. So we are giving an opportunity to help all students.

Yes, we are sending a get-well card, the same get-well card we sent last year; and that get-well card got us a half a billion dollars. The same get-well card we sent the year before, that get-well card got us \$600 million. I am hoping that this get-well card, when the appropriators read it, will also get us another billion.

I would say that is a pretty good investment in a get-well card. I wish I could get some other get-well cards going out there that could get those

kinds of returns that our get-well cards have gotten us in the last several years.

I want to make sure that everybody understands, yes, it was the Court who determined all children deserved an equal and a quality education. It was the Federal Government then who came along, as they generally do, and said, do it our way, do it our way, and we will give you 40 percent of that excess cost.

How attractive that is. Forty percent, that is better than trying to go it alone, but they should have known better. They should have known that that 40 percent was just a gimmick. It was not anything else.

Now, in the last 3 years we have changed all of that, and we are going to continue to change all of that because we are going to step up to the plate as we have the last 3 years and put our money where our mouth was and help all children by helping local districts fund special education.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to express my opposition to H. Con. Res. 84, the resolution calling for full-funding of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA). My opposition to this act should in no way be interpreted as opposition to increased spending on education. However, the way to accomplish this worthy goal is to allow parents greater control over education resources by cutting taxes, thus allowing parents to devote more of their resources to educating their children in such a manner as they see fit. Massive tax cuts for the American family, not increased spending on federal programs should be this Congress' top priority.

The drafters of this bill claim that increasing federal spending on IDEA will allow local school districts to spend more money on other educational priorities. However, because an increase in federal funding will come from the same taxpayers who currently fund the IDEA mandate at the state and local level, increasing federal IDEA funding will not necessarily result in a net increase of education funds available for other programs. In fact, the only way to combine full federal funding of IDEA with an increase in expenditures on other programs by state and localities is through massive tax increases at the federal, state, and/or local level!

This bill further assures that control over the education dollar will remain centered in Washington by calling for Congress to "meet the commitment to fund existing Federal education programs." Thus, this bill not only calls on Congress to increase funding for IDEA, it also calls on Congress to not cut funds for any program favored by Congress. The practical effect of this bill is to place yet another obstacle in the road of fulfilling Congress' constitutional mandate to put control of education back into the hands of the people.

Rather than increasing federal spending, Congress should focus on returning control over education to the American people by enacting the Family Education Freedom Act (H.R. 935), which provides parents with a \$3,000 per child tax credit to pay for K-12 education expenses. Passage of this act would especially benefit parents whose children have learning disabilities as those parents have the greatest need to devote a large

portion of their income toward their child's education.

The Family Education Freedom Act will allow parents to develop an individualized education plan that will meet the needs of their own child. Each child is a unique person and we must seriously consider whether disabled children's special needs can be best met by parents, working with local educators, free from interference from Washington or federal educators. After all, an increase in expenditures cannot make a Washington bureaucrat know or love a child as much as that child's parent.

It is time for Congress to restore control over education to the American people. The only way to accomplish this goal is to defund education programs that allow federal bureaucrats to control America's schools. Therefore, I call on my colleagues to reject H. Con. Res. 84 and instead join my efforts to pass the Family Education Freedom Act. If Congress gets Washington off the backs and out of the pocketbooks of parents, American children will be better off.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution urging Congress, and the President, to fully fund the Federal Government's obligation under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

In 1975 the Federal Government committed to provide 40 percent funding aid for the mandate to educate those students with disabilities. As most of my colleagues know, federal funding for IDEA has never risen above 12 percent.

On average, local school districts currently spend 20 percent of their budgets on special education services. Once the Federal government begins to pay its fair share, local funds will be freed up, allowing local schools to hire and train additional high-quality teachers, reduce class size, build and renovate classrooms and invest in technology.

In my district, the Duval County School District receives about \$7 million. If IDEA were fully funded, this school district would receive over \$37 million, an increase of over \$30 million.

It is time for us to send a clear message that the Federal government must honor our commitments to help our state and local school districts educate children with disabilities.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mrs. CAPP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

When special education legislation was first enacted in 1975, the federal government, recognizing the extraordinary costs of inclusion, pledged to provide state and local education agencies with forty percent of the excess costs associated with educating students with disabilities.

Sadly, the federal government has not come close to meeting this obligation, with annual appropriations never exceeding twelve percent of excess costs.

The chronic underpayment of this federal mandate has left state and local governments with a burden of more than \$146 billion in lost funding over the past twenty-two years—a staggering shortfall that has forced education agencies to shift resources out of lower-priority, but important necessities such as building maintenance and upkeep.

Special education departments end up eating large portions of local and state school budgets, which creates a competitive relationship between regular and special education, as they vie for the same scarce funds. This situation is not the fault of school districts, but a direct result of Congress's inadequate funding of IDEA.

Special education has received a billion dollar increase over the past two years. Yet even with this substantial increase, funding is still substantially below Congress's 40 percent promise. This means that states and districts will continue to be unfairly burdened by these excess costs.

Congress is simply being unfair to our local school districts by not living up to our end of this bargain and we are taking needed resources away from regular education.

I hope the Congress will live up to its obligation, and fully fund IDEA. If we do not, all students across this country will suffer.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 84 calls for increased funding for IDEA at the expense of initiatives like the Clinton/Clay Class Size Reduction Act. While I support increased funding for IDEA, we should not be robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Achieving the goal of 100,000 new teachers will ensure that every child receives personal attention, gets a solid foundation for further learning, and is prepared to read by the end of the third grade.

I am disappointed that the Republicans have continued their attempt to torpedo this critical program. On the Ed-Flex bill, Republicans tried to raid class size funds for other programs. We should never pit one program against another—we should support overall increases in education spending.

I believe that reducing class sizes with well-qualified teachers is the single most significant action we can take to enhance student achievement.

We should increase funding for IDEA, but not at the expense of class size reduction.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

IDEA ensures that all children with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education. Prior to IDEA, 2 million children were excluded from receiving their right to a public education. Another 2.5 million children received an inadequate education.

IDEA has served as a civil rights initiative for our Nation's children for more than 22 years.

Fully funding this educational program is important to the millions of learning disabled students in our districts across the country. It is important to our communities that benefit from the achievement level of all these students.

IDEA is another example of how government support of an educational program provides the foundation for states and local educational agencies to work together. Funding this initiative for the sake of our children is important for the future success of our schools and communities.

In addition to fully funding IDEA, Congress should also better fund other educational programs that are seriously underfunded. For example, consider Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI's).

We have charged these institutions with ensuring the academic success of the Hispanic students that are at their institutions. Similar to

IDEA, these institutions cannot fulfill their duty to the students and the community at large without adequate funding.

The funding of IDEA is critical along with the funding of all our education programs that aim to serve every child that has the right to fair, and equitable access to a quality education.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight one of the most important issues for our nation: educating our young people. Everyone agrees that a good education is critical for the future success of our children, and yet are not providing the financial resources that make this possible. This is especially true for the education of children with disabilities.

School districts are struggling with how to provide the best education possible for all children within often very tightly constrained budgets. I applaud their efforts. In many cases, however, school districts can not reduce class sizes, build needed schools, or hire new teachers while still providing the services so important to students with disabilities. In my home state of California, over 600,000 students receive special education and related services in public schools at a reported cost of \$3.4 billion. Without federal assistance, local school districts are forced to use their general funds to the detriment of other programs.

This is not to say that the IDEA hasn't been successful. It has. By providing children with disabilities with the same educational opportunities as their abled peers, we now have a system supporting happier and more productive adults. According to the Department of Education, disabled young people are three times more likely today to attend college than prior to 1975 and twice as many of today's twenty-year olds with disabilities are working. But we must do more to make sure there are more success stories than setbacks.

I applaud my friends on the other side of the aisle for bringing to the floor House Concurrent Resolution 84, which urges the Congress and the President to fully fund the federal Government's obligation under IDEA. This must be more than just words in a Resolution though. I call upon this Congress, this year, to fulfill its pledge for full funding of IDEA. It is time that the federal government make good on its obligation to the school districts and our children across the country.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 84, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 84.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

URGING CONGRESS AND PRESIDENT TO INCREASE FUNDING FOR PELL GRANTS

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 88) urging the Congress and the President to increase funding for the Pell Grant Program and existing Campus-Based Aid Programs.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 88

Whereas the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program, now known as the Pell Grant Program in honor of Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island, was first authorized in the 1972 amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965;

Whereas the Pell Grant Program has become the largest need-based Federal higher education scholarship program and is considered the foundation for all Federal student aid;

Whereas the purpose of the program is to assist students from low income families who would not otherwise be financially able to attend a postsecondary institution by providing grants to students to be used to pay the costs of attending the postsecondary institution of their choice;

Whereas in the late 1970's, the Pell Grant covered seventy-five percent of the average cost of attending a public four-year college; by the late 1990's, it only covered thirty-six percent of the cost of attending a public four-year college;

Whereas families across the country are concerned about the rising cost of a college education, and for children from low income families, the cost of college continues to be an overwhelming factor in their decision to forego a college education;

Whereas children from high income families are almost twice as likely to enroll in college as children from low income families;

Whereas higher education promotes economic opportunity for individuals and economic competitiveness for our Nation;

Whereas the Pell Grant and Campus-Based Aid Programs target aid to low income students as effectively as any programs administered by the Federal government; and

Whereas student borrowing to finance a postsecondary education has increased to an average indebtedness of \$9,700, and therefore increased grant aid is more important than ever: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress and the President, should, working within the constraints of the balanced budget agreement, make student scholarship aid the highest priority for higher education funding by increasing the maximum Pell Grant awarded to low income students by \$400 and increasing other existing campus-based aid programs that serve low-income students prior to authorizing or appropriating funds for any new education initiative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering H. Con. Res. 88, which sets forth specific priorities for higher education funding and proposes that we refrain from creating new education programs until we adequately fund these priorities.

The top funding priority for higher education is the Pell Grant Program, and the goal is to increase the maximum award to students from low-income families to \$3,525. This amount represents an increase of \$400 to the maximum Pell grant award and would be the largest increase since the inception of the program in 1972.

The resolution also recognizes the importance of providing increased funding for the existing campus-based student aid programs. These need-based programs provide financial aid administrators at colleges across the country with considerable flexibility in the packaging of financial aid awards that best meet the needs of their students.

The Pell Grant Program is one of the largest voucher programs in the country, and it is considered the foundation program for all Federal student aid. Students eligible for a Pell grant can use that money to attend one of almost 6,000 postsecondary institutions in the country.

The Pell Grant Program was created in 1972, and the goal of the program was simple. Congress wanted to assist students from low-income families who would not otherwise be financially able to attend a postsecondary institution.

In the first year of the program, 176,000 students received Pell grant awards. Funding Pell grants at the level set forth in the resolution would make more than 4 million students eligible for Pell grants next year, including an additional 21,000 students in my home State of California.

Ninety percent of the students who will receive a Pell grant come from families with incomes under \$30,000, and 54 percent of those students come from families with incomes under \$10,000. This is a program that simply continues to serve the vital purpose for which it was originally created.

This is not the first time that we have stated our support for making the Pell Grant Program the top funding priority for higher education. On June 26, 1997, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and I sent a letter to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that began by saying, we greatly appreciate support for increased funding for the Pell Grant Program, and we believe it should be the top funding priority of all higher education programs.

I continue to believe that the Pell Grant Program should be the top higher education funding priority. I also think a \$400 increase to the maximum award is a very reasonable request.

For more than 7 years, the Pell grant maximum fluctuated between \$2,300

and \$2,400. However, after years of stagnant funding levels, the Committee on Appropriations has shown overwhelming support for the program during the past 3 years by increasing funding for the Pell Grant Program by more than \$2.7 billion. Had the administration not cut \$250 million from last year's appropriation level for the Pell Grant Program in order to fund its other priorities, we would be well on our way to our goal of a maximum award of \$3,525.

In addition to the Pell Grant Program, this resolution supports increased funding for the campus-based student aid programs. While Pell grants open the door to postsecondary education for many students from low-income families, it is the campus-based programs that provide these same students some degree of choice in selecting a postsecondary institution.

After years of double-digit increases in the cost of a college education, the maximum Pell grant no longer covers a large percentage of the cost of attendance at most public 4-year institutions in the country. However, a Pell grant, coupled with awards from the campus-based program, goes a long way in reducing the amount a student needs to borrow in student loans in order to pay the bills for tuition and room and board.

In closing, I want to address some of the objections I have heard with respect to this resolution. We all know the budget caps are tight, and the Committee on Appropriations will have a difficult time in making funding decisions, but that simply supports getting our priorities on record.

I have copies of testimony submitted to the subcommittee of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) from various higher education organizations, and each one identifies certain funding priorities important to the particular organization. However, there are two consistent messages. The first is strong support for a \$400 increase to the maximum Pell grant. The second is strong support for funding proven education programs, rather than creating new ones that take money away from the existing programs.

Finally, do not misread this resolution. It does not say only fund Pell in the campus-based programs. It does not say that we should cut the class size teacher program. Unlike the President's budget that cuts several existing programs, including the Pell appropriation, impact aid, the Title VI block grant and others, this resolution does not propose cuts to existing programs.

□ 1515

This resolution simply establishes funding priorities for higher education. We have many higher education programs that have been in existence a long time and serve students well, such as the TRIO programs, Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need, Institutional Aid programs under Title III, and many others. We reauthorized

these programs last year, and we support their continued funding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the following associations and organizations that have given their support for this resolution, including the American Association of Community Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the United States Student Association, the Career College Association, the American Council on Education, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the U.S. Public Interest Research Group, the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, the Coalition of Higher Education Organizations, the Association of American Universities, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and finally, the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution and the higher education funding priorities it establishes for the Congress and the President.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly today in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 88.

I want to be very clear that I do support the priority for Pell Grant and campus-based student aid programs. However, specifically, I oppose the last 12 words of this resolution, which I believe are not only unnecessary to the intent of the resolution, but have the potential to tie the hands of Congress in our ability to help the children of this country.

Were we not considering this resolution under a suspension of the rules, I would have offered an amendment to strike those 12 words, as I did during the committee markup, which would allow, if we did strike those 12 words, it would allow myself and I daresay all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle to lend wholehearted support to this resolution. Members may get support from some of the Members on our side because those Members would not want to be on record as seeming to vote against Pell Grants, but they would not get their unconditional support.

I would stress that my colleagues and I are not opposed to establishing the Pell Grant and campus-based student aid programs as a funding priority. On the contrary, over the past years we have always supported Pell Grants and the increase in Pell Grants and campus-based student aid programs.

As a matter of fact, on the other side of the aisle, until recently they did not. But we, as a matter of fact, are delighted to see that our colleagues on that side are taking so much of an interest in these programs that have provided millions of low-income students with an opportunity to pursue higher education.

On this side of the aisle, we have always believed that providing an opportunity to less fortunate people of our country is a paramount responsibility of the government. The Pell Grant program has provided millions of low-income students with the opportunity to pursue their higher education dreams and goals.

Moreover, I firmly believe that my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the sponsor of this resolution, is sincere in his desire to expand opportunity to millions of other struggling students. I sincerely regret that I cannot join him in supporting this resolution.

As I stated, my concern surrounding the resolution are the last 12 words, which call for the funding of Pell Grants and campus-based aid programs, and I quote, "prior to authorizing or appropriating funds for any new education initiative."

Earlier, my colleague said that it does not cut other programs, but it does prevent other programs from being funded. Although I understand and agree with my colleague and his desire to fund existing programs that work before we create and fund new programs, I am concerned that the language in this resolution is ambiguous and may tie our hands and our ability to help the children of our country.

The problem, as I see it, is that House Concurrent Resolution 88 fails to define the term "new education initiative," and leaves open the question of how it might affect the future work of this Congress.

For instance, is the class size reduction initiative, which, although currently authorized for only 1 year, is in full swing in many of the States, is that a new program? Is the Reading Excellence Act which was just passed last year a new program?

Also created last year was Gear Up, a program that, like Pell and the campus-based aid programs, would allow millions of low-income students to attend college. Will it be considered a new program?

If in the course of reauthorizing ESEA we decide to consolidate several existing professional development programs into a larger, more effective professional development initiative, will it be considered a new program and therefore go unfunded?

If we develop a program to address school violence like that which took place in Littleton, Colorado, will it be considered a new program and be denied funding?

To avoid these pitfalls, during committee mark-up I mentioned that the Senate is currently considering a similar resolution which has bipartisan support, and I offered that as a substitute to this resolution.

Like House Concurrent Resolution 88, the resolution currently being considered by the Senate acknowledges the importance of Pell and campus-based student aid programs, and urges the Congress and the President to

make them a funding priority. However, the Senate resolution refrains from bolstering students' aid at the possible expense of other programs. Senate Concurrent Resolution 828 is identical to this resolution except that it does not contain those last 12 words.

The language in the Senate resolution would have allowed us to recognize Pell and campus-based aid as educational priorities without denying the importance of existing programs or the potential importance of programs that may come out of the reauthorization of ESEA.

I regret that I did not have the opportunity to offer that amendment here today. I regret that, as a result of that, I will not be able to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to express strong support for the House Concurrent Resolution 88 urging both the President and Congress to increase Pell Grants for low-income students, and I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the sponsor of this measure, for bringing it to the floor at this time.

Because the Pell Grant is basis for all Federal student aid, and the amount of aid needed to cover the ever-rising cost of higher education is increasing, it is imperative we make students' scholarship aid a high priority.

In the ever-increasing global market, our Nation must make sure that it maintains its leading role. Therefore, now more than ever we must guarantee that our students are well-prepared to compete against their counterparts from all over the world. Education is the only way that we can ensure a strong future for America's children, and increasing Pell Grant awards is one way we can begin to achieve that goal.

Accordingly, I urge our colleagues to fully support this measure.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of both of these resolutions. Unfortunately, I was detained and was not able to come over and speak on behalf of the full funding for IDEA.

But first let me say, on the Pell Grants, I strongly support increasing the Pell Grant program. As outlined by a couple of the speakers already, clearly as the cost of college continues to accelerate, we find that we are covering a much smaller percentage of that with the existing Pell Grants than we had previously. Previously we cov-

ered about 72 percent of the average costs. Now we are in the position of covering about 34 percent of that.

As a result of that, many young students from low-income families who have worked very hard in high school to get the grades in order to do the work required and to be accepted to college find out that economics now stand in the way of them achieving that education.

We should not allow that to happen, because we obviously have an economy that needs the contributions of all of these young people to our economic system. For that reason, I join the bipartisan support for the increase in the Pell Grant.

I am concerned, as the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) pointed out, exactly the meaning of those words at the end of the legislation, because we know that there is a great deal of concern that this would take precedence over the class size reduction money, since that in fact is not an authorized program and needs authorization. And if it were to take place after the passage of this resolution, would that knock it out of the box?

We know that class size reduction, as we just found out last week with the Tennessee study, is starting to have some important positive impacts on young people, when coupled with qualified teachers. So I think the concern is quite proper that the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) has raised about that. But since I think we will get a second shot at that in our authorizations, I am prepared to support the full funding.

On the question of the IDEA funding, I am deeply concerned about the suggestion that to be for full funding of education for individuals with disabilities, that therefore somehow we have to cut other worthy programs in the education field, because we know that it sets up a false choice between programs like Head Start or America Reads, all of which work to help kids become school-ready, to help them become ready to read and to participate in schools.

While fully supporting the idea of full funding for IDEA, I wish that the Republicans had not tried to set it up so they could chase away Democratic sponsors of this legislation by suggesting that it has to be done by cutting these other programs.

When we look at the Republican budget that cuts about \$1.2 billion below a freeze compared to 1999 in the education field, if we were to fully fund this, we would be talking about a 40 percent cut below the President's education request to fully fund IDEA.

It is interesting to note that the Committee on the Budget, when full funding of IDEA was offered, they voted in lockstep against it, and again in the Committee on Rules would not allow that amendment to be put into consideration, where we could have provided offsets or what have you within the budget resolution.

So I am not sure that this resolution is exactly as it should be, but the fact is we should support the continued increase in appropriations of IDEA funds.

Finally, let me say that time and again it is suggested that somehow the Federal Government is shirking its responsibility when it does not provide all of the funding for IDEA. When we passed that legislation, Republicans and Democrats said that the goal was to provide some 40 percent of the excess costs of providing education for individuals with disabilities.

It continues to remain a goal. It is a goal that we have made great advancements on in the last couple of years. We ought to continue to go after it. But it is not a question of an unfunded Federal mandate. The fact is that this is there because of the United States Constitution.

If we were to repeal IDEA, every State and local education authority would still have the obligation under the Constitution of the United States to educate these children in a free and appropriate education. They could end up picking up 100 percent of the cost.

The Federal Government is trying to do the best it can to help districts with the cost of these educations, but the belief somehow is that this is our duty alone, and in fact the legislation passed last year would allow, unfortunately, schools to withdraw support for IDEA if we hit a Federal threshold, so the same schools who are saying they do not have enough money find out they can in fact withdraw support for this effort.

I think the intent of these resolutions is good and is proper, and both of these programs need increases in funding. The Pell Grant needs an increase in the maximum grant. But I am concerned about some of the nuances that are suggested in these resolutions.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his support of the resolution. For the record, the President's budget for the year 2000 for education is \$65.28 billion. Our budget for the year is \$66.35 billion, \$1.1 billion more than the President's.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), chairman of the full committee.

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

There was a time when Pell Grants covered 75 percent of a college education. We are now down to about 36 percent. The good news is, however, we did get a \$2.7 billion increase in the last 3 years, so we have billions of dollars available in student aid from the Federal Government to State governments and institutions of higher education, and children from high-income families continue to enroll in college

at almost twice the rate of children from low-income families.

For many of the students from low-income families, the cost of college is the overwhelming factor in their decision to forego a college education. In 1997 we supported the enactment of tax credits related to post-secondary education for middle- and upper-income families. At the same time, we voiced strong concern about the need to continue making substantial commitments to the Pell Grant program in order to assist those students from low-income families who would not receive any benefits from the new tax credit.

I mention that because I want to mention now the most unbelievable thing that I think I have heard in my entire time in the Congress. Prior to our mark-up of this resolution in committee last week, a Department of Education official told the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services of the Committee on Appropriations that a \$400 increase to the Pell maximum would not help low-income students all that much, since they would lose their tuition tax breaks.

I want to repeat that, because I know everybody listening will be smart enough, I will not even have to explain how ridiculous it is.

□ 1530

But what he said was that a \$400 increase to the Pell maximum would not help low-income students all that much since they would lose their tuition tax breaks.

I can only assume that the administration has forgotten the debate over tax credits and the testimony of college officials and students who all agree that up-front cash assistance such as the Pell Grant program is the most effective form of aid for increasing access to college.

Now, I would also remind that gentleman, and he should not need to be reminded, retroactive tax credits are great for those who have enough money to enroll in college in the first place. But I am sure if he would just look at his statistics, he would discover that 54 percent of the families receiving Pell Grants have incomes under \$10,000. What tax credits are they waiting for? What tax credits are they expected to get? Of course, they do not get any. How silly the man could ever make a statement of that nature.

The resolution also expresses support for campus-based student aid programs.

These need-based programs help students pay the bills that are not covered by a \$3,000 Pell Grant.

The campus-based student aid programs require institutions to provide matching funds in order to receive funds from the Federal government. The \$1.5 billion devoted to the campus-based programs last year leveraged almost \$400 million in additional aid to college students across the country.

The Higher Education Amendments of 1998 enacted last fall, streamlined the operation of

all these programs in order to make them more effective. More importantly, the formula under which funds are distributed was modified. Under the new formula, any new money provided for the campus-based programs goes to institutions of higher education that serve large populations of students from low-income families who are most in need of financial assistance.

These are fundamentally sound programs that have served our nation's college students will for the past three decades and we should consider them a higher education funding priority.

This resolution does not propose cutting any programs. It does not say that we should not fund other education programs that work. It does not pit one program against another. It simply says that our highest priorities for higher education funding should be the Pell Grant Program and the campus-based aid programs, which have a proven record of success.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), a really strong advocate of education.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) for yield me this time. I rise to support the intent of the legislation, not particularly the accomplishment of the legislation.

Certainly, the "whereas" clauses in this Pell Grant concurrent resolution are very, very strong and language that I agree with, particularly the fact that in the language we talk about being concerned that the impact and the help of the Pell Grant has been sliced in half from the 1970s.

We have gone from providing through a Pell Grant about 76 percent of the cost of education; in the 1990s now, the impact of the Pell grant is about 36 percent of the cost of a 4-year public college. That is slashing in half the impact and the help of the Pell Grant, and we need to do something about that.

I sat on an airline just this past week with a young gentleman from Indiana who was trying to select between Cornell in New York and DePaul in Indiana. The entire rationale for his decision was going to be resting on one part of the economics of a decision between Cornell and DePaul, and that was the financial aid: what Pell Grant, Stafford loan, work study programs could be put together.

So families and students are very concerned about education. But what we need to do, Mr. Speaker, as we show our concern about the declining impact and help of the Pell Grant, is to come up with a piece of legislation, a bill that funds it.

This is a concurrent resolution. It is not signed by the President. It is not an appropriation bill that takes a penny out of the Treasury. It simply conveys the intent of Congress that we would like to see some more money put toward Pell Grant. I think everybody on our side would like to do that. I am sure everybody on the Republican side would like to do that.

But what we need are not unfunded mandates, not unfunded resolutions, but bipartisan solutions to this problem.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for his support of our intent.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT), a member of the committee.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 88. This resolution proposes our funding priority should first include programs that work, and Pell Grants do work. We are talking about a program of more than a 25-year track record of success. Pell Grants have offered millions of students the opportunity to pursue a higher education. While opening that door, they help narrow the gap between the rich and the poor and help alleviate the debt burden from young people just starting out in their careers.

Students awarded Pell Grants are among the neediest, and probably would not have attended college without this financial assistance. For example, in the 1995-1996 school year, 54 percent of Pell Grant recipients came from families with incomes of less than \$10,000.

We all know that students from middle and high-income families are more likely to attend college, and one reason is that those parents can at least help finance the costs. Students from low-income families do not have that safety net, and Pell Grants help fill that void. At the current level, a Pell Grant on average only covers 36 percent of the cost of college, compared to 77 percent in the 1970s.

The Federal Government also helps students with loans, and thousands of both low and middle-income students finish college each year with loans to pay off. In fact, the average student graduates with more than \$9,000 in debt. But low-income students, who have had to finance nearly everything, can face particularly steep debt.

This problem is amplified when considering that often these students choose lower paying but very important jobs like teaching or social work. In these situations, students may be faced with years and years of debt payments. We can lower that hurdle to higher education by not only continuing our strong support for the Pell Grant program, but by also increasing the minimum Pell Grant level.

The current maximum for Pell Grants is \$3,125. This resolution suggests a modest \$400 increase. The resolution also proposes increasing, within the context of our balanced budget agreement, other aid programs that serve low-income students. Those programs include work study, Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants, and Perkins Loans. Pell Grants, these programs work, and they could be put to much broader use if the funding is

increased, and we should aim toward that goal before jumping into new untested education initiatives.

This resolution does not say that we should not fund other higher education programs, and it does not pit one group of students against another. It simply says that the Pell Grant program has worked well, and that by making Pell Grants a priority, we are indeed making education a priority and strengthening our commitment to helping low-income students achieve their potential.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 88.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the beautiful State of Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, we have heard previous to this debate a long dissertation about the Federal obligation to fund IDEA. While there is disagreement in terms of how that responsibility has fallen upon the Federal Government, most of us agree that funding for IDEA should be increased.

Now we are discussing another concurrent resolution which has to do with Pell Grants. This I believe is a time when the majority must listen to what they were saying when they debated IDEA.

The authorization language which comes from this august committee calls for a basic funding of Pell Grants. That ought to be interpreted as an obligation which this Congress and this Federal Government is according based upon very severe eligibility standards. Much as we do Medicare, we have eligibility standards and then we decide how much funding that individual should get for Medicare, for hospitalization, for doctor's care, and so forth.

It seems to me that if we are really true to what we are saying on this floor with regard to the importance of funding low-income students, giving them the best opportunity to have a higher education, this Congress ought to fund the complete amount that we authorize for Pell Grants. That is the only way we are going to meet our fundamental responsibility. Let us not talk about just \$400 beyond what was authorized or appropriated last year. We ought to go for the entire amount.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which I ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to cosponsor with me, and that is to make the Pell Grant program an entitlement. Young people ought to know with great assurance that if they meet the criteria for a Pell Grant to go on to higher education, that this Congress is willing to fund it.

So I have created a program which makes it a responsibility for this Congress, for this Federal Government, to treat this program as an entitlement. Every young person ought to have that right to continue on to higher education

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of increasing funding for Pell Grants.

There is nothing better we can do for this nation than to improve education, and ensure that all children in all communities across this nation have access to higher education.

Pell Grants were created to provide this access for low-income families. The Pell Grant Program was created in 1972 to assist students from low-income families in obtaining a postsecondary education by meeting at least 75% of a student's cost of attendance. Unfortunately, Congress is not living up to its promise.

In real dollars, the appropriated maximum individual grant, adjusted for inflation, has decreased 4.7% between 1980 and 1998. Considering the exorbitant increases in college costs, the Pell Grant has covered less and less of a student's cost of attendance. In just the last 10 years, total costs at public colleges have increased by 23% and at private colleges by 36%. According to the General Accounting Office, this means that over the last 15 years, tuition at a public 4-year college or university has nearly doubled as a percentage of median household income. All students suffer as a result of these increases; however students from low-income families suffer the most.

The resolution before us calls for an increase of \$400 in the maximum Pell Grant awarded to students from low-income families.

Although it is important to raise the maximum Pell Grant awarded, it does not go far enough. We need to guarantee that eligible students are entitled to the maximum amount under the Pell Grant Program. Today, I have introduced legislation that does just that.

My bill will create a contractual obligation on the United States to reimburse institutions that award Pell Grants to its eligible students in the full amount they are entitled to. Simply put, my bill guarantees that an eligible student will receive the maximum award amount she is entitled to. By guaranteeing that eligible students will receive the maximum amount, this bill will make it easier for students from low-income families to get a higher education.

I urge my colleagues to do more than support this resolution, which merely requests a \$400 increase in the maximum award allowed. I urge my colleagues to support my legislation which guarantees that eligible students are entitled to the maximum amount authorized under the Pell Grant Program.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), subcommittee chair of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, American students I think are confused about the President's student aid priorities.

On Election Day in 1996 they heard the President proclaim, and I will quote, "I am proud that we have got the biggest increase in Pell Grants in 20 years, but we must do more. I want to open the doors of college to all Americans; and if you give me 4 more years, that is exactly what I intend to do."

That was in Lexington, Kentucky. He said the same thing in Cleveland, Santa Barbara, Green Bay, New Orleans, St. Louis, and the Democratic Convention in Chicago.

Many students also heard this ad, run by the President's campaign, and I will quote, "As a Latino and a student, I know the value of education." The ad read in Spanish. "Under President Clinton, Pell Grants and scholarships were increased. President Clinton wants us to have more opportunities to improve our quality of life. That is why, on November 5, I am going to vote for President Clinton."

Well, Mr. Speaker, on November 5, that is exactly what a lot of students did. But now the President is singing a different tune. The President is proposing cutting Pell Grant funding by 3 percent; he proposes cutting Perkins Loans by eliminating an adjustment for inflation; and he proposes cutting student loans by \$2 billion in favor of a program that makes the Department of Education the country's largest bank, a loan program that is 30 percent more expensive than the private sector program, and that is the program that most universities say that they do not want.

Mr. Speaker, students are confused about the President's student aid priorities, so let us be crystal clear about ours. This resolution sends a clear message that we are serious about funding programs that have been proven to work.

I went to college myself on a program that is now known as the Perkins Loan, and I can tell my colleagues firsthand that these programs do work. But if my colleagues no longer believe that these programs should be our highest priority, then vote "no" on this resolution. But do not blame students for being confused about where we stand on these student aid priorities.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked, but pleasantly shocked, pleasantly shocked to hear the other side of the aisle finally stepping up to the plate and saying that rather than shut down the Department of Education, they understand that there is a Federal commitment to do something to raise the level and to raise the bar.

I was listening to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) speak about making Pell Grants an entitlement, and I thought maybe we would need some armed guards over here to stop all of our friends and colleagues from the other side rushing over and signing onto that legislation as cosponsors. But I trust that really will not be a problem.

In fact, I asked some members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce who have been there for quite some time to search back in their historical perspective to see if there ever was an occasion when the current majority proposed more money for Pell Grants, to raise the authorization for Pell Grants, that the Democrats were not first in line to be there and do that. They could remember none.

In fact, I searched for the one bill that has been filed that would, in fact, raise the authorization for Pell Grants to make them worth what they used to be worth when this program was originally adopted, and that is H.R. 959. There were 62 sponsors and cosponsors on that bill, not one Member of the majority party.

So here we are today talking about a resolution. It is Teacher Appreciation Week. All things education are apparently on schedule for all of us. But when the dollar has to stop and the buck has to stop here, Mr. Speaker, let us see how many people on the other side are willing to actually come forward with the money by raising the appropriation level and by raising the authorization level to make Pell Grants really what they should be worth.

Again, I think we are faced here with a potential in this language for pitting program against program. The other side says that is not the case, and we hope it is so. And we are probably all going to vote for this because we want the strong message to continue as we have continuously put it forward, that we need to pay for Pell Grants because that is the best way to fund higher education. We need to raise funds for work study programs. We need to make the interest rates as low as possible for anybody that does have to take a loan.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have to stop making resolutions and feel-good pieces of legislation, move on to bills and acts that actually put our money where our mouth is, and make things happen. We stand ready to do that.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), a member of the committee.

(Mr. EHLERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

I have a personal interest in this. The previous speaker wondered why Republicans are supporting this bill, and I can certainly tell him why this Republican is.

□ 1545

When I wanted to go to college, my parents, who were low-income, regretfully told me that they simply did not have the money to support me. They would do what they could, but it was not much, and I would have to earn my own way.

I was not sure I would go to college but, fortunately, I was able to get summer employment in high school and save up enough money for the first year, and so I went off to college. I worked my way through, every cent, every inch of the way. I worked over 25 hours a week during the school year. I worked over 60 hours a week during the summers in order to put myself through college.

I am not saying this to brag, but I simply point out that students cannot

do that today, even if they worked 40 hours a week. The costs have gone up too much. I paid \$188 a semester for tuition. Today, it is many, many times that.

I am very intimately aware of the concerns and the problems that students have, and I have a special acquaintance with these problems because after going to college I went to graduate school, got a doctorate, and I taught at the University of California for some time and at Calvin College. So I have had experience in both the public and the private sector.

Higher education is expensive, and I am very thankful that the Federal Government has established student loan programs and Pell grants which allows every student today to achieve a college education. We have fallen behind in the amount of money available, particularly for lower income students.

I strongly support this resolution, and I ask this House to support it so that our students, no matter what the income level of the family, are able to go to colleges and universities, achieve a higher education and thereby improve their earning potential throughout their lives, as well as their appreciation of life and all that comes with education.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD), a member of the committee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of both resolutions we are considering today, both which urge this Congress and the President to fully fund IDEA and the Pell grant Programs before funding any new program.

As a supporter of both these programs, I understand that IDEA provides an education for many American children who would otherwise be denied an education, and the Pell grant has enabled millions of Americans, including my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), to attend college. However, Mr. Speaker, these nonbinding resolutions will not make a dent, really, even with all the flowery and wonderful rhetoric we have heard from both sides today. For we are merely expressing our wishes, merely talking about the problem, but not acting.

I can assure my colleagues that if Democrats were in control of this Chamber, not only would we be talking today, we would be preparing to act. In fact, if we were serious about education, we would probably think about funding the class size reduction program of the President and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

As the chairman of the full committee and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) both know, in Tennessee, where I am from, a study was just completed to show that small classes in grades K through 3 continue to outperform students in larger classes right through high school graduation.

I know my dear friend, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT), knows and strongly believes, as I do, that we should support programs that work. This program works.

In addition, our schools are in dire need of modernization. It has been shown that this Federal Government can contribute money to build new prisons and build new roads and build new highways. We have to find the capacity and the courage to build new schools.

Let us stop being the suspension bill and resolution Congress. I say to the other side, let us go to work and do the job the American people pay us \$136,500 a year to do. Resolutions, expressing our wishes will not do it. It is time to act. This Congress has failed that test, and we are failing American children in the process.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER), one of our great Members.

(Mr. GARY MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues who is most impacted by the shrinking power of Pell grants: community colleges, junior colleges and the students they serve.

In California, our community college system has 106 campuses, 71 districts and serves 1.5 million students. That is the largest system in the country, dedicated to serving students with incomes below those students who attend our large University of California and California State University systems. They are the ones on the margin who are most impacted by any fee increase or any loss in buying power from the Pell grant.

The Pell grant was created to serve as the foundation of need-based student aid, and it is the single most important program for low-income students served by community colleges.

More and more students are benefiting from Pell grants. In 1973, 176,000 students received Pell grants. Under this resolution, almost 4 million students will receive a Pell grant next year.

Unfortunately, its purchase power has declined by 25 percent over the past 20 years. The President's last budget actually cut current appropriation levels by \$250 million in order to fund his new education programs. The most disturbing part is that if the President did not propose cutting the actual appropriations, we would already be funding a \$3,325 grant.

Maybe it is the nature of politics to loudly speak in favor of a program when it is new but then take money from it when it is not so new anymore to get credit for creating a new program.

All this resolution does is say that we will appropriately fund the programs that work, instead of taking money from them to create new pro-

grams. This resolution does not propose cutting any other program. Unlike the President's budget, we do not propose to cut the Pell grant Program appropriation, Impact Aid, Title VI block grants, or the other programs that are clearly not priorities of the President.

It does not say we should not fund other education programs that do work. It does not aim to pit one group against another. It simply says our highest priority for higher education funding should be the Pell Grant and Campus-Based Aid Programs, which have a proven success record.

If my colleagues do not believe that the Pell grant and Campus-Based Aid Programs work and should be our highest priority, then I urge them to vote "no" on this resolution. But I would urge my colleagues to support this program. It supports those low-income students who mostly need our help.

I urge my colleagues to: support existing programs before rushing to fund a new fad; support those lower income students who benefit from the Pell Grant Program, and support community colleges and colleges in your communities.

I urge my colleagues to support this common sense resolution.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just want to say we are not worried about pitting Pell grants and Campus-Based Student Aid against other programs that have long been in existence and have long proven themselves to be worthy of funding. That is not the question. The question is, are we going to tie our hands so that if there is an innovative new program, in order to deal with school violence, such as the school violence that happened in Littleton, Colorado, are we then going to tie our hands and say we cannot fund a program, no matter how great it may look or how much good we feel it can do because we have tied ourselves to this resolution?

Now, I say that, but I am not really that concerned about it, because this is a resolution that carries no impact in law. In fact, I think I will vote for S.28, if it will ever get over here, but it will not get over here.

I will support Pell grants. My decision to not vote for this bill does not mean I do not support Pell grants. What it does mean is that I do not believe in the idea of cutting ourselves from any program that might have a tremendous impact on some aspect of education just because we say that we are feeling that Pell grants should be of the highest priority. We can say that without doing this.

So I will continue to not support this resolution. As I say, I will not vote against it, but I will not vote for it. I will reserve my right to be in strong support of Pell grants through other methods. And I will especially wait for the authorizing bill, in which I will vote, if that authorizing bill increases Pell grants.

This is not an authorizing bill, and it does not carry any weight in law.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF).

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our Nation's teachers. I would like to thank them for their dedication and inspiration.

I was a public school teacher for 30 years, so I understand the importance of a good education and the foundation it builds for our youth. American students, parents and teachers must maintain the highest level of quality in education.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

A lot of the debate today, Mr. Speaker, has focused on Pell grants, but I also want to point out this does cover the Campus-Based Aid Programs which provide institutions with Federal support for grants, loans, and work-study programs. These require matching funds from the schools. It gives the schools greater flexibility to keep those in school that have the greatest need. And with requiring the matching funds, it is a multiplier and brings more money to the table to help those students that need it the most.

There has also been some talk about the fact that this is a resolution and does not really carry the weight of law. It does state and it does show how we have performed the last 5 years. Since we have had the majority, we have increased Pell grants every year. It indicates our high priority for the Pell grants and campus-based programs and the fact that we continue to want them to be the highest priority of higher education.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of significant increased funding for Pell Grants and Campus-Based Aid programs.

Coming from south Texas, I know the dire need for Pell Grants. By providing resources for our students, we create real opportunity for them to attain higher education.

The Pell Grant program is the largest need-based Federal grant program for students pursuing higher education. I know that in San Antonio, this program is the foundation for student aid. Pell Grants help our students from families of modest income who could not otherwise afford a college education.

I support the resolution but would like to express my strong reservations about the wording. This resolution is another example of how Republicans are purporting to be education friendly when they are not. Just like a wolf in sheep's clothing there is a face behind this resolution.

The language in this resolution essentially says that any new programs we come up with would have to take a backseat to Pell Grant increases.

To make demands on what programs should take precedence at this time, is unrealistic and removed from the approach we should be taking on the funding of our education programs. For example, what if a new program is introduced later on this year that will seriously address the needs of our youth and the issue of violence? Does this program automatically get a back seat simply because it is a "new" program under this resolution?

Yes, we should fund Pell Grants but we should also look at the bigger picture and realize that there may be other "new" programs that have been introduced that will be equally as important and help with the early development of our students in the K-12 grades.

Higher education is a priority and what better way than through increases in Pell Grants. However, we should also make sure that we are doing what we can to strengthen the foundation of our elementary and secondary education system.

If our Republican colleagues are serious about the Pell Grant program I encourage them to support H.R. 959, the Affordable Education through Pell Grants Act. The legislation will raise the maximum Pell Grant award level to \$6,500 for the academic year 2000 to 2001, bringing it to funding where the Pell Grant is meant to be.

If Republicans want to put their money where their mouth is, I would ask that they also support H.R. 959.

Education is our number one priority. The future of our economy, and our communities rests our ability to increase access to higher education but to also ensure our students can get from point A to point B.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, it's a great revelation to see that our colleagues on your side of the aisle have come to realize the importance of increased support for student aid programs which assist low income students. I am especially pleased that, after numerous efforts to slash funding for education programs, Republicans now see the light. My hope is that they will continue moving in that direction and realize that increased funding for education across the board is essential to increase educational opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I support a substantial increase for Pell funding. In fact, in the last Congress I introduced legislation to make Pell Grant funding mandatory spending, just like the loan programs.

However, I am concerned that the way H. Con. Res. 88 is written, could be interpreted to pit one group of education programs against another. If adopted and adhered to by the appropriators, it would rob Peter to pay Paul.

The record of House Democrats' support for increased aid to needy college students is clear. House Democrats have been in the forefront in advocating increased funding for student aid programs without short-changing or reducing spending for other programs. Since 1996, Democrats, in conjunction with the President, have been responsible for adding nearly \$8 billion more for education than was in bills supported by House Republicans. With respect to Pell Grants, since 1996 the President requested, and House Democrats supported, an increase of \$3.4 billion, while House Republicans advocated 62% less.

Today, we are being asked to vote for a resolution that would aid freshmen at the expense of first graders. We believe that is an unwise, inappropriate choice.

During the committee markup my colleagues and I offered amendments to H. Con. Res. 88 designed to increase Pell Grants without jeopardizing other worthy programs. The language we offered was the same language adopted in the Senate on a bipartisan basis. The Senate resolution calls for increased Pell Grants, without pitting one education program against another. Unfortunately, we are not successful in these efforts.

We should go on record for increasing our overall investment in education, instead of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to explain why I oppose H. Con. Res. 88, which expresses the sense of the Congress that funding for the Pell Grant Program should be increased by \$400 per grant and calls on Congress to increase funding for other existing education programs prior to authorizing or appropriating funds for new programs. While I certainly do oppose creating any new federal education programs, I also oppose increasing funds for any programs, regardless of whether or not the spending is within the constraints of the so-called balanced budget agreement. Mr. Speaker, instead of increasing unconstitutional federal spending, Congress should empower the American people to devote more of their own resources to higher education by cutting their taxes. Cutting taxes, not increasing federal spending, should be Congress' highest priority.

By taxing all Americans in order to provide limited aid to a few, federal higher education programs provide the federal government with considerable power to allocate access to higher education. Government aid also destroys any incentives for recipients of the aid to consider price when choosing a college. The result is a destruction of the price control mechanism inherent in the market, leading to ever-rising tuition. This makes higher education less affordable for millions of middle-class Americans who are ineligible for Pell Grants!

Federal funding of higher education also leads to federal control of many aspects of higher education. Federal control inevitably accompanies federal funding because politicians cannot resist imposing their preferred solutions for perceived "problems" on institutions beholden to taxpayer dollars. The prophetic soundness of those who spoke out against the creation of federal higher education programs in the 1960s because they would lead to federal control of higher education is demonstrated by examining today's higher educational system. College and universities are so fearful of losing federal aid they allow their policies on everything from composition of the student body to campus crime to be dictated by the Federal Government. Clearly, federal funding is being abused as an excuse to tighten the federal noose around both higher and elementary education.

Instead of increasing federal expenditures, Mr. Speaker, this Congress should respond to the American people's demand for increased support of higher education by working to pass bills giving Americans tax relief. For example, Congress should pass H.R. 1188, a bill I am cosponsoring which provides a tax deduction of up to \$20,000 for the payment of college tuition. I am also cosponsoring several pieces of legislation to enhance the tax benefit for education savings accounts and pre-paid tuition plans to make it easier for parents to

save for their children's education. Although the various plans I have supported differ in detail, they all share one crucial element. Each allows individuals the freedom to spend their own money on higher education rather than forcing taxpayers to rely on Washington to return to them some percentage of their own tax dollars to spend as bureaucrats see fit.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to reject H. Con. Res. 88 and any other attempt to increase spending on federal programs. Instead, my colleagues should join me in working to put the American people in control of higher education by cutting taxes and thus allowing them to use more of their resources for higher education.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, today, I come before the House to ask, "have the Republicans done a U-turn?"

Their education record includes: opposing education funding increases; passing a year 2000 budget \$2.9 billion short of the President's education proposal; and advocating for the abolishment of the Department of Education.

Again, I ask, "is this resolution a Republican U-turn?"

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there has been no U-turn. The Republican course is straight and does not lead to a true endorsement of education.

I support Pell Grant increases. However, without language to state otherwise, I am left to surmise that this resolution may endanger initiatives to reduce class size, hire more teachers, and modernize schools.

Let's set a better course and invest at every level of our children's education—preschool through postsecondary.

Let's stand up for all worthwhile education initiatives!

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 88.

The question was taken.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 88.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE IN SUPPORT OF AMERICA'S TEACHERS

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 157) expressing the

sense of the House of Representatives in support of America's teachers.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 157

Whereas the foundation of American freedom and democracy is a strong, effective system of education in which every child can learn in a safe and nurturing environment;

Whereas a first-rate education system depends on a partnership between parents, principals, teachers, and children;

Whereas much of the success of our Nation during the American Century is the result of the hard work and dedication of teachers across the land;

Whereas, in addition to their families, knowledgeable and skillful teachers can have a profound impact on a child's early development and future success;

Whereas, while many people spend their lives building careers, teachers spend their careers building lives;

Whereas our Nation's teachers serve our children beyond the call of duty as coaches, mentors, and advisors without regard to fame or fortune; and

Whereas across this land nearly 3 million men and women experience the joys of teaching young minds the virtues of reading, writing, and arithmetic: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors and recognizes the unique and important achievements of America's teachers; and

(2) urges all Americans to take a moment to thank and pay tribute to our Nation's teachers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) **each will control 20 minutes.**

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is only appropriate that today on the floor of this House the Congress of the United States of America recognize and acknowledge the teachers of our country. Today, over 3 million American men and women are teaching our children, our next generation, our Nation's greatest resource.

Were I to stand anywhere in this Chamber and pose one question to every Member, I would get exactly the same response. Were I to ask any Member, think for a second and tell me if there was ever a teacher that made a difference in their life, instantly, without question, every individual would think of a teacher or teachers and would respond further with a story about how that person had impacted their life.

So, too, is it true with almost every adult in America today. Save only our parents, teachers are the most important people in the lives of our children. While we are doing the right thing to pause today and pay tribute to America's teachers, we must remember every week and every day to give thanks and give support for the contribution that they make.

Were I to be asked if a teacher had made a difference in my life, I would think back to Alice Gibson in Atlanta,

Georgia, a teacher who made a student of me. She was a disciplinarian, a demanding lady, a lover of literature. For me, before having Ms. Gibson, learning was work and books belonged on shelves. After attending her class, barely making it the first time and excelling the second, everything that is open to me today is because of the windows of the world that she opened in teaching that appreciation.

In my home district in Cobb County, there is a teacher by the name of Linda Morrison, a social studies teacher in North Cobb High School in Cobb County, who year in and year out her teams win Model U.N. and win debates. Every year political candidates come to her class and they are overwhelmed by the inspiration and motivation that Linda Morrison places in all those children.

I did that trip 3 months ago, shortly before my special election. Linda turned the classroom over to me; and I was once again impressed by the respect, the courtesy, and the insight of those kids. When I left the class, once again awed, the principal put his arm around me and told me that Ms. Morrison had just finished her first chemo treatment but had come to class to see to it that her students were fulfilled and her class went on.

□ 1600

That is the kind of dedication, that is the kind of commitment we see not just in one but in many of our teachers all over America.

And lastly, it is only fitting that I recognize Andy Baumgartner, this year the United States of America's Teacher of the Year, as honored just 2 weeks ago in Washington D.C.; a kindergarten teacher outside of Augusta, Georgia who dedicates his life to putting excitement into education for every child. He recognizes that, at the age of five, he has one opportunity to help the life of an individual in the most formative year of their education.

Mr. Speaker, it is only appropriate that this House today commend our teachers all over this country, recognize them for the contribution they make, and appreciate the fact that today in every American classroom they are under the watchful eye of a teacher, an individual who is willing to share with them.

And, Mr. Speaker, I think all of us remember or might ask, had it not been for teachers or a teacher, where might any of us have been today?

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 157, which recognizes the unique and important achievements of America's teachers and urges all Americans to pay tribute to our Nation's teachers.

As the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) just said, most of us can point to a teacher in our lives that has made a difference. Were it not for the benefit of several outstanding teachers, I might not be where I am today.

I remember one particular teacher that really turned me around in the sixth grade. And I was busy doing things I should not have been doing, drawing pictures instead of doing the class lesson. And she snuck up behind me and caught my attention with the ruler that she carried, which was about 18 inches long and about 1½ inches wide, and it came down across my hands with a real sting. And I jumped up and raised back my hand, and she immediately struck me in the face with the ruler, not hard, just enough to make a sting and get my attention. And she got my attention. And then she instructed me to sit down and wait until the bell rang and I would stay after school, and I did.

But that was the most prosperous couple hours I had ever spent in school in my life, because in that 2 hours she taught me everything there was to learn about the lesson I was supposed to be learning. And I noticed something about it. When I started realizing that I could do the work and I was getting the answers right, I looked up and I saw her smiling at me from ear to ear. No one in the class had ever seen her smile before. And I thought, this is really a very nice teacher.

But more important was what she taught me that day. Well, from that day on I never had a problem with those lessons again and I decided that I can learn. But I think that was what she was saying to us.

I remember one time Terrel Bell, the Secretary of Education under Reagan, when he said to us one time at a hearing, there is nothing so rewarding to a teacher as when they look into that young person's eyes and see that light go on, that they learned that they can learn. Well, Mrs. Cassons saw that light go on in my eyes and she made me realize that a good teacher can make the difference between success and failure for a student.

Recent studies show that teacher quality is the most single important factor in student achievement. In recent hearings that we have held in the committee of the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) we have had testimony, and when they were asked what was the most important thing in the education of young people, each of them answered the quality teacher.

However, if we look at today's teachers, they face greater challenges than ever before, greater challenges than my teacher, Mrs. Cassons, ever saw. Classes are larger and they are more unmanageable. Classroom spaces are now inadequate and they are in poor condition and often pose a safety hazard.

Discipline problems and school violence are at an all-time high, as we recently saw in Colorado. On top of all this, teacher candidates often do not receive adequate training, new teachers are not supported by their school system, and experienced teachers are not provided with meaningful professional development they need to remain effective.

Under these circumstances, even Mrs. Cassons would have had problems. Therefore, I think it is high time we provide our Nation's teachers with some greatly needed assistance.

Although most decisions regarding teacher recruitment, training, and professional development are made at the State and local level, as they should be, Congress has before it the wonderful opportunity to provide our Nation's teachers with the tools and support they need to educate the next generation of American citizens.

I feel very lucky to be the ranking member on the subcommittee which has jurisdiction over such a wonderful opportunity. And I am pleased to say that the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and I are currently working on legislation which provides incentives to States and districts to get high-quality individuals into the classroom and keep them there.

I know that the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), and many of my colleagues share my desire to help those special individuals who dedicate their lives to bettering the lives of others. I look forward to working with everyone in Congress to ensure that every child has a Mrs. Cassons.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I rise in support of the resolution to honor and recognize the unique and important achievements of America's teachers. As one who spent many years of his professional life in schools, and also as a Member whose wife continues to teach, I know firsthand the dedication and commitment teachers put forth every single day despite the ever-growing challenges that they face, which are almost insurmountable.

As the gentleman from Georgia mentioned, we can all remember a teacher or teachers. And, of course, I go back to my first 4 years in a one-room school where Ms. Yost was the teacher. She had 40 students, 4 different grades represented. She had no special teachers. She did it all. She stoked the stove. She carried out the ashes. She did everything. And she was a magnificent teacher.

It does not matter how many they have in the classroom if they do not have a quality teacher in that classroom.

One of the problems that teachers are often faced with today is the fact that many times they do not receive the kind of preparation and training that they should from the teacher training institutions. Sometimes they get assigned subject areas that they have very little knowledge about that par-

ticular subject, and oftentimes they are not given quality in-service programs.

So we, as Congress, working along with States, schools and parents, must continue to address the problems that face our Nation's teachers.

Specifically, we must continue to take a close look at existing Federal education programs to determine if, in fact, they are meeting the needs of our teachers as well as the students they are intended to serve. If not, working together with State and local schools and parents, we must develop new ways to ensure these funds are being used effectively.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I simply want to say to our teachers one great big "thank you."

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from California for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would start off by pointing out that the purpose of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is twofold; and I would start with the second one, which urges all Americans to take a moment to thank and pay tribute to our Nation's teachers.

As a former teacher, Mr. Speaker, and as a product of both Catholic private education and public education, I rise to thank the many teachers that contributed to my education, that contribute to the children's education throughout Indiana, and contribute to all our Nation's children throughout all the schools in the United States of America.

There is not a single more important profession or calling on the face of the Earth than to get into a school classroom with 30, 25, or 30 or 35 children and to take on the challenges of teaching those children every day in our Nation's classrooms.

And I agree that we all, as parents, must participate in what this resolution calls for, and that is all of us getting out there on a daily basis, not just on a yearly basis, and having contact with the school and thanking the teacher and participating in reading programs with our classrooms and engaging that school.

I saw a figure last week that said about 30 percent of our parents have contact with the school, yet every single one of us has contact with the graduates of that school system. So we need to engage our schools and do even more than thank our teachers but participate in our children's education.

The first part of this resolution honors and recognizes the unique and important achievements of America's teachers. And certainly we recognize their integrity, we recognize their intelligence, we recognize their contributions every day to our children.

And more so, as I conclude, Mr. Speaker, on a note that more and more

teachers are stepping forward on, it is not only to ensure that our schools get better but that our schools are safe. And in Jonesboro, Arkansas and in Littleton, Colorado we have school safety issues where teachers not only gave their intelligence, their talents, and their integrity; they gave their lives. They put their lives on the line and they lost them on school safety issues to protect other children.

So this resolution I think is timely, Mr. Speaker, in that not only should we thank our teachers, not only should we engage our education system and participate as community leaders and as parents, but we should also recognize the unlimited contributions that these teachers make to our children in terms of their intelligence, in terms of their safety, and in terms of their long-standing contributions in society.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for Teacher Appreciation Week; and I urge Americans everywhere to take a moment to pay tribute to our Nation's teachers.

A sound democracy rests on a first-rate education system, one where parents and teachers work together. A solid education in any of our Nation's schools comes from the teachers who strive to give the gift of knowledge to the minds of our future generations.

Dedicated teachers work day after day to ensure that all of our students will have a bright and successful life. Teachers wear many hats: as counselor, friend, and, most importantly, role model. Today learning not only consists of the three R's but skills that parents no longer have time to teach.

Accordingly, I urge all of our colleagues to support this resolution honoring American teachers. I thank our colleagues, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) for sponsoring this legislation.

It is my hope that Congressional support for teachers will serve as an example to all Americans that the service that teachers render is irreplaceable.

This week is the 14th Annual Teacher Appreciation Week which was created by the National Parent Teacher Association (PTA). The PTA is an organization that encourages parent and public involvement in all of the Nation's public schools. By strengthening the tie between both parents and the nearly 3 million American school teachers we can only further ensure that American education continues to be second to none. Teachers have an immeasurable impact on the growth and development of students and are responsible, in part, to the shaping of a future generation. Because of this, teachers are indispensable.

The face on the American family is vastly different from the way it was only decades

ago. My wife is a former teacher and when she was in school the sole job of a teacher was to impart knowledge. However, today teachers fill the void that hard working parents and single parents cannot.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the House resolution paying tribute to our Nation's teachers.

Since I have come to this House 2½ years ago, I spend so much time in my schools and have gotten to know my teachers, gotten to know how much they care about our students and how hard they are trying to make our students better prepared to go into the world, that makes this a better country.

Education is our number one priority for this country, and it should be. But we are seeing a teacher shortage and it is making our teachers' jobs harder. We are seeing that we are bringing young people out of college to become teachers; that they are failing mainly because they do not feel that they are well-prepared. I think that is something that we can work on, especially in the special education that we are going to be doing in the next several months.

Our teachers have to be well-prepared so they can do a great job in our classes, especially in early education. And I think that it is something that our teachers want, because they want to be the best they can.

We have to do everything in the world to prepare our young people to become teachers so that we again will have the amount of teachers that we are going to need. We are seeing too many of our teachers drop out, and that is not good for any of us, mainly because they felt that they were not prepared.

We dealt with it last year on the Higher Education Act on having teachers better prepared, and I think it is something that we can do on early education. I plan on introducing a bill to have a mentoring program on early education, and I hope I will have the support of my committee.

When we talk about the teachers in the classroom today versus the teachers that certainly taught us years ago, it was an easier time back then. We had so much more cooperation between the parents and the teachers, and we have to encourage that more and more.

Our teachers are supposed to be there, to be teaching. They need the support of the parents, and I think that is important. We are seeing our teachers today taking in our young people and trying to be parents to them when they can. That is not their job.

□ 1615

Their job is there to teach our children. But if we do not encourage our

parents to become more involved in our schools, we are making our jobs harder for our teachers.

Look at some of the schools that do so well. It is not that the kids are brighter. It is because their parents are so involved in those particular schools. They are giving the encouragement for the teachers to go that extra yard. We have to make all our schools like that. That is how we are going to turn around education in this country.

Our children are bright, our teachers are good, but we have to work together to make sure that we are the best, better than anywhere else in this country. I think we are on the right track.

We still have some work to do, but certainly the love of teaching, someone that I had in sixth grade, Mrs. Engelman, she taught me the love of history. I think if she ever saw me here today, she would be so proud of me because she talked about the Constitution, she talked about our government, and here I am being very proud of being a graduate of her class but also living what she taught me.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the House Resolution paying tribute to our nation's teachers. This resolution expresses a sense of the House, thanking and paying tribute to our nation's teachers. Education is my number one priority. Providing our children with a good education and a bright future is one of our most effective tools for ending gun violence, drug abuse, and poverty in our country.

I spend every Monday and Friday in my schools on Long Island, talking with students, teachers, principals, superintendents, and parents about how we can make the education system work better.

In visiting these schools, I see teachers and students who are committed to education. And I have learned that our teachers are the cornerstone of our education system. Brand new classrooms, reduced class size and improved access to technology are empty promises without a dedicated, well-qualified teacher in front of the class.

Unfortunately, we are facing a shortage of teachers. Our nation will need to hire 2 million new teachers in the next decade to handle a growing student population and to replace retiring teachers. However, fewer young people are going into teaching, and when they do, many do not receive the learning they need to succeed in the classroom. Many children are warehoused in bigger classes, often with unprepared instructors, because there simply are not enough teachers to go around.

Last year, Congress passed my teacher training bill as part of the Higher Education Act. My legislation will better prepare teachers for teaching our children. I worked with local school administrators and educators to draft a bill that will (1) recruit new teachers; (2) prepare future teachers for the rigors of the classroom; and (3) mentor new teachers in their first year on the job.

Today, I am proud to introduce legislation that will expand Teacher Mentoring programs in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This legislation will complement the mentoring programs I sponsored in the Higher Education Act, ensuring that mentoring becomes a continuous, comprehensive program,

addressing the needs of experienced teachers as well as new teachers.

Mentoring programs help all teachers—they benefit new teachers by easing the transition into teaching, increasing retention rates and improving the quality of teaching. Mentoring also helps experienced teachers by exposing them to new ideas and current trends in teaching.

The key to improving the quality of education is our teachers. Reducing class size is not going to be effective unless you have a qualified teacher in that class. We must do everything we can to make sure our teachers are well-trained before they enter the classroom. And that they continue to improve their skills once they are in the classroom.

I will be working hard to pass my mentoring bill which will give teachers the tools they need to be the best possible educators they can. Our children, and our teachers, are worth it—and deserve it.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), distinguished member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this important resolution and in recognition of the hard work of our Nation's teachers.

As a former member of the local school board and President of that school district for 9 years, as a father of six and grandfather of 16, I understand the crucial role that teachers play in the lives of our children and in our communities. We have for too long taken their role for granted and have come to expect our teachers to perform heroic acts of teaching despite ever-rising challenges.

I believe that as a Nation we must no longer take for granted the ability for teachers to somehow magically prepare our students. We must join together at the national, State and, most importantly, at the local level in working together to address these challenges facing our teachers, our schools and our students.

At the national level, we must ensure that Federal education programs are flexible enough to allow local schools to make decisions which meet their specific needs. At the same time, we must ensure that these funds are used effectively and that they are used for activities that demonstrate increased academic achievement for all students.

I am pleased to say that as chair of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Training and Life-Long Learning, I am working with Members to craft a bipartisan bill which will address some of these important issues. I am especially pleased to be working with the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ), who has deep insight into this important area.

I would like to take just a moment, along with this resolution, to thank teachers who have had an impact on me personally. I have four younger brothers. We went to school in the Los Angeles unified school system. All five of us had Mrs. Peters for kindergarten.

I can think back to teachers at all levels, high school, junior high, elementary school, university, that have had an impact on my life. I do not know that I ever took the time to thank them, I know I did not thank them adequately, for the job that they have done. There is probably not a day that goes by that I do not think of some lesson that I learned from some teacher. Probably outside of my parents, teachers have had more impact on my life than anyone else.

I go visit schools whenever I am home in the district. I like to go in a classroom, probably for a selfish reason, because I always feel good when I leave, after seeing an enthusiastic, motivated teacher that is devoting and dedicating their life to helping our young people to make this a better world.

Our district at home, each year the members of the community have a night where they honor teachers. I was not able to be there this week, but I would like to thank them for taking the time to honor our teachers, because I do think that that is very important. I tell teachers when I visit that you can count the number of seeds in an apple, but you cannot count the number of apples in a seed. One little seed can grow into a giant apple tree that grows apples for many, many years and has great impact. That is what our teachers mean to us.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his leadership and for yielding me this time.

What a special time to come on the floor of the House to honor those champions, those heroes who really are the basis of making our country great. This is a salute to teachers, and it means all teachers in all capacities but particularly those who educate our children.

I come personally and as the parent of two children recognizing the importance that teachers have in the lives of children. I also work and chair the Congressional Children's Caucus. Members who have joined that Caucus have committed themselves to promoting children as a national agenda. Where would we be without that strong and abiding force of those who believe in education, particularly those who treat young children with the kind of respect and the kind of belief in themselves that many of our teachers have and do with respect to our children?

I spend a lot of time in my schools, in particular our public schools, our elementary, our middle school and our secondary. I work a lot with our private schools. I know that each and every time I come upon a teacher it is someone who has expressed a love and affection for children, someone who cares for children, someone who wants to see children thriving and growing.

In the light of the events that have happened over the past couple of years, when teachers have been highlighted and spotlighted, unfortunately not for good but for the tragedy of maybe being injured, what comes to mind is certainly the heroic teacher in the Littleton, Colorado, tragedy, the stories that came out from the young people who said he put their lives ahead of his.

How many times we know that that occurs. And maybe not necessarily to that degree, where a teacher has lost his or her life, but we realize that teachers who believe in what they do most often put the needs of their students in front of their personal needs. They extend their days, they take them on field trips, they guide and counsel them, they help them get into college, they help them get scholarships, they help them get into summer programs. So often the teachers who have taught my children have come to me and said, I think this program would be good for your child or that program, something a parent is not aware of.

At the same time in the public school setting, I know that teachers extend themselves. They are also the hall monitors, the people who participate on retreats or the ones who are the guiders of extracurricular activities, at the basketball games or football games.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to stand today to pay special tribute and applaud this resolution as an appropriate statement that this Congress should make and certainly the United States should make, that teachers are a vital part of our history, a vital part of our society.

I know, for one, that I am a product of the teachers who educated and helped educate me. I know that parents and home and church have a viable part in a child's education, but I can assure my colleagues that there are many teachers who I took in confidence and who helped me along the way, who made me feel better, and also that I had the ability to achieve albeit through some rocky times.

Can I just say to each and every one of them who may be sitting at home or in fact have another day's work tomorrow, in preparing a lesson plan or dealing with a student, that we do appreciate you, we salute and honor you. You are American heroes. We hope that this Congress will continue to stand behind you as you educate and provide and secure our children's lives.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the original sponsor of this resolution.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, as a former teacher myself and as the daughter of two teachers it is my great privilege to cosponsor this important resolution, and it is my great pleasure to speak out on its behalf. Someone has said that teaching is not a lost art, but regard for it is a lost tradition.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise the guardians of America's future, and those are our teachers. The issue of education generally and teachers specifically is as important as it is timely.

I approach this issue from a simple philosophy. Education is a Federal concern, a State responsibility and a local function. Education is a team sport, and it requires all of us to do our part.

As a Member of Congress, I believe one of the most important steps we can take to support the schools of our Nation is to encourage the teachers of our schools. I have always believed that teachers are a very special breed. While most people spend their lives building careers, most teachers spend their careers building lives. That is why it is so important that we take the time to honor our teachers as indeed they should be honored.

Moreover, we need to be encouraging the very best and brightest to join the teaching profession. We can all agree that teachers do not earn the kind of money they should, but the rewards of teaching cannot be measured in dollars and cents. Teachers see the fruits of their labor in lives that have changed.

So today we want to express the sense of the United States Congress that our teachers are an essential part of America's greatness. I know every one of us can point to a teacher in our past who helped to shape us, make us who we are. Though years ago we may have left their classes, their classes have never left us. From the teachers of the past we learned the traits we use today, how to type and how to calculate but how to read and how to write and how to think. These are lessons that have served us all well, and we will all do well to thank those who taught them to us.

That is exactly what this resolution does. As we end this century, let us begin a renewed commitment. In the debate over the future of education, there are a few things we can all agree on. Let us commit ourselves to having schools that are safe and curriculum that is sound. Let us commit ourselves to having our children learn to read today so they can read to learn throughout their lives. And let us commit ourselves to having teachers who know the subject they are teaching and the name of the child they are teaching it to.

Mr. Speaker, too often in Washington we talk in terms of politics, but this issue is different. Education is not a matter of right versus left. It is a matter of right versus wrong. It is always the right time to do the right thing. Let us pass this teacher appreciation resolution. Let us begin to renew our schools by recognizing our teachers. After all, they literally hold our future in their hands.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of our Nation's teachers.

I am a graduate of the Cleveland Public School System of Cleveland, Ohio. I can remember all the wonderful teachers that were my teachers.

From kindergarten, I can remember Ms. Chapman's name, all the way up to teachers that I had in junior high and high school. In fact, several of my elementary teachers that taught me French were my French teachers in high school. So every chance I have an opportunity to talk about how great teachers are, I am glad to be able to say that. I need to put their names in the RECORD, Ms. Gilliam and Ms. DiPadova. I speak French as a result of the great work of those wonderful women.

As we pause today to celebrate teachers across our country, I wish that every child in these United States could have as memorable a moment in their lifetime as me with the teachers that I had in the public school system. I can even name some of my college and law school teachers that I remember very well.

Like the prior speaker, I would encourage all of us to assure our children that are in school today, be they black or white, urban or suburban or rural, that they have teachers who have the opportunity to teach.

Many teachers in our school systems today have to be mother, they have to be father, they have to be uncle, grandmother, grandfather, psychologist, disciplinarian, nurse, doctor; and they should not have to be all of those things. They should be able to teach in an environment that is safe. They should be able to teach in a classroom where there are 15 students or less. They should be able to have all of the accoutrements that go with teaching, the books they need at the time they need them, the room should be clean.

Mr. Speaker, as we rise in support of teachers today, I just want to add my kudos to all the teachers that I had. I praise the teachers who teach today. May God continue to bless them.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

For years now we have been looking to how to restore civility to the House. Now I know all we have to do is introduce a resolution supporting our teachers and we find the thing that all of us agree upon.

I in Delaware have had the privilege of being in every single public school in my State—do not try that if you are in a big State—and almost all the private schools as well. When you spend 1 to 3 hours there, you obviously are going to touch in a lot of classrooms and watch a lot of teachers teaching.

There may not be good teachers in our classrooms in Delaware, I cannot say for sure there is, but I have not seen one. I have seen devoted men and women who are trying to care for their

kids, sometimes in one-on-one circumstances, other times in larger classroom circumstances. These are individuals who are committed to their task at hand.

I am sure it is just as true in every other State in the Nation as it is in the State of Delaware. When you choose teaching, you choose a profession which is of profound importance to every young person in this country and to our society as a whole.

□ 1630

We have done, I think, remarkably well in the people that we have been able to attract to the teaching profession and retain in the teaching profession. They truly care about our children. They truly make the effort to teach as well as they possibly can.

Like others here, I, too, have memories. Maybe I was not as good a student as some of the others here because not all my memories are as good as I would like them to be, but it is actually some of those more difficult classes where teachers are more demanding that I have the greatest memories now of what they did for me and what they meant to all of us.

A quality education, it is the best gift we can possibly give our children, and the teachers are there every step of the way encouraging them, helping them, making sure they are on the road to success.

I am sure that the teaching profession may seem like a thankless job at times. We have all heard that expressed, and we have to worry when we see what happened in Littleton, Colorado. That affects all teachers. But as teachers, the teachers of this country really are shaping the future of the country.

I am fond of saying to a whole room of elected officials and corporate heads and everything else, that teachers are the most important people in our State, and sometimes people come back and, "What about my father? He's a teacher." But teachers are extraordinarily important, and we should thank them not only today but at all times.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COBLE). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, today it is my honor to join in saluting teachers in communities all across America as students, parents, school administrators and the public celebrate the teaching profession. Few other professionals touch so many people in such a lasting way as teachers do.

Mr. Speaker, I think each and every one of us can recall that one special teacher who inspired us, who guided us and who helped make us the person we are today, and I know I can. Teachers open children's minds to the magic of ideas, knowledge and dreams. They keep American democracy alive by lay-

ing the foundation for good citizenship, and they fill many roles as listeners, explorers, role models, motivators and mentors. Long after our school days are only memories, teachers continue to influence us.

I know that at elementary school Miss Halcomb did exactly that. In middle school Audrey Geoff did that for me. In high school math, E.R. Broughton; in high school government, Lucille Parrish; in high school English, Eddie McNail. From my youth I recall a proverb that has stayed with me throughout the years: Better than a thousand days of diligent study is one day with a great teacher.

Today and all throughout the year celebrate teaching. Take the time to recognize the lasting contributions that educators make to our community and thank those special teachers who have truly made a difference in each of our lives.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed that my colleagues, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), could remember so many of their teachers, and I was just sitting here thinking if I could remember any of my elementary and secondary teachers, and I do remember the first names of all of them, but I cannot remember much more. The first name was: Sister.

I rise in support of the House Resolution, pay tribute to the hard work of our Nation's teachers. As a former public school teacher, I take great pride in my former colleagues and believe that teachers are a national treasure. Those are teachers in public schools, private schools and, of course, parents who take on that huge responsibility of home schooling, and who have provided such wonderful models for their children and have done such a wonderful job in teaching their children.

But I would especially like to take this moment to pay tribute to an educator who through his heroism 2 weeks ago inspired us all. His name is David Sanders, and he gave his life to save the lives of several students at Columbine High School, Littleton, Colorado, my district. Dave Sanders was a business teacher and the coach of the girls' basketball and softball teams at Columbine, but he was also a friend to the hundreds of students at the school who looked at him for guidance and support.

Two weeks ago, during the rampage at Columbine, David Sanders saved a number of students from ricocheting bullets and then went upstairs in the school to aid other students. While leading two dozen students down a hallway to safety, Mr. Speaker, he was shot twice in the chest, and 3½ hours later David Sanders passed away, however, not before asking nearby students to tell his family that he loved them.

Later Rick Bath, Columbine softball coach, said about his friend: "There

were just so many good qualities about him, you always knew that he would just be there for you. All he ever wanted to do was teach since he was 21. He would not have known what else to do."

Mr. Speaker, today the community of Littleton, Colorado joins me in thanking David Sanders for the sacrifice that he made for his students and his fellow teachers during last Tuesday's massacre and for making a difference in the lives of children at Columbine and, as a matter of fact, all over America.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any other speakers, and I am ready to yield back the balance of my time. I would just make a concluding statement in regard to the Columbine High School incident.

I read the other day in a paper where there were many instances of teachers' heroism. There was one teacher who herded a group of children into a room, and then closed the door and set her body in front of the door so that if any shots came through, they would hit her, not the students. I do not think that we can ever make any commendation high enough to reward someone with that kind of heroism.

Mr. Speaker, I think that teachers across this country by and large are the same kind of quality as teachers who are dedicated to their children. As many people have said today in honoring the teachers they can remember, I, like the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) cannot remember a lot of last names, but I can remember a lot of first names, and I realize that my success in life was attributable to what they taught me.

So again, I honor the teachers of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT).

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support today of this resolution honoring the nearly 3 million teachers across America that work every day to secure the future of our children.

Yesterday I had the opportunity to visit two of Mrs. Becham's classes at East Side High School in Greenville, South Carolina. These were two hour-and-a-half-long government classes, and these students wore me out with questions, and it reminded me of the incredible energy it takes every day, day in and day out, for these teachers to open the minds and to fill these minds with the knowledge that will help these students be successful in life. I thank Mrs. Becham, and I thank her that she wanted her students not only to hear about Congress, but she persisted until she got the Congressman right there in her room.

I am thankful myself for teachers because my wife and I have four children from junior high through college. I am thankful for all the teachers that

helped to shape their lives. I am thankful for the teachers, so many good ones, that when I was not such a good student did so much for me, particularly Mrs. Humphries in the 9th grade, when she handed me back one paper with red marks all over it and I expected to hear how bad it was, when she said:

"Jim, you're a good writer. You've got a lot of good ideas."

Mr. Speaker, I ignored the red marks, and I took it to heart that I was a good writer, and that is what I made as my profession, and I thank Mrs. Humphries.

Today is a good day to honor all of teachers. We need to treat them as the professionals that they are. We have given them almost an impossible job to do. We have given them so much of the blame that they are not responsible for, and I am thankful today that we are giving them a little bit of the credit that they so richly deserve.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, before introducing our final speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 157.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, this week we honor those who assist parents and take our children to the next levels of learning, America's teachers. Teachers have motivated our children. Teachers have helped our children to mature.

Here is a teacher through the eyes of a second grader, Kacie Hershey in my district, and I quote:

I like Mr. Durante because he is funny and because he teaches us math. Now he is teaching us about Japan and how to count to 10 in Japanese.

When teachers like Mr. Durante make learning fun for their students, whole new worlds are opened.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it can be said any better than the way it is stated in this resolution, and I quote again:

Many people spend their lives building careers. Our teachers spend their careers building lives.

What could be more true? America's teachers rise every day out of their commitment to mold and shape young lives. As a former public school math and science teacher myself, I can attest to the amount of time, and energy, and creativity and patience that it takes to lead our students to the next step of discovery, be it in literature, math, music theory or physics.

Earlier today I honored Elaine Suvukas of Hempfield High School for leading an excellent group of students in the "We the People, the Citizen, the Constitution" academic competition on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Her students know America's

Constitution probably better than many Members of Congress. She stirs her students to excellence. Excellent teachers like Miss Suvukas are all over this country using the resources that they have been given to the best of their ability for the betterment of our students, and we need to get more resources directly to our teachers, dollars into the classroom, and then we can truly honor their work.

Mr. Speaker, that is one very clear way that we can say thanks to our public school teachers across the country. After all, these are the people who are influencing our children and teaching young minds the value of reading, writing and arithmetic.

Except for parents at home, no adult is closer to the learning process of our kids. Teachers are the ones who have the power to affect the learning and help them so that they can compete. Let us arm them with the tools they need.

So, as we honor our teachers this week, let us continue the process throughout the year. Our children and our children's children are the most precious resources that we have, and that is why we must recognize their invaluable contributions of spending their entire days with them, shaping their lives.

To our teachers: I thank them. Their work is greatly needed, appreciated and admired.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to our nation's teachers. Their dedicated service should be acknowledged every day, not just during National Teacher Appreciation Week.

As a father, grandfather and former school board member, I have a great deal of personal respect for those who educate our youth. I believe these individuals know our children better than some Washington bureaucrat. We should strive to give them programs that return educational decisions to those most qualified to make them, the parents, teachers, and local school boards.

Currently, only 65 percent of federal education funds actually make it to classrooms. Too many needed funds are spent on unnecessary and inefficient bureaucracies, rather than on local schools. We must make a commitment to send more education dollars to schools, libraries, teachers, and students. Our children are this nation's most precious resource. The future of a child's education is essential to the future of our nation.

Mr. Speaker, again I would like to extend my gratitude to those who make teaching our children more than simply a daily job. I will continue to support those whom we entrust with our children's future.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our nation's teachers. It is with great appreciation that I recognize teachers across America who are shaping a brighter future for our children.

Today teachers face many challenges in the classroom, challenges that often force them to give more of their time and energy on matters other than teaching. Increased classroom sizes, crumbling infrastructure, and new social challenges in the lives of children require our teachers to wear many different hats. They

play a vital role in not only setting a solid academic foundation for all students, but also teaching our students basic life skills to succeed in the future. To say the least they are extraordinarily influential in shaping the lives of our students.

I would like to thank teachers everywhere for their time and commitment. As a former school board member and the husband of an elementary school teacher I know that teachers do not stop working when the school bell rings. A teacher's job never stops. Each day brings new challenges and new opportunities. Many evenings are spent reviewing papers and preparing for the next day's class, and teachers often devote their time to extracurricular activities on evenings and weekends. They have one of the most important jobs in the country and should be praised for their diligence in the classroom.

As we mark National Teachers Day this week, we cannot fail to mention one teacher in Littleton, Colorado, William Sanders, who gave his life defending and protecting his students. Teachers across the nation share his love of students and devotion to their well-being. Unfortunately, he paid the ultimate price and we should honor and remember his sacrifice.

We must provide our teachers with the means to do their job well. If they don't, our children lose. Without an education, our children will not be prepared to compete in the global economy, they will not be empowered to escape poverty, they will not have the tools to succeed. But worst of all, they will never know the joy of challenging and expanding their minds. It is most appropriate to honor our teachers who daily engage our children in the art of learning.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution, and to express my profound appreciation for the teachers that played such an important role in my life.

From my days as a student at Roosevelt, St. Mary's, Marshall and finally graduation from Craig Sr. High, my teachers had a positive impact on my early learning habits as well as my future successes.

I'd like to single out for recognition, however, one teacher in particular, Mr. Sam Loizzo. Sam was my high school United States Government teacher. What distinguishes Sam is his ability to involve students in all aspects of learning activities. Students become active participants in the educational process, not casual observers, and they're trained to apply the lessons learned in his classroom. Sam's students don't simply learn about our government, but they gain an appreciation for the structure and framework by which this great country was founded.

Sam taught the value of civic responsibility. He encouraged me to research the role of the founding fathers and the Constitution. In fact, Sam was here on Capitol Hill with students from Craig Sr. High just last week impressing upon them the very same values he had shared with me.

For over 20 years, Sam has been building friendships with his students, one on one relationships like ours that exist still today. He is a role model and a friend.

Sam has a remarkable influence upon the lives of all the students that have an opportunity to sit in his class. Sam is indeed a credit to his profession.

Through experience, skill and dedication, teachers like Sam are creating an environment in which every child in his or her class feels important and challenged.

The students of today will soon take active roles in business, education, government, and other important positions in society. Today's teachers, in coordination with parents and families, are doing a wonderful job of equipping those students for the tasks they will face after graduation.

I want to take this opportunity to not only recognize teachers like Sam, but to thank all of them for their contributions to future generations.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, today Americans celebrate National Teacher Day, a day set aside to honor dedicated individuals. I would like to take a moment to recognize educators of excellence across the Fourth Congressional District for their contribution to our state.

Teachers are a diverse group. Some teach children, some adults. Some give instruction in vocations, others liberal arts. Some educate children with special needs. Others teach English to students from other countries. Some coach basketball. Some are parents schooling their own children. Although different in many ways, good teachers have this in common: They are individuals devoted to excellence, possessing talent, patience, fortitude, and a personal love of learning.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, excellence in education has been the focus of my efforts since my days in the Colorado State Senate. As the son of two retired school teachers and the father of three children who attend public schools (and one on her way), no issue is closer to my heart and home. Exceptional school teachers deserve our admiration, not only for their hard work but for the sheer weight of their accomplishments—the cultivation of an educated citizenry. These inspirational individuals give me a glimpse into what the future can hold if we let it. If we continue to improve our system by recognizing and building on the achievements of great educators, the sky is the limit for American education.

Empowering good teachers is essential to education reform. We can do this by ensuring more education funds reach the classroom, for example, by passing the Dollars to the Classroom Act. This act would require 95 percent of federal education money be spent in classrooms. Currently, as little as 39 cents of every dollar reaches the classroom. This Act would increase education spending in Colorado by as much as \$11 million simply through efficiency savings in Washington. More importantly, this money would go to support teachers, not bureaucrats, and special interests.

After all, studies have shown the single most important factor in a quality education is a good teacher. Caring and talented teachers are of immeasurable worth to our society. They are the pride of our community and essential to our quality of life. In the words of Historian Henry Brooks Adams, "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops." Let us honor them today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 157.

The question was taken.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate has concluded on the first three motions to suspend the rules.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which those motions were entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Con. Res. 84, as amended, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 88, by the yeas and nays; and

House Resolution 157, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the third electronic vote in this series.

URGING CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT TO FULLY FUND IN- DIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 84, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 84, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 2, answered "present" 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

YEAS—413

Abercrombie	Bentsen	Brady (TX)
Ackerman	Bereuter	Brown (FL)
Aderholt	Berkley	Brown (OH)
Allen	Berry	Bryant
Andrews	Biggert	Burr
Archer	Bilbray	Burton
Armey	Bilirakis	Buyer
Bachus	Bishop	Callahan
Baird	Blagojevich	Calvert
Baker	Bliley	Camp
Baldacci	Blumenauer	Campbell
Baldwin	Blunt	Canady
Ballenger	Boehert	Cannon
Barcia	Boehner	Capps
Barr	Bonilla	Capuano
Barrett (NE)	Bonior	Cardin
Barrett (WI)	Bono	Castle
Bartlett	Borski	Chabot
Barton	Boswell	Chambliss
Bass	Boucher	Chenoweth
Bateman	Boyd	Clay
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Clayton

Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Oliver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns

Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry

Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)

Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)

NAYS—2
Obey Paul

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1
Owens

NOT VOTING—17
Johnson (CT)
Largent
Lucas (OK)
McCrery
Shuster
Simpson

Slaughter
Tiaht
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Wynn

□ 1703

Mr. CLAY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. OWENS changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

URGING CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT TO INCREASE FUNDING FOR PELL GRANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COBLE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 88.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 88, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on the next motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 13, answered "present" 4, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]
YEAS—397
Abercrombie
Archer
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin

Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (MI)	Tierney	Baker	Ehrlich	LaHood	Regula	Sherman	Thune
Rothman	Smith (NJ)	Toomey	Baldacci	Emerson	Lampson	Reyes	Sherwood	Thurman
Roybal-Allard	Smith (TX)	Trafficant	Baldwin	Engel	Lantos	Reynolds	Shimkus	Tierney
Royce	Smith (WA)	Turner	Ballenger	English	Larson	Riley	Shows	Toomey
Rush	Snyder	Udall (CO)	Barrera	Eshoo	Latham	Rivers	Sisisky	Towns
Ryan (WI)	Souder	Udall (NM)	Barr	Etheridge	LaTourette	Rodriguez	Skeen	Trafficant
Ryun (KS)	Spence	Upton	Barrett (NE)	Evans	Lazio	Roemer	Skelton	Turner
Sabo	Spratt	Velazquez	Barrett (WI)	Everett	Leach	Rogan	Smith (MI)	Udall (CO)
Salmon	Stabenow	Vento	Bartlett	Ewing	Lee	Rogers	Smith (NJ)	Udall (NM)
Sanchez	Stark	Visclosky	Barton	Farr	Levin	Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)	Upton
Sanders	Stearns	Walden	Bass	Filner	Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (WA)	Velazquez
Sandlin	Stenholm	Walsh	Bateman	Fletcher	Lewis (GA)	Rothman	Souder	Vento
Sawyer	Strickland	Wamp	Becerra	Foley	Lewis (KY)	Roukema	Spence	Visclosky
Saxton	Stump	Watt (NC)	Bentsen	Forbes	Linder	Roybal-Allard	Spratt	Walden
Scarborough	Stupak	Waxman	Bereuter	Ford	Lipinski	Royce	Stabenow	Walsh
Schaffer	Sununu	Weiner	Berkley	Fossella	LoBiondo	Rush	Stark	Wamp
Schakowsky	Sweeney	Weldon (FL)	Berry	Fowler	Lofgren	Ryan (WI)	Stearns	Waters
Sensenbrenner	Talent	Weldon (PA)	Biggert	Frank (MA)	Lowe	Ryun (KS)	Stenholm	Watt (NC)
Serrano	Tancredo	Weller	Bilbray	Franks (NJ)	Lucas (KY)	Sabo	Strickland	Waxman
Sessions	Tanner	Wexler	Bilirakis	Frelinghuysen	Luther	Sanchez	Stump	Weiner
Shadegg	Tauscher	Weygand	Bishop	Frost	Maloney (CT)	Sanders	Stupak	Weldon (FL)
Shaw	Tauzin	Whitfield	Blagojevich	Galleghy	Maloney (NY)	Sandlin	Sununu	Weldon (PA)
Shays	Taylor (MS)	Wicker	Biley	Ganske	Manzullo	Sanford	Sweeney	Weller
Sherman	Taylor (NC)	Wilson	Blumenauer	Gejdenson	Markey	Sawyer	Talent	Wexler
Sherwood	Terry	Wise	Blunt	Gekas	Martinez	Saxton	Tancredo	Weygand
Shimkus	Thomas	Wolf	Boehler	Gephardt	Mascara	Scarborough	Tanner	Whitfield
Shows	Thompson (CA)	Woolsey	Boehner	Gibbons	Matsui	Schaffer	Tauscher	Wicker
Sisisky	Thornberry	Wu	Bonilla	Gilchrest	McCarthy (MO)	Schakowsky	Tauzin	Wilson
Skeen	Thurman	Young (AK)	Bonior	Gillmor	McCarthy (NY)	Scott	Taylor (MS)	Wise
Skelton		Young (FL)	Bono	Gilman	McCollum	Sensenbrenner	Taylor (NC)	Wolf

NAYS—13

Clay	Obey	Thompson (MS)
Clyburn	Paul	Towns
Conyers	Payne	Waters
Hilliard	Sanford	
Nadler	Scott	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Becerra	Martinez
Clayton	Owens

NOT VOTING—19

Berman	Johnson (CT)	Slaughter
Brown (CA)	Largent	Tiahrt
Carson	Lucas (OK)	Watkins
Dingell	McCrery	Watts (OK)
Fattah	Roukema	Wynn
Houghton	Shuster	
Istook	Simpson	

□ 1720

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE IN SUPPORT OF AMERICA'S TEACHERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 157.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 157, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 1, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

YEAS—408

Abercrombie	Allen	Armye
Ackerman	Andrews	Bachus
Aderholt	Archer	Baird

Baker	Baldacci	Baldwin	Ballenger	Barrera	Barr	Barrett (NE)	Barrett (WI)	Bartlett	Barton	Bass	Bateman	Becerra	Bentsen	Bereuter	Berkley	Berry	Biggert	Bilbray	Bilirakis	Bishop	Blagojevich	Biley	Blumenauer	Blunt	Boehler	Boehner	Bonilla	Bonior	Bono	Borski	Boswell	Boucher	Boyd	Brady (PA)	Brady (TX)	Brown (FL)	Brown (OH)	Bryant	Burr	Burton	Callahan	Calvert	Camp	Campbell	Canady	Cannon	Capps	Capuano	Cardin	Castle	Chabot	Chambliss	Chenoweth	Clay	Clayton	Clement	Clyburn	Coble	Coburn	Collins	Combest	Condit	Conyers	Cook	Cooksey	Costello	Coyne	Cramer	Crane	Crowley	Cubin	Cummings	Cunningham	Danner	Davis (FL)	Davis (IL)	Davis (VA)	Deal	DeFazio	DeGette	Delahunt	DeLauro	DeLay	DeMint	Deutsch	Dickey	Dicks	Dixon	Doggett	Dooley	Doolittle	Doyle	Dreier	Duncan	Dunn	Edwards	Ehlers
-------	----------	---------	-----------	---------	------	--------------	--------------	----------	--------	------	---------	---------	---------	----------	---------	-------	---------	---------	-----------	--------	-------------	-------	------------	-------	---------	---------	---------	--------	------	--------	---------	---------	------	------------	------------	------------	------------	--------	------	--------	----------	---------	------	----------	--------	--------	-------	---------	--------	--------	--------	-----------	-----------	------	---------	---------	---------	-------	--------	---------	---------	--------	---------	------	---------	----------	-------	--------	-------	---------	-------	----------	------------	--------	------------	------------	------------	------	---------	---------	----------	---------	-------	--------	---------	--------	-------	-------	---------	--------	-----------	-------	--------	--------	------	---------	--------

Ehrlich	Emerson	Engel	English	Eshoo	Etheridge	Evans	Everett	Ewing	Farr	Filner	Fletcher	Foley	Forbes	Ford	Fossella	Fowler	Frank (MA)	Franks (NJ)	Frelinghuysen	Frost	Galleghy	Ganske	Gejdenson	Gekas	Gephardt	Gibbons	Gilchrest	Gillmor	Gilman	Gonzalez	Goode	Goodlatte	Goodling	Gordon	Goss	Graham	Granger	Green (TX)	Green (WI)	Greenwood	Gutierrez	Gutknecht	Hall (OH)	Hall (TX)	Hansen	Hastings (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Hayes	Hayworth	Hefley	Henger	Hill (IN)	Hill (MT)	Hilleary	Hilliard	Hinchey	Hinojosa	Hobson	Hoeffel	Hoekstra	Holden	Holt	Hooley	Horn	Hostettler	Hoyer	Hulshof	Hunter	Hutchinson	Hyde	Inslee	Isakson	Jackson (IL)	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Jefferson	John	Johnson, E. B.	Johnson, Sam	Jones (NC)	Jones (OH)	Kanjorski	Kaptur	Kasich	Kelly	Kennedy	Kildee	Kilpatrick	Kind (WI)	King (NY)	Kingston	Klecza	Klink	Knollenberg	Kolbe	Kucinich	Kuykendall	LaFalce
---------	---------	-------	---------	-------	-----------	-------	---------	-------	------	--------	----------	-------	--------	------	----------	--------	------------	-------------	---------------	-------	----------	--------	-----------	-------	----------	---------	-----------	---------	--------	----------	-------	-----------	----------	--------	------	--------	---------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--------	---------------	---------------	-------	----------	--------	--------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	---------	----------	--------	---------	----------	--------	------	--------	------	------------	-------	---------	--------	------------	------	--------	---------	--------------	------------------	-----------	------	----------------	--------------	------------	------------	-----------	--------	--------	-------	---------	--------	------------	-----------	-----------	----------	--------	-------	-------------	-------	----------	------------	---------

LaHood	Lampson	Lantos	Larson	Latham	LaTourette	Lazio	Leach	Lee	Levin	Lewis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Lewis (KY)	Linder	Lipinski	LoBiondo	Lofgren	Lowe	Lucas (KY)	Luther	Maloney (CT)	Maloney (NY)	Manzullo	Markey	Martinez	Mascara	Matsui	McCarthy (MO)	McCarthy (NY)	McCollum	McDermott	McGovern	McHugh	McInnis	McIntosh	McIntyre	McKeon	McKinney	McNulty	Meehan	Meek (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Menendez	Metcalfe	Millender	McDonald	Miller (FL)	Miller, Gary	Miller, George	Minge	Mink	Moakley	Mollohan	Moore	Moran (KS)	Moran (VA)	Morella	Murtha	Nadler	Napolitano	Neal	Nethercutt	Ney	Northup	Norwood	Nussle	Oberstar	Obey	Olver	Ortiz	Ose	Owens	Oxley	Packard	Pallone	Pascarell	Pastor	Paul	Payne	Pease	Pelosi	Peterson (MN)	Peterson (PA)	Petri	Phelps	Pickering	Pickett	Pitts	Pombo	Pomeroy	Porter	Portman	Price (NC)	Pryce (OH)	Quinn	Radanovich	Rahall	Ramstad	Rangel
--------	---------	--------	--------	--------	------------	-------	-------	-----	-------	------------	------------	------------	--------	----------	----------	---------	------	------------	--------	--------------	--------------	----------	--------	----------	---------	--------	---------------	---------------	----------	-----------	----------	--------	---------	----------	----------	--------	----------	---------	--------	-----------	------------	----------	----------	-----------	----------	-------------	--------------	----------------	-------	------	---------	----------	-------	------------	------------	---------	--------	--------	------------	------	------------	-----	---------	---------	--------	----------	------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-------	---------	---------	-----------	--------	------	-------	-------	--------	---------------	---------------	-------	--------	-----------	---------	-------	-------	---------	--------	---------	------------	------------	-------	------------	--------	---------	--------

Regula	Sherman	Thune
Reyes	Sherwood	Thurman
Reynolds	Shimkus	Tierney
Riley	Shows	Toomey
Rivers	Sisisky	Towns
Rodriguez	Skeen	Trafficant
Roemer	Skelton	Turner
Rogan	Smith (MI)	Udall (CO)
Rogers	Smith (NJ)	Udall (NM)
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)	Upton
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (WA)	Velazquez
Rothman	Souder	Vento
Roukema	Spence	Visclosky
Roybal-Allard	Spratt	Walden
Royce	Stabenow	Walsh
Rush	Stark	Wamp
Ryan (WI)	Stearns	Waters
Ryun (KS)	Stenholm	Watt (NC)
Sabo	Strickland	Waxman
Sanchez	Stump	Weiner
Sanders	Stupak	Weldon (FL)
Sandlin	Sununu	Weldon (PA)
Sanford	Sweeney	Weller
Sawyer	Talent	Wexler
Saxton	Tancredo	Weygand
Scarborough	Tanner	Whitfield
Schaffer	Tauscher	Wicker
Schakowsky	Tauzin	Wilson
Scott	Taylor (MS)	Wise
Sensenbrenner	Taylor (NC)	Wolf
Serrano	Terry	Woolsey
Sessions	Thomas	Wu
Shadegg	Thompson (CA)	Young (AK)
Shaw	Thompson (MS)	Young (FL)
Shays	Thornberry	

NAYS—1

Salmon

NOT VOTING—24

Berman	Istook	Shuster
Brown (CA)	Jenkins	Simpson
Carson	Johnson (CT)	Slaughter
Cox	Largent	Snyder
Diaz-Balart	Lucas (OK)	Tiahrt
Dingell	McCrery	Watkins
Fattah	Mica	Watts (OK)
Houghton	Myrick	Wynn

□ 1730

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 107, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I'm recorded as having voted "nay" on House rollcall vote No. 107. I intended to vote "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 105, 106, and 107. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" or "aye" on rollcall votes 105, 106, and 107.

REPORT ON H.R. 1664, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS RELATING TO THE CONFLICT IN KOSOVO

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-125) on the bill (H.R. 1664) making emergency supplemental appropriations for military operations, refugee relief, and humanitarian assistance relating to the conflict in Kosovo, and for military operations in Southwest Asia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes,

which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COBLE). Pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXI all points of order against provisions of the bill are reserved.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1598

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1598.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 732

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 732.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on the remaining motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken tomorrow.

EXTENDING DEADLINE UNDER
FEDERAL POWER ACT FOR MT.
HOPE WATERPOWER PROJECT

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 459) to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act for FERC Project No. 9401, the Mt. Hope Waterpower Project.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 459

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FERC PROJECT.

Notwithstanding the time limitations specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, upon the request of the licensee for FERC Project No. 9401 (and after reasonable notice), is authorized, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of such section 13 and the Commission's procedures under such section, to extend the time required for commencement of construction of such project until August 3, 2002.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 459.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 459 extends the construction period for a hydroelectric project in the State of New Jersey. Under section 13 of the Federal Power Act, project construction must begin within 4 years of issuance of the license. If construction is not begun by that time, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission cannot extend the deadline and must terminate the license.

H.R. 459 grants the project developer until August 3, 2002, to commence construction if it pursues the commencement of construction in good faith and with due diligence.

These types of bills have not been controversial in the past. The bill does not change the license requirement in any way. It does not change environmental standards but merely extends the construction deadline.

There is a need to act, Mr. Speaker, since the construction deadline for the Mt. Hope Pumped Storage Project expires in August of this year. If Congress does not act, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission will terminate the license, the project sponsor will lose \$28 million that they have already invested in the project, and the local community will lose the prospect of significant job creation and added revenues. Construction of the Mt. Hope project will create 1,300 jobs during construction and generate \$254 million for the local economy. If the Congress does not act, the local community will lose these jobs and these revenues.

These extension bills have not proved controversial in the past. H.R. 459 was approved by the Subcommittee on Energy and Power of the Committee on Commerce by unanimous voice vote. The bill was introduced jointly by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

I support H.R. 459, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will be brief, Mr. Speaker. I thank the chairman of the committee; and I want to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), for his very hard and successful bipartisan work on this bill.

He has worked closely with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANK PALLONE), who is an active member of our subcommittee, as well as the original cosponsor of this legislation. These two men together have done such an excellent job of building bipartisan support that, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) has pointed out, it was reported out unanimously by both the Subcommittee on Energy and Power and the full Committee on Commerce.

I know of no objection to this project; and I am, therefore, pleased to add our support to the legislation that would authorize FERC to extend the license for the Mt. Hope hydroelectric project for an additional 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time; and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), one of the original cosponsors whose district the project is located in.

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and I rise in strong support of H.R. 459, legislation I introduced earlier this year to extend the FERC license for the Mt. Hope hydroelectric project by a period of 3 years.

First, let me thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), chairman of the full Committee on Commerce, as well as the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANK PALLONE), for moving so expeditiously on this bill.

Mt. Hope received its original FERC license in August of 1992. The license has been extended for 2 years by FERC and once by Congress in 1995. H.R. 459 would simply ensure that there is additional time for Mt. Hope to secure the energy supply contracts to begin the construction of the proposed facility.

This project is an advanced pumped-storage hydroelectric plant located in my district, Morris County, New Jersey. Far from a conventional hydro plant, this facility will be a closed cycle system in which water will be continuously circulated between two man-made reservoirs.

The project has the strong support of local government officials and organizations where the project will be built, namely the New Jersey Business and Industry Association and the Sierra Club of New Jersey. This \$2 billion project will be financed entirely by the private sector with no taxpayers' dollars used for its construction.

As the chairman has mentioned, the project will bring approximately 1,300

jobs to New Jersey and boost our Nation's economy by adding approximately \$6 billion to the gross national product during construction.

In a nutshell, this project can serve as our region's, northern New Jersey, New York and that area, as an energy insurance policy by enhancing the security of the electrical supply system for our region.

Mr. Speaker, the project has many environmental, energy and economic benefits to the State of New Jersey and the mid-Atlantic region. The project has strong support of local and State officials; and it will help us meet, most importantly, the goals of the Clean Air Act. I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 459 so we can begin to realize these benefits.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today in support of H.R. 459, to extend the deadline for the Mt. Hope hydropower project.

The Federal Power Act allows a licensee two years to begin construction of a hydroelectric project once a license is issued. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) may extend that deadline, but it may only do so once and only for two years. If project construction has not commenced by this deadline, the commission is required to terminate the license.

However, there are many obstacles that often make it difficult for a project to commence construction during either the initial license time frame or the extension period. Perhaps the most frequent reason for delay is the lack of a power purchase agreement, for without such an agreement, it is unlikely that a project could get financed. This is the case with the Mt. Hope hydropower project to be located in Rockaway Township, Morris County, in my home state of New Jersey.

Because of the limitations set in the Federal Power Act, the House has had a long, bipartisan tradition of moving non-controversial license extensions. I am pleased that Representative FRELINGHUYSEN and I could introduce this bill in a bi-partisan manner. The Commerce Committee unanimously passed this bill. In addition, the chairman of FERC wrote a letter to the House Commerce Energy and Power Subcommittee just a few months ago indicating his approval for extending the deadline for this project.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time; and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 459.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEWIS R. MORGAN FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules

and pass the bill (H.R. 1121) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 18 Greenville Street in Newnan, Georgia, as the "Lewis R. Morgan Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1121

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 18 Greenville Street in Newnan, Georgia, shall be known and designated as the "Lewis R. Morgan Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Lewis R. Morgan Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1121 designates the Federal Building and United States courthouse in Newnan, Georgia, as the "Lewis R. Morgan Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

Lewis Morgan was born and raised in Georgia and went on to earn his law degree from the University of Georgia.

Prior to his appointment to the Federal bench, Judge Morgan was in private practice and served in the Georgia General Assembly to represent Troup County. He also served as the administrative assistant to Congressman Sidney Camp, and during World War II served in the Signal Corps of the United States Army. Following the war, Judge Morgan was a city attorney for LaGrange and county attorney for Troup County.

Judge Morgan was appointed as a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia in 1961. He served as chief judge prior to being appointed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Judicial Circuit.

In 1981, Judge Morgan was appointed to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals. He maintained an active case load until illness forced him to retire in 1996.

This is a fitting tribute to a dedicated public servant. I support this bill and encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1121 is a bill to designate the Federal Building in Newnan, Georgia, as the "Lewis R. Morgan Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

Throughout his distinguished legal career, Judge Morgan has served the citizens of Georgia with humility, scholarship, compassion and dignity. Judge Morgan, a native Georgian, received his education in the public schools in Georgia and received his law degree from the University of Georgia. He served in the Georgia General Assembly and is a veteran of World War II.

In August of 1961, he was appointed as a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia. During his career, he served on the Court of Appeals for both the Fifth and the Eleventh Circuit.

□ 1745

This designation in honor of Judge Morgan is widely supported by various groups, including the Mayor and City Council of Newnan, the Newnan-Coweta Bar Association, and the Mayor and City Council of LaGrange, Georgia.

It is most fitting and proper to honor the long, distinguished career of Judge Morgan with this designation. I support H.R. 1121 and I urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a man whose record of community service to the State of Georgia is paralleled only by that of his contributions to the American judicial system.

Judge Lewis Render Morgan was a judge for the United States Board of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit until his retirement in 1996. During his illustrious career, he maintained his office and chambers in the Federal Building and Courthouse located in Newnan, Georgia. Largely because of his efforts, this facility was constructed in 1968 and stands as a symbol of his integrity and commitment to American law. Therefore, it is very appropriate that the building be named for him.

Mr. Speaker, I will repeat many of the fine compliments that have already been made by my colleagues in my remarks, but I think this man well deserves a repetition of those remarks.

Judge Morgan was born in LaGrange, Georgia, July 14, 1913. He received his primary education in the LaGrange public school system before heading off to the hills of Ann Arbor to begin a pre-law program at the University of Michigan. Those studies culminated with a law degree from the University of Georgia in 1935.

Following his graduation, Judge Morgan began a distinguished career of public contribution to the State of Georgia, which included service as a member of the Georgia General Assembly, representing Troup County, Georgia; administrative assistant to the Honorable A. Sidney Camp, Member of

Congress; member of the Signal Corps of the United States Army, World War II; city attorney for the City of LaGrange, Georgia; and county attorney for Troup County, Georgia.

The people of Coweta County were very fortunate when Judge Morgan was appointed as a United States District Court Judge for the Northern District of Georgia on August 10, 1961. That appointment served as the beginning of a long and productive relationship between Judge Morgan and the Coweta County residents.

Four years later, he served as Chief Judge of the Northern District, a position which he held until 1968, when he was appointed as a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. And on October 1, 1981, Judge Morgan was appointed to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals.

During that tenure, Judge Morgan served the Federal judiciary in many ways, including being a member of the Judicial Conference of the United States' Committee on the Budget from 1969 to 1979, serving as a judge of the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals from 1979 to 1987, and as a member of the Special Division of the District of Columbia's Court of Appeals for Appointing an Independent Counsel from 1978 to 1988.

Judge Morgan is married to the former Sue Lorraine Phillips; and they have two children, Parks Healy and Sue Ann Morgan Everett. He is a member of the American Bar Association, the American Law Institute, the American Judicature Society, the Georgia Bar Association, the Troup County Bar Association, and the Coweta Judicial Circuit Bar Association.

Throughout his distinguished and celebrated career, Judge Morgan has served the City of Newnan, the State of Georgia, and the United States with honor and commitment. In recognition of this service, and for the high esteem with which he is held by the members of his community, it is very fitting, Mr. Speaker, that the site of his office and chambers bears his name.

I am very honored to have worked with many individuals in this legislative process, including the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) who has supported this endeavor from the start; Howard "Bo" Callaway, former Congressman and Secretary of the Army; L. Keith Brady, Mayor of Newnan and counsel of Newnan, Georgia; Walter Jeff Lukken, Mayor of LaGrange, Georgia; the Newnan-Coweta Bar Association; the Coweta County Board of Commissioners; United States District Court Judges Jack T. Camp and W. Homer Drake, Jr.; United States District Court Chief Judge G. Ernest Tidwell; and many others.

Generations to come will now have a lasting reminder of what Judge Morgan has meant and continues to mean to the City of Newnan, Georgia.

My thanks to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS), subcommittee chairman, and the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), chairman of the Committee on Transportation, for this legislation, and to the ranking member for his assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following resolutions from the different cities and organizations praising the accomplishments of Judge Morgan:

NEWNAN-COWETA BAR ASSOCIATION

Upon motion and second at a regularly scheduled and noticed meeting of the Newnan-Coweta Bar Association, the members of the Newnan-Coweta Bar Association unanimously voted to adopt the following resolution honoring United States Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals Judge Lewis Render Morgan, requesting that the United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 18 Greenville Street, Newnan, Georgia be named in his honor by the United States Congress.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Judge Lewis R. Morgan is held in great esteem by all of the members of the Newnan-Coweta Bar Association and has long been a friend of this bar; and

Whereas, five current and active members of the Newnan-Coweta Bar Association are fortunate enough to have served as law clerks for the Judge; and

Whereas, many lawyers and former lawyers were friends and contemporaries of Judge Morgan throughout his legal career, including Walter D. Sanders, formerly City Attorney for the City of Newnan and county attorney for the county of Coweta; J. Littleton Glover, attorney for Newnan Utilities; Byron M. Matthews, former State Court Judge of Coweta County; Jack T. Camp, United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia; William F. Lee, Jr., Chief Superior Court Judge for the Coweta County Circuit; and W. Homer Drake, Jr., United States Bankruptcy Judge for the Northern District of Georgia; and

Whereas, Judge Morgan established his office and chambers in the City of Newnan since his original appointment to the Federal Bench in 1961 through his retirement 35 years later in 1996; and

Whereas, the Federal Court Building was constructed at its current location in 1968, largely due to the undertaking of Judge Morgan to locate the facility in the City of Newnan for the benefit of not only the citizens of Coweta County but also to benefit citizens throughout the entire Newnan Division, Northern District of Georgia; and

Whereas, Judge Morgan has had a prestigious and respected tenure on the judiciary as well as serving as a member of the Judicial Conference of the United States' Committee on the Budget from 1969 to 1979, serving as Judge of the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals from 1979 to 1987, and as a member of the Special Division of the District of Columbia's Court of Appeals for Appointing Independent Counsel from 1978 to 1988; and

Whereas, Judge Morgan had a successful and thriving private practice wherein he developed his reputation as a fair, upstanding, and admired attorney prior to his appointment to the bench; and

Whereas, in the opinion of the members of the Newnan-Coweta Bar Association it would be appropriate for the Federal Building in Newnan to be named in honor of Judge Lewis Render Morgan.

Therefore, *Be it Resolved* that it is our desire that the United States Courthouse and Federal Building in Newnan be named as the "Lewis R. Morgan United States Courthouse and Federal Building"; and

That it *Be Further Resolved* that we as an Association request the aid and support of the Honorable Mac Collins, United States Representative in Congress, for the purpose of introducing and sponsoring the necessary legislation to effectuate this Resolution in naming the United States Courthouse and Federal Building for Judge Lewis R. Morgan.

It is so resolved this 10th day of March 1999.

THE CITY OF NEWNAN, GEORGIA—OFFICE OF THE CITY COUNCIL

The members of the City Council of the City of Newnan, in regular meeting assembled, unanimously adopted the following Resolution concerning the naming of the United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 18 Greenville Street, Newnan, Georgia, in honor of retired United States Circuit Judge Lewis Render Morgan:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Judge Lewis R. Morgan served as a United States Judge since 1961 until his retirement from active service in 1996, having first served as a United States District Judge and later as a United States Circuit Judge; and

Whereas, Judge Morgan has served the Federal Judiciary well in many ways during his prestigious and respected career on the Bench, including being a member of the Judicial Conference of the United States' Committee on the Budget from 1969 to 1979, serving as a Judge of the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals from 1979 to 1987, and also serving as a member of the Special Division of the District of Columbia's Court of Appeals for Appointing Independent Counsel from 1978 to 1988; and

Whereas, Judge Morgan enjoyed a most successful and thriving law practice all over the West Georgia area prior to his appointment to the Federal Bench, during which time he developed his reputation as a fair, upstanding, and admired attorney; and

Whereas, Judge Morgan has continually established his office and chambers in the City of Newnan since his appointment to the Federal Bench in 1961 through his retirement 35 years later in 1996; and

Whereas, the Federal Court facility in Newnan was constructed in 1968, principally because of the efforts of Judge Morgan; and

Whereas, this Federal facility was considered, in essence, his building, his idea, and his dream; and

Whereas, in the opinion of the members of the City Council of the City of Newnan, it would be a fitting climax to his career for this building, that presently has no name, to be named in honor of Judge Morgan.

Therefore, *Be it Resolved* that the members of the City Council of the City of Newnan officially acknowledge and recognize Judge Morgan's long and distinguished service as a member of the Federal Judiciary, recognize the high esteem in which he is held by the citizens of this community, and publicly extend our grateful appreciation to Judge Morgan for what he has meant, and continues to mean, to the City of Newnan; and

Therefore, *Be it Further Resolved*, that it is our desire that the United States Courthouse and Federal Building in Newnan be henceforth known as the "Lewis R. Morgan United States Courthouse and Federal Building"; and

Therefore, *Be it Further Resolved*, that we respectfully solicit the assistance and support of the Honorable Mac Collins, United States Congress, in introducing and sponsoring legislation in Congress to name this building for Judge Morgan.

Be it so Resolved and Ordered in regular session assembled, this the 9th day of March, 1999.

TROUP COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION

Upon motion and second at a called and noticed meeting of the Troup County Bar Association, the members of the Troup County Bar Association unanimously voted to adopt the following resolution honoring United States Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals Judge Lewis Render Morgan, requesting that the United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 18 Greenville Street, Newnan, Georgia be named in his honor by the United States Congress.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Judge Lewis R. Morgan is held in great esteem by all members of the Troup County Bar Association and has long been a friend of this bar organization; and

Whereas, many lawyers and former lawyers of this bar were friends and contemporaries of Judge Morgan throughout his legal career; and

Whereas, many lawyers in this bar have had the honor to practice before Judge Morgan; and

Whereas, the Federal Court Building was constructed at its current location in 1968, largely due to the undertaking of Judge Morgan to locate a facility in the City of Newnan for the benefit of not only the citizens of Coweta County but also to benefit citizens in Troup County and throughout the entire Newnan Division, Northern District of Georgia; and

Whereas, Judge Morgan has had a prestigious and respected tenure on the judiciary as well as serving as a member of the Judicial Conference of the United States' Committee on the Budget from 1969 to 1979, serving as Judge of the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals from 1979 to 1987, and as a member of the Special Division of the District of Columbia's Court of Appeals for Appointing Independent Counsel from 1978 to 1988; and

Whereas, Judge Morgan had a successful and thriving private practice wherein he developed the reputation as a fair, upstanding, and admired attorney prior to his appointment to the bench; and

Whereas, in the opinion of the members of the Troup County Bar Association it would be appropriate and fitting that the Federal Building in Newnan be named in honor of Judge Lewis Render Morgan.

Therefore, *Be it Resolved* that it is our desire that the United States Courthouse and Federal Building in Newnan be named as the "Lewis R. Morgan United States Courthouse and Federal Building"; and

That it *Be Further Resolved* that we as an Association request the aid and support of the Honorable Mac Collins, United States Representative to Congress, for the purpose of introducing and sponsoring the necessary legislation to effectuate this Resolution in naming the United States Courthouse and Federal Building for Judge Lewis R. Morgan.

It is so Resolved, this 24th day of March, 1999.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Lewis R. (Pete) Morgan, a native son of Troup County, who after completing his primary education in the LaGrange public schools and receiving his law degree from the University of Georgia, returned to LaGrange and practiced law from 1935 to 1961, several of such years being served as Troup County attorney as well as attorney for the City of LaGrange; and

Whereas, the service to this county continued when he was appointed to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia; and

Whereas, Judge Morgan served at the Newnan Division of said court hearing cases arising from this area including Troup Coun-

ty from 1961 to 1968, at which time he was appointed as a judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Judicial Circuit. On October 1, 1981, he was appointed as a judge to the United States Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals where he served until his retirement; and

Whereas, as a result of his appointment to the federal bench, Judge Morgan relocated his office from LaGrange to Newnan, Georgia, the site of the United States District Courthouse; and

Whereas, the construction of said building was carried out under the direction of Judge Morgan thereby making it easier for the citizens of Troup County to conduct any necessary business with the federal courts in a more convenient location in Newnan; and

Whereas, it appears to this Board that a lifetime of service to citizens of this county should be recognized.

Now, Therefore, it is Hereby Resolved that a copy of this Resolution be mailed to Congressman Bob Barr, representing this county in the United States Congress, with a request that Congressman Barr introduce legislation to name the building housing the United States District Court in Newnan in honor of Judge Lewis R. Morgan;

It is Hereby Further Resolved that a copy of this Resolution be spread upon the minutes of this body as a testament of a lifetime of service rendered our citizens by Judge Morgan.

Resolved this 6th day of April, 1999

TROUP COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Judge Lewis R. Morgan served as a United States Judge since 1961 until his retirement from active service in 1996, having first served as a United States District Judge and later as a United States Circuit Judge; and

Whereas, Judge Morgan has served the Federal Judiciary well in many ways during his prestigious and respected career on the Bench, included being a member of the Judicial Conference of the United States' Committee on the Budget from 1969 to 1979, serving as a Judge of the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals from 1979 to 1987, and also serving as a member of the Special Division of the District of Columbia's Court of Appeals for Appointing Independent Counsel from 1978 to 1988; and

Whereas, Judge Morgan enjoyed a most successful and thriving law practice all over the Coweta Judicial Circuit and the West Georgia area prior to his appointment to the Federal Bench, during which time he developed his reputation as a fair, upstanding, and admired attorney; and

Whereas, Judge Morgan has continually established his office and chambers in the City of Newnan since his appointment to the Federal Bench in 1961 through his retirement 35 years later in 1996; and

Whereas, the Federal Court facility in Newnan, Coweta County, was constructed in 1968, principally because of the efforts of Judge Morgan; and

Whereas, this Federal facility was considered, in essence, his building, his idea, and his dream; and

Whereas, in the opinion of the members of the Coweta County Commission, it would be a fitting climax to his career for this building, that presently has no name, to be named in honor of Judge Morgan.

Therefore, be it Resolved, that the members of the Coweta County Board of Commissioners officially acknowledge and recognize Judge Morgan's long and distinguished service as a member of the Federal Judiciary, recognize the high esteem in which he is held by the citizens of this community, and pub-

licly extend our grateful appreciation to Judge Morgan for what he has meant, and continues to mean, to Coweta County; and

Therefore, be it Further Resolved that it is our desire that the United States Courthouse and Federal Building in Newnan, Coweta County, Georgia be henceforth known as the "Lewis R. Morgan United States Courthouse and Federal Building"; and

Therefore, be it Further Resolved that we respectfully solicit the assistance and support of the Honorable Mac Collins, United States Congress, in introducing and sponsoring legislation in Congress to name this building for Judge Morgan.

Be it so Resolved and Ordered in Regular Session lawfully assembled, this the 16th day of March, 1999.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR—LAGRANGE, GA

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, Lewis Render Morgan served as a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia from 1951 to 1968 and was Chief Judge of that Court from 1965 to 1968; and

Whereas, Judge Morgan was appointed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in 1968 and took Senior Judge status in 1978 and was appointed to the newly created Eleventh Circuit in 1981; and

Whereas, Judge Morgan has served the State of Georgia as a member of the General Assembly from 1937 to 1939, Attorney for the City of LaGrange from 1943 to 1946, Attorney for Troup County from 1957 to 1961, a member of the Judicial Conference Committee on the Budget from 1969 to 1979, has served on the Special Division of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit since 1978 and in 1979 was appointed to serve on the temporary Emergency Court of Appeals; and

Whereas, Judge Morgan made his home and raised his family in LaGrange, Georgia and was married to Sue Lorene Phillips, has two children, Parks Healey Morgan and Sue Ann Morgan Rogers, and three grandchildren; and

Whereas, Judge Morgan is a member of the American Bar Association, the American Law Institute, the American Judicature Society, the Georgia Bar Association, the Troup County Bar Association, and the Coweta Judicial Circuit Bar Association; and

Whereas, Judge Morgan enjoyed a successful and thriving law practice throughout West Georgia prior to his appointment to the Federal Bench and developed a reputation as a fair, outstanding and admired attorney and, through his efforts, the Federal Court Facility in Newnan, Georgia was constructed in 1968.

Now, Therefore Be It Resolved, That the Mayor and Council of the City of LaGrange, Georgia desires that the United States Courthouse and Federal Building in Newnan, Georgia be henceforth known as the "Lewis R. Morgan United States Courthouse and Federal Building"; and

Be It Further Resolved, That the City of LaGrange respectfully solicits the assistance and support of the Honorable Mac Collins, United States Congress, in introducing and sponsoring legislation in Congress to so name this facility for Judge Lewis Render Morgan.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1121, a bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse locates in Newnan, GA, as the "Lewis R. Morgan Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

Judge Lewis R. Morgan served as a United States Judge since 1961 until his retirement from active service in 1996, having first served as a United States District Judge and later as a United States Eleventh Circuit Court Judge. Judge Morgan sat on the bench for 35 years

developing a reputation as a fair, upstanding, and admired judge.

Lewis R. Morgan, a native son of Troup County, who after completing his primary education in the LaGrange, Georgia public school received his law degree from the University of Georgia, returned to LaGrange and practiced law from 1935 to 1961. During that time, he served the state of Georgia as a Member of the General Assembly from 1937 to 1939, Attorney for the City of LaGrange from 1943 to 1946, Attorney for Troup County from 1957 to 1961.

Judge Morgan was appointed as a judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Judicial Circuit. On October 1, 1981, he was appointed as a judge to the United States Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals.

In addition, as a member of the bench he served on the Judicial Conference of the United States' Committee on the Budget from 1969 to 1979, serving as Judge of the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals from 1979 to 1987, and as a member of the Special Division of the District of Columbia's Court of Appeals for Appointing Independent Counsel from 1978 to 1988.

The idea of naming this building after Judge Morgan has been endorsed by the Coweta County and Troup County Board of Commissioners, the City Council of Newnan, the Newnan-Coweta Bar Association, the Troup County Bar Association, the Office of the Mayor of LaGrange and the City Council, Georgia.

Judge Morgan has established his office and chamber in the City of Newnan since his original appointment to the Federal Bench in 1961 through his retirement. The federal court facility in Newnan, Georgia was constructed in 1968, principally because of the efforts of Judge Morgan. This facility was considered, in essence, his building, his idea, and his dream. Today we take a step in making the dream after the dreamer, Judge Lewis R. Morgan.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, we have no other requests for speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1162.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM H. NATCHER BRIDGE

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1162) to designate the bridge on United States Route 231 that crosses the Ohio River between Maceo, Kentucky, and Rockport, Indiana, as the "William H. Natcher Bridge."

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1162

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The bridge on United States Route 231 that crosses the Ohio River between Maceo, Ken-

tucky, and Rockport, Indiana, shall be known and designated as the "William H. Natcher Bridge".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the bridge referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "William H. Natcher Bridge".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1162 designates the bridge on U.S. Route 231 over the Ohio River near Owensboro, Kentucky, as the "William H. Natcher Bridge" in honor of our late and former colleague William Natcher.

Identical legislation was passed unanimously by this House on June 18, 1996, and on September 22, 1994, but was never enacted.

Representative Natcher was born in Bowling Green, Kentucky, in 1909 and was educated at Western Kentucky College and the Ohio State University Law School. His life was dedicated to public service, serving in the U.S. Navy during World War II and holding a series of local and State offices before being elected to Congress. He moved up the ranks of the Committee on Appropriations, eventually assuming chairmanship of the full Committee in 1993.

I am proud to have had the privilege of serving in the House with Congressman Natcher. Although well-known for having cast 18,401 consecutive votes during his 40 years here, Congressman Natcher's accomplishments are much more than his extraordinary voting record. He put an extremely high value on public service and set a very high standard for himself.

Bill Natcher was always an inspiration to me and I know to many other Members, as well. He was a gentleman, a statesman, and a man of unquestioned integrity who served this House and his constituents in Kentucky from 1954 until his death in 1994 with quiet, unflinching dedication.

The naming of this bridge for Bill Natcher is a fitting and lasting memorial to our friend and former colleague. I support this bill and urge my colleagues to support it, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to associate my remarks with many of those of my colleagues who have had the honor to have known and served with Mr. Natcher. The distinguished gentleman from Kentucky represented the people of Kentucky in Congress for over 40 years.

This bill, H.R. 1162, has the full support of the Kentucky delegation. It would designate a bridge on U.S. Route

231 over the Ohio River between Maceo, Kentucky, and Rockport, Indiana, as the "William H. Natcher Bridge." This legislation acknowledges the efforts of Mr. Natcher to construct this bridge.

Mr. Speaker, similar legislation passed the House in both the 103rd and 104th Congress but failed to be enacted. I urge a unanimous vote in approving this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 1162, which designates a new bridge under construction in Owensboro, Kentucky, the "William H. Natcher Bridge." The House passed similar legislation in both the 103rd and 104th Congresses. Unfortunately, the other body never acted on these bills.

During consideration of those bills, however, many Members from both sides of the aisle shared their experiences about working with Mr. Natcher. They talked about the dedication and hard work of my predecessor.

I encourage my colleagues to take a moment to look at some of those comments. As most Members who served with Mr. Natcher can attest, he was a statesman and a true gentleman. While he will always be remembered on Capitol Hill for never missing a vote during his many years in service, he will be known in the Second District for his hard work on behalf of his constituents.

Mr. Natcher was dedicated to making this bridge a reality due to the benefits it would bring to the Second District. He guided this project through Congress and laid the groundwork to assure its completion.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky has already designated this bridge in honor of Mr. Natcher. Now it is our responsibility in Washington to do the same. This bill gives us the chance to recognize his efforts at the Federal level and provide a visible reminder of this true friend to Kentucky.

I hope my colleagues will join me and the members of the Kentucky House delegation in supporting this legislation.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. I want to commend our colleague, the gentleman from the Second District of Kentucky (Mr. RON LEWIS) for offering this legislation. His predecessor in the Second District, Bill Natcher, most all of us served with here in this great body, and knew him

and knew him to be the epitome of rectitude and the very model of what a U.S. Congressman ought to be.

Bill Natcher was a combined Lou Gehrig and Cal Ripken. He was the Lou Gehrig and Cal Ripken of Congress. Forty-one years of service in this body.

As has been mentioned, he holds the record for consecutive votes cast, 18,401 over that 41 years of service, never having missed a single vote, a record that I am going to say never will be matched. It is technically possible but not very likely.

But Bill Natcher, as we all know, was more than a consecutive voting streak; he was a patriot and a statesman. He was a man of the highest character. He prided himself in dutifully serving his district, his great Kentucky, and the Nation.

As has been mentioned, he was a very long time member of the Committee on Appropriations. He served for 18 years as the chairman of the District of Columbia Subcommittee, 18 years, and during that time became known as the mayor of Washington. In those days, the chairman of that subcommittee held great sway in the running of this city.

And then, of course, we know he served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, and that is where he really made his mark. His tenure was marked by a strong commitment to programs that benefited the general welfare of our population. He was a man of commitment.

I am going to quote him here. He said, "I have always believed that if you take care of the health of your people and educate your children, you continue living in the strongest country in the world."

In 1992, at the age of 83, he ascended to become chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations. He liked to laughingly say that he had sat next to the chairman waiting to assume the seat for some, I think, 25 years, Jamie Whitten. And finally, in 1992, he assumed that chair. He continued his reputation as a fair and responsible lawmaker.

□ 1800

Bill Natcher's contributions to this country, to Kentucky, and to this body were so many, we never may fully appreciate all that he did and meant to all of us.

But one contribution that will certainly be appreciated by the residents of the Second District of Kentucky is that bridge extending over the Ohio River into Indiana. Methodically Bill Natcher labored to erect that bridge for his constituents and for the betterment of the State, and it was unable to be finished, of course, during his lifetime, unfortunately. But the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) has taken up the task, and he has persistently fought to get the money and the authorization and the wherewithal to finish what Bill Natcher had begun.

I want to commend the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), Bill Natcher's very worthy successor, for continuing Bill Natcher's legacy and diligently working for the people of that great district and especially to finish the construction on this bridge, and now to name that bridge the William H. Natcher Bridge, something that all of us will be proud of until the day we die and our kids will continue believing is worthy of that name for many, many decades to come. It will be a daily reminder to Bill Natcher's former beloved constituents of his tremendous service to our Nation.

This is a fitting tribute to Kentucky's former dean, and I am honored to urge support unanimously of this measure.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time. I wanted to take just a minute to express my appreciation to him and to the Speaker and to others who have brought this bill to the floor of the House here tonight.

I had the great privilege of knowing Congressman Natcher personally and working closely with him for several years.

What is interesting to me is just this morning I had a group from the First Baptist Church of Athens, Tennessee, on the floor of the House, showing them around the Capitol. I showed them the voting card that we each have and told them how we voted in the names, how they light up on the wall and so forth. One of the women in that group asked me about the man who broke the record, having the most consecutive votes, and so I told them about Congressman Bill Natcher, and that is who they were talking about.

Because I know, as has already been mentioned, he did not miss a rollcall vote for more than 40 years. He had a record that will never be broken. It will never be surpassed. He was so dedicated to this institution and so dedicated to this country.

He did many, many wonderful things for the District of Columbia during his time that he chaired the D.C. Appropriations Subcommittee. In fact, I think for a while he was called or frequently referred to as the Mayor of the District of Columbia for many years.

But he did many, many other things, also, in his work for the Committee on Appropriations. In this time of such big spending on campaigns, I remember that he used to pride himself in the fact that he spent I think only about \$10 or \$15 or something on some of his campaigns. He would spend a little gas money driving around the district.

It was phenomenal what he did in his campaigns and in his voting record, never missing a vote. I remember one time hearing that his wife was sick at home. Maybe somebody has already mentioned this. But his wife was sick

in the hospital in Bowling Green. He flew for like 2 straight weeks each night after the House would get out of session. He would fly home to Nashville, drive I think 60 miles or so to Bowling Green or 70 miles, spend the night with her, fly back the next morning, and then do the same thing over again the next day and did that for 2 weeks. The lengths that he went to to keep up this record.

He was a great American. I do not think that we really could pay enough honor and tribute to William Natcher, who was the epitome of what a United States Congressman should be. I strongly support this legislation.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. I think it only appropriate to honor our late friend and colleague by designating in his name this bridge, for which he fought so hard during his legendary tenure in this Chamber.

Bill Natcher will always be remembered for his determination and longevity, but it was his commitment to the people of the second district of Kentucky and his love and respect for this body that inspired us all.

Today we have the opportunity to create a lasting memorial honoring Bill Natcher's name.

I strongly urge that we pass H.R. 1162 and do just that.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COBLE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1162.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT K. RODIBAUGH UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURTHOUSE

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 460) to designate the United States courthouse located at 401 South Michigan Street in South Bend, Indiana, as the "Robert K. Rodibaugh United States Bankruptcy Courthouse".

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 460

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF ROBERT K. RODIBAUGH UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURTHOUSE.

The United States courthouse located at 401 South Michigan Street in South Bend, Indiana, shall be known and designated as the "Robert K. Rodibaugh United States Bankruptcy Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Robert K.

Rodibaugh United States Bankruptcy Court-house”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 460 designates the United States courthouse in South Bend, Indiana, as the “Robert K. Rodibaugh United States Bankruptcy Courthouse.” Judge Rodibaugh served the northern district of Indiana in the area of bankruptcy law since his appointment as a bankruptcy judge in 1960. During his tenure he oversaw the growth of the bankruptcy court from one small courtroom with a part-time referee and a clerk’s office of four employees in South Bend to four separate courtrooms located throughout northern Indiana. In 1985, Judge Rodibaugh was appointed Chief Bankruptcy Judge and assumed senior status in 1986.

Judge Rodibaugh has fulfilled his duties as a referee and a judge in bankruptcy proceedings with patience, fairness, dedication and legal scholarship, which is most worthy of recognition. It is a fitting tribute to honor him and his accomplishments in this manner today.

This marks the third time the House has passed legislation honoring Judge Rodibaugh. I am pleased to note that this bill passed the other body earlier this year, and we can safely say that the third time is the charm.

I support this act and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I join in supporting S. 460, a bill to designate the Federal bankruptcy court in South Bend, Indiana, as the “Robert K. Rodibaugh United States Bankruptcy Courthouse.”

As my colleagues all know, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) introduced an identical bill in the 104th and 105th Congress. Unfortunately, the Senate did not consider these measures before it adjourned.

Judge Rodibaugh has served the citizens of Indiana with honor and distinction since 1960 and at the age of 80 years is one of the Nation’s most senior judges.

Judge Rodibaugh is a native of Elkhart County, Indiana, and received his education in the public schools. He graduated from Notre Dame and received his law degree from Notre Dame in 1941.

During his judicial career, he has seen the rapid growth of the bankruptcy courts. He has seen the courts grow from one small courtroom with a part-time referee and a clerk’s office

with four employees to four different courtrooms in the cities of South Bend, Fort Wayne, Gary and Lafayette.

Judge Rodibaugh is an active member of the Board of Governors of the St. Joseph County Bar Association, the Boy Scouts of America, the Red Cross and the National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges.

Judge Rodibaugh is noted for his fairness, dedication and legal scholarship. He has set an example for his judicial clerks with his high standards and judicial excellence. It is fitting and proper to honor Judge Rodibaugh with this designation.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 460 which recognizes the outstanding public service record of Judge Robert Kurtz Rodibaugh, a loyal and dedicated friend, and the senior bankruptcy judge for the South Bend Division of the Northern District of Indiana.

It is truly a great honor for me to recognize Judge Rodibaugh, who has consistently demonstrated generosity and selfless dedication to the citizens and legal community of Northern Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, as you may recall, I introduced identical legislation which was passed by the House of Representatives during the last Congress. I was honored to sponsor this legislation and pleased that the entire Indiana Congressional delegation cosponsored my bill.

Unfortunately, the measure was not considered by the U.S. Senate before the 105th Congress adjourned. However, this legislation was reintroduced by the senior Senator of Indiana, RICHARD LUGAR, and passed by the full Senate last month. This Senate-passed bill, S. 460, now under consideration, designates the recently dedicated courthouse on the corner of Western and South Michigan Streets in South Bend, Indiana in honor of Judge Rodibaugh and his numerous contributions to the legal community.

Last year, I also had the privilege to attend the dedication ceremony for the “Robert K. Rodibaugh United States Bankruptcy Courthouse.” While this courthouse has already been dedicated, I believe that S. 460 is an appropriate way to express our gratitude for Judge Rodibaugh’s life-long dedication to public service.

Judge Rodibaugh is recognized by his community and his peers as an honorable man worthy of such a tribute. He is highly regarded throughout the entire country and has been a pillar of the community. Moreover, he is greatly respected by other judges and the bankruptcy bar in Northern Indiana. Since his initial appointment as a referee in bankruptcy in November 1960 and throughout his legal career as a bankruptcy judge, Judge Rodibaugh has served the citizens and legal community of the Northern District of Indiana wisely, efficiently, and honorably.

A native of Elkhart County, Indiana, Judge Rodibaugh graduated from the University of Notre Dame with a Bachelor of Science degree in 1940 and attended the University of Notre Dame Law School, where he served as the Associate Editor of the Notre Dame Law Review between 1940 and 1941.

Judge Rodibaugh received his Juris Doctor degree in 1941. After gaining his admittance to practice law in 1941, Judge Rodibaugh entered active duty as a private in the United

States Army. He was discharged in 1946 as a Captain after serving in the infantry and armored forces during World War II.

Following his release, Judge Rodibaugh entered private practice in 1946. He also served as the Deputy Prosecuting Attorney of the 60th Judicial Circuit, in St. Joseph County, Indiana, from 1948 to 1950, and again from 1953 to 1957. In addition, Judge Rodibaugh served as Attorney for the St. Joseph County Board of Zoning Appeals between 1958 and 1960.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Rodibaugh received the 33 Years of Distinguished Service to Bench and Bar Award from the Bankruptcy Judges of the Seventh Circuit in 1993, the 50 Year Golden Career Award from the Indiana State Bar Association in 1991, and the Notre Dame Law School’s Distinguished Alumnus Award in 1991. Some of the significant cases that Judge Rodibaugh has decided include *Papelow v. Foley* and *In the Matter of John Kelly Jeffers*. Judge Rodibaugh has always enjoyed the challenge of bankruptcy law and has a special talent for working with corporate reorganizations.

Recently, Judge Rodibaugh said: “I still think bankruptcy law is one of the most fascinating areas of the law. When a reorganization is successful, it is a satisfying feeling.”

Mr. Speaker, throughout his tenure, Judge Rodibaugh has presided over the growth of the bankruptcy court in Northern Indiana from one small courtroom with a part-time referee and a clerk’s office of two employees in South Bend, Indiana, to four different courtrooms in the cities of South Bend, Fort Wayne, Gary, and Lafayette, Indiana, with four full-time judges and a clerk’s office of over forty employees. According to his colleague, Judge Harry Dees, also a bankruptcy judge for the Northern District of Indiana: “Judge Rodibaugh never complained about all the weekly traveling, he just did it.”

Moreover, Judge Rodibaugh has fulfilled his duties as a bankruptcy judge with patience, fairness, dedication and legal scholarship which is most worthy of recognition. His high standards have benefitted the many law clerks and judicial personnel who have served under his tutelage, the lawyers who have practiced before the bankruptcy court, as well as the citizens residing in the Northern District of Indiana.

In 1985, Judge Rodibaugh was appointed Chief Judge of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Indiana. He served in that position until he assumed full-time recall status as a senior judge one year later. Today, Judge Rodibaugh continues in this position, carrying a full case load, and he has no plans to cut back on his work with the court. Currently, Judge Rodibaugh and his wife, Eunice, live in South Bend, Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, it is important for me to indicate that the firm of Panzica Development Company with Western Avenue Properties, LLC, graciously agreed to name the new privately-owned courthouse building in Judge Rodibaugh’s honor, owing to his unblemished character and numerous professional achievements in the bankruptcy field.

I am confident that the “Robert K. Rodibaugh United States Bankruptcy Courthouse” is an appropriate title for the new bankruptcy court facility. Judge Rodibaugh is a shining example of the importance of public service, whose tireless contributions provide

an invaluable service to our community. I am confident that Judge Rodibaugh will continue to play a constructive and important role in our community, and will continue to serve as a powerful inspiration to all of those who come into contact with him.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 460.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HURFF A. SAUNDERS FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 453) to designate the Federal building located at 709 West 9th Street in Juneau, Alaska, as the "Hurff A. Saunders Federal Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 453

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF HURFF A. SAUNDERS FEDERAL BUILDING.

The Federal building located at 709 West 9th Street in Juneau, Alaska, shall be known and designated as the "Hurff A. Saunders Federal Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Hurff A. Saunders Federal Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. Shows) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 453 designates the Federal building in Juneau, Alaska as the "Hurff A. Saunders Federal Building."

Hurff A. Saunders was a resident of Alaska who played an instrumental role in the State's history both as a territory and as a State. Prior to World War II, he emigrated from South Dakota to Ketchikan, Alaska, where he accepted a civilian engineering position with the United States Coast Guard. During the war he played a critical role in the ability of the United States Navy and Coast Guard to navigate the North Pacific waters by correctly determining the latitude and

longitude of various key aids to navigation that were misidentified on official charts at that time.

Following the war, Mr. Saunders returned to a civil engineering position with the Federal Government. In this position, he supervised several public works projects, completing the projects on schedule and within budget.

In 1966, prior to his retirement, Mr. Saunders successfully completed his final Federal construction project, the Juneau Federal Building, Post Office and United States Courthouse, which is the building we designate in his honor today.

This is a fitting tribute to a dedicated public servant. I support this act. I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Senate bill 453 is a bill to designate the Federal building in Juneau, Alaska in honor of Hurff A. Saunders. Mr. Saunders was a lifelong Alaskan who helped write chapters of Alaska's history.

He was a civil engineer for the United States Coast Guard in charge of constructing the Juneau Federal Building which was completed on budget and on schedule. Mr. Saunders later supervised many public works projects for the territory and later the State of Alaska. His work on correcting the navigational charts for the waters in southeast Alaska aided the Navy and the Coast Guard during World War II.

Mr. Saunders was widely respected and viewed as a dedicated public servant, a devoted father, and beloved husband who lived a full life and died peacefully at the age of 94.

Mr. Speaker, the City of Juneau and the Juneau Rotary Club both passed unanimous resolutions supporting this designation. Also, the American Society of Civil Engineers and the Society of Professional Engineers adopted resolutions urging this distinction be bestowed upon Mr. Saunders.

It is fitting and in recognition of his outstanding contributions to Alaskan life that the Federal building in Juneau, Alaska, be designated the Hurff A. Saunders Federal Building.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 453.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J.J. "JAKE" PICKLE FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 118) to designate the Federal building located at 300 East 8th Street in Austin, Texas, as the "J.J. 'Jake' Pickle Federal Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 118

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building located at 300 East 8th Street in Austin, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "J.J. 'Jake' Pickle Federal Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "J.J. 'Jake' Pickle Federal Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 118 designates the Federal building in Austin, Texas, as the "J.J. 'Jake' Pickle Federal Building."

Congressman Pickle began his long career in public service by serving 3½ years with the United States Navy in the Pacific during World War II. Following the war, Congressman Pickle returned to Austin, Texas, and held positions in the private and public sectors. He served his party ably as executive director of the Texas State Democratic Party.

In 1963, he was elected to the United States House of Representatives in a special election to fill a vacant seat created by Congressman Thornberry's resignation. He was then reelected to the next 15 succeeding Congresses, until his retirement on January 3, 1995.

□ 1815

During his tenure in Congress, Congressman Pickle provided a strong voice on civil rights issues. He vigorously advocated and supported such historic legislation as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act. For over 30 years Congressman Pickle continuously worked on behalf of civil rights issues and equal opportunities for women and minorities.

In addition, as chair of the Committee on Ways and Means' Subcommittee on Oversight and the Subcommittee on Social Security, he worked to shape the system of Medicare to assure that it fulfilled its intended purpose of providing basic health care for those in need, and tirelessly fought for the future of Social Security.

Congressman Pickle was a dedicated public servant who remained close to his Texas constituents. Thus it is fitting legislation that honors him here today.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill and encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 118 is a bill to designate a building located at 300 East 8th Street in Austin, Texas, as the "J.J. 'Jake' Pickle Federal Building." It is a pleasure and an honor to support this bill intended to honor the significant contributions of our dear friend, Jake Pickle.

As we all know, Jake was a native Texan and very proud of his heritage. He was educated in public schools and was graduated from the University of Texas in 1938. Jake is a World War II veteran, serving his country in the Pacific arena.

Jake entered politics after a special election to fill the seat of Homer Thornberry. Officially he began his service in the House in December of 1963. Jake immediately showed his mettle and joined five other southern Members who voted in favor of President Johnson's Civil Rights Act of 1964. He further demonstrated his support for equal rights by voting for the Voting Rights Act.

Jake was a close friend of President Johnson, and his friendship and with Mrs. Johnson continues strong even today. Due to his closeness with the Johnson family and President Johnson's administration, Jake often served as a personal historian for one of the greatest American Presidents.

Jake himself is best known for his devotion and dedication to his constituents and his extensive community involvement. It is with great pleasure that I join the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) and others in supporting this very worthwhile bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) for yielding this time to me, and of course I join in support of this measure that is before the House now. But we find ourselves in the curious situation this afternoon that this is one of the rare occasions, perhaps the first since I have been a Member of this body, that the House has moved faster than we have been told on the schedule instead of slower, and so we have actually this afternoon proceeded with the approval of a piece of legislation in which I am most interested that will rename our Federal Building in Austin, Texas, for Congressman J.J. "Jake" Pickle, my predecessor. And so I come with shortened remarks, hoping not to say anything that would cause us to reconsider this legislation which I am most appreciative to my colleague

from New Jersey and our colleague from West Virginia for their prompt approval in the committee.

Mr. Speaker, basically we had two choices. We could either try to paint that Federal building pickle green, or we could simply put a plaque up dedicating it as the J.J. "Jake" Pickle Federal Building, and so the House chose the more practical approach of putting his name on the building. This is actually legislation that this House approved in the last session of Congress last year. Unfortunately, the Senate, which moves a little slower sometimes, they usually get an hour to speak when we get a minute, did not get this piece of legislation passed last session, and we are hoping that they will react to it as speedily as the House has considered it this afternoon.

Let me just say a few words, and there are several of my colleagues from the Texas delegation and beyond north Texas, I believe New York State, that may want to offer comments in support of this legislation.

Jake Pickle served central Texas for some 31 years. I first came to know him as a high school senior at Austin High School where I was in class with his daughter, Peggy, and he was elected the year that I was a senior at Austin High School. He has really been the only Congressman who has ever served our district during the time that I was growing up and living there in central Texas, and he along with his great wife Beryl have served our community with the greatest distinction.

This is certainly not the first and probably not the last monument to his service. The Pickle Research Campus at the University of Texas is where much of the development that produced the success that we have had in central Texas with high technology had its origin through public-private partnerships beginning right there at the University of Texas. During his tenure here in Congress that was a real priority of Congressman Pickle, and it is most appropriate that it should bear his name.

And most recently, just within the past month, I have been participating in the many dedication ceremonies at the new Austin-Bergstrom International Airport. We have managed to dedicate just about everything in that airport except for some of the luggage carousels and the storage closets, but in particular and first in our dedications, we dedicated one of the new runways to Congressman Pickle because even after his service here in the House, he continued to work on our Airport Advisory Committee to ensure that this airport was completed and that it had an all-weather runway that would meet the needs of our community not only for hauling passengers around the world, but hauling the cargo that is so very important to our technology industries there in central Texas.

□ 1845

So it is now that "onward through the fog" in central Texas is more than a bumper sticker at Oat Willie's. It is the center, the indication, that the Pickle runway along with the LBJ runway at that new airport are available to serve our community, whatever the conditions.

I have to say that I will feel just a little better going home, and perhaps some of my Democratic colleagues will want to join me, knowing that when one lands there in Austin they either get the LBJ runway or the J.J. Jake Pickle runway, and when they pull up to the terminal they come into the Barbara Jordan terminal. So that is a pretty good place for those of us on this side of the aisle or either side of the aisle to call home, to come in and see the capital city of the great State of Texas.

Congressman Pickle was a distinguished veteran, distinguished former Student Body President of the University of Texas at Austin. I do not know what it is in the water up at Big Spring, but he is well into his eighties now, and he and I know a number of his classmates gathered there in Austin awhile back. They seemed to have something good going on up there because he remains a very vigorous force in our community.

Here in the Congress, he is remembered as one of the few Members from the south who had the courage to vote for the Civil Rights Act of 1964, for the Voting Rights Act; and he still is proud, and justly so, of the call that he received from President Johnson at 2:00 a.m. in the morning after that vote to commend him for his courage.

There are many tall tales that he has about the work on the Great Society there in the Federal building that we are naming in his honor with President Johnson, where the President had an apartment and an office that remains in generally the condition that it was in when he left the presidency. I am confident that at least a few of those tales are true, because there was much good accomplished by these two good friends and partners working together not only for central Texas but for our entire country.

Of course, Congressman Pickle's service on the Committee on Ways and Means, where he played a major role in addressing both Social Security and preserving and continuing it, and Medicare addressed issues that we face once again in Congress, but we are able to deal with them now because of the good work that he contributed over the years.

Jake Pickle never turned down the chance to help a neighbor, and that is perhaps his greatest legacy, not just what he accomplished in this room but his accessibility and his willingness to be available when people had problems in our community with various aspects of the Federal bureaucracy.

So naming our Federal building in Austin after Congressman Pickle is the

most appropriate symbol of our admiration, our respect and our appreciation for his true public service, and I am hopeful that the Senate will move quickly on this legislation this year and speedily approve it.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to get to say a word or so about Jake Pickle.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) and others have talked about all of his attainments, his acquisitions and his honors. I guess I just want to talk about Jake Pickle, the good guy that I knew.

I have probably known him longer than any Member of this Congress. I have known Jake since I was about 20 years old. I am 75 years old, and Jake would say that he is much younger than I am.

People are proud of him all the way from Roscoe, Texas, where he was born out in far west Texas, Big Spring, Austin. He knows everybody. Everybody knows Jake. There was no better Member of Congress, no one more persuasive, no one that could get something done because everybody liked Jake and everybody wanted to help Jake, and Jake knew everybody in the world.

Allan Shivers, John Connally, of course, LBJ, Joe Kilgore, all the movers and shakers. Jake was a close personal friend of theirs, and they felt a brotherly feeling, and people in this Congress felt like Jake was a brother to them because he loved them and they loved him.

I just know of no public servant that has been any better than Jake. I first knew him when he was in a PR firm there in Austin, a young man, handsome, of course, and part of the Lyndon Johnson team from the word go. They have had great Members of Congress to serve Travis County and the area around: LBJ, Homer Thornberry, Jake Pickle, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) doing a superb job of representing that area today.

Jake was always the same. That is what I liked about him. He was always the same. He was always cordial. He was always smiling. He always knew everyone, and he was always persuasive.

He could have a bill that he had introduced, moving something out of someone else's district that they liked into Travis County and he was so persuasive he could make them think it helped them more than it did him. That was the Jake Pickle I knew and loved. I wish him the best, I wish Beryl the best because they are the best. God bless this couple and God bless this occasion for Jake Pickle.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to once again voice support for this measure honoring Jake Pickle. Jake was a friend of most of us here in the Congress, I virtually would say all of us in the Congress, when he served over 30 years in great public service to our Nation.

I knew Jake as an expert on Social Security. I knew Jake as a traveler when we went overseas together and his good wife Beryl traveled with us. Jake is someone we have long missed in the Congress. He had a good word for all of us, and I think it is highly appropriate that this building be named for a deserving public servant.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is my own honor to rise and offer these remarks in support of the measure that would name the Federal building in Austin, Texas, after former Representative Jake Pickle.

As many that are gathered here tonight know that my father served in this Congress for 37 years and, of course, shared every one of those years, at least 31 of those years, with Jake Pickle as his esteemed colleague.

We will hear stories often expressed by Jake Pickle and my father regarding the many rides they would take back to their district on Air Force One when LBJ was the President. They will always talk about the Civil Rights Act and the great vote of 1964 and the 2:00 a.m. phone call that President Johnson made to Jake Pickle, which is an interesting story in and of itself. The real story, though, lies in the phone calls that both my father and Jake Pickle received from LBJ before the vote.

Jake Pickle is an extraordinary man, and I have had the great privilege of knowing him since I was a teenager. When I went to college in Austin and Jake Pickle was back in the district, he would come to the State capital where many of the students would work. And he would come in there and he would mentor us and he would counsel us.

He is a great man in many, many respects, not just a great representative but everything that we should aspire to as public officials. He is the kind of individual that will take the time, from the busiest of schedules, and do it the old way and that is to sit with the person, to meet with them, to listen, to understand them and then give good, sage counsel and advice.

To Jake Pickle, I think it would be the greatest honor but truly it would be something that would remind us every day of what public service is all about.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am honored tonight to stand in support

of H.R. 118 designating the J.J. Jake Pickle Federal Building in Austin, Texas. This is a fitting tribute to a unique Texan and former Member of Congress. I hope Jake and his wife are watching tonight in Austin, Texas.

Jake Pickle is a legend to me, and even by Texas standards he is a legend. He put himself through college during the Depression, worked for President Roosevelt's National Youth Administration, served in the Pacific in World War II and started a radio station in central Texas, and he represented the Tenth District from 1963 to 1995.

He had a long, distinguished career that my other colleagues have talked about, chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security of the Committee on Ways and Means. At one time even with the famous Claude Pepper, Jake Pickle won out on the Social Security reform bill with Claude Pepper.

Mr. Speaker, Jake has a book just simply called "Jake," and a couple of years ago on Father's Day my daughter was a student at the University of Texas and she went over and had Jake sign his book for me. And Jake talked to my daughter, and she has now graduated, and Jake was talking about some of his stories. His book is great on stories about Congress. I am just going to tell one of them because it is a great story.

Jake is known for his storytelling abilities, and anybody who wants to read some great stories needs to look up that book at the Library of Congress and ask for "Jake." It would probably make him happy if we even bought it.

Jake served so many years, and in one of the chapters in his book, chapter 35, there is a great story that, in 1957 or 1958, Governor Price Daniel and Jake were in El Paso attending the State Democratic Executive Committee. At the time, the State of Chihuahua and Texas were instigating a program to eradicate the yellow boll weevil. So the Governor was in El Paso to officially give credence to the boll weevil eradication program as well.

Their party stayed in El Paso, but they went across the border to Juarez. In Juarez, there was a good band and a floor show. So the manager looked around and he had heard the governor of Texas was in the party but he wished no publicity. The governor did not want it known, this was in the 1950s, that he was in a bar in Mexico, particularly since most of Texas was dry then, particularly the part Governor Daniel was from in east Texas.

When their group arrived at the bar, they were seated at a long table near the band. Governor Daniel was a Baptist and a teetotaler, and he never drank, but he liked Cokes. And every once in awhile he would say well, Jake, I will take a Coke.

Jake said he would go up to the bartender and ask the bartender to go ahead and put a shot of bourbon in it. He always asked for Cokes.

Anyway, the funny part of the story is that everything went fine for a few

minutes and the band having played some lively tunes from Mexico suddenly stopped and they had a drum roll. The governor looked around and looked at Jake and the band leader then announced on the mike, we are proud to have with us tonight the governor of the State of Texas, and another drum roll, the Honorable Price Daniel. Amid the fanfare, the light swept the bar and came to rest on their table, and nobody moved.

Obviously, the governor did not want to stand up and be recognized in that bar in Mexico. Again, the announcer announced, *damas y caballeros*, another drum roll and still no movement from Governor Daniel.

With the spotlight still on us the third time, the announcer said, please, will the governor of Texas stand and be recognized. Finally, the governor's wife, Jean, leaned over and whispered, Jake, for goodness' sakes, will you do it?

The governor said, Jake, I bet you always wanted to be governor. Now here is your chance.

So Jake Pickle stood up in that bar in Juarez and was recognized as the governor of Texas, and the band struck up "The Eyes of Texas."

That is just one of Jake's stories. Obviously, we miss him from Texas and all over Congress. He was a great Member.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 118, designating the J.J. "Jake" Pickle Federal Building in Austin, Texas. This is a fitting tribute to a unique Texan and former Member of Congress.

Congressman Pickle is a legend even by Texas standards. He put himself through college during the Depression, worked for President Roosevelt's National Youth Administration, served in the Pacific during World War II, started a radio station in Central Texas, and represented Texas' Tenth Congressional District from 1963 to 1995. During his long and distinguished career in the Congress, Jake Pickle prided himself as a protector of small businesses and a specialist in the Social Security system.

Over the years, Congressman Pickle managed to involve himself in every major issue that confronted the Ways and Means Committee, from Social Security to trade to the complete revision of the Tax Code.

During the 98th Congress, Jake Pickle chaired the Ways and Means Social Security Subcommittee. As chairman of that subcommittee, he was convinced that the way to save the Social Security system from a long-term collapse was to raise the retirement age. Democratic leaders, including Thomas P. O'Neill and Claude Pepper, wanted to solve long-term financing problems with eventual increases in the payroll tax. Few expected Pickle would prevail on the floor, but he did.

Through months of argument over what to do about Social Security, Pickle and Pepper were the spokesmen for two diametrically opposite points of view. During floor consideration, the House chose Jake Pickle's approach, which later became law. This victory represents the culmination of a long personal struggle for Jake Pickle to put the Social Security system on a sound personal footing.

Most everyone knows Jake Pickle as a political protege of President Lyndon B. Johnson. Congressman Pickle was a campaign manager and a Congressional aide to Johnson before World War II and an advisor in Johnson's 1948 Senate campaign. Jake always speak reverently about President Johnson and his commitment and dedication is a testament to their friendship.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have served with Congressman Jake Pickle and will be forever grateful for his friendship and his leadership. This designation is only a small token of our appreciation to a dedicated public servant.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) for graciously giving me this moment to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I love Jake Pickle. He is a man of courage, a man of compassion, and someone who loves life, every day of it.

He was a man of compassion as a freshman Member of this House when, in 1965, as a young southern representative he voted in favor of the Civil Rights Act, an act that made major changes in allowing equal opportunity for American citizens of all colors.

He was a man of compassion in everything he did, especially in his leadership and saving the Social Security system back in the 1980s. We could all talk about the many accomplishments of Jake Pickle but, frankly, the reason I love Jake Pickle, in addition to respecting him for his legislative accomplishments, is because he personifies the biblical passage of, this is the day the Lord hath made. Let us rejoice and be glad in it.

Jake Pickle brought light into any room, into anyplace where he came. He loves life and we love him. We miss Mr. Pickle of Texas, our dear friend.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to our colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I appreciate my colleague bringing this up and naming the Federal Building after J.J. Jake Pickle, a very appropriate honor for a man serving on the Committee on Ways and Means, and I think that all of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle would agree with me when I say that there have been very few Members that have ever taken their job more diligently, more seriously, in looking at the questions from social security reform to any tax bill that has ever come before us.

He also was a man of responsibility. One thing that I noted, and we try to emulate but cannot come close to Jake, when he says he is going to be at a dinner party for the Texas delegation or any other place, he is always there. Very seldom did he ever miss. When he said he was coming, he came.

I think one appropriate remark that I have not heard, maybe it has been mentioned, but to me, this building

could be better named if it were named the J.J. Jake and Beryl Pickle Building, because so many times those of us recognize our spouses do not nearly get the credit that they deserve when we get honored in ways in which we honor Jake today.

I think of the story that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) was telling, and there was no better storyteller to ever occupy a seat in this House. He was great at it.

But all of the times that Beryl listened to those stories, which were repeated not one, ten, one hundred, but for the thousandth time, and still laugh when her husband told that joke, I think Beryl ought to be somewhere in the name of this building. I know she will be in spirit by those of us who knew and loved her as well as Jake Pickle.

Jake was born in my district. Therefore, I have always had to take somewhat responsibility for the actions that Jake has taken, and I have done it proudly.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) for yielding time to me, and for guiding us through a very welcomed event this evening, and that is to properly give recognition to J.J. Jake Pickle, and of course, his wife, Beryl. They are Texas heroes, both of them, and today I hope with the naming of this Federal Building that it will be forever grounded in our memories that they are American heroes as well, both.

I have great pleasure in acknowledging the leadership of Jake Pickle. I was talking to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CHARLIE STENHOLM), and I was trying to claim the fact that I had served with Jake Pickle, I guess because I viewed him as such an historic but as well such an institutional person with such great leadership.

I was trying to claim having been here with him, but he retired in 1994 and I came to this Congress in 1995. But we can be assured that Jake Pickle's legacy, his smile, his genuineness, his gentlemanliness was here on the premises. In fact, I think the reason why I thought I served with him is because right after he retired from this Congress, he spent a lot of time with us. I enjoyed lunching with him and, again, hearing some of the stories.

But Jake Pickle, the man, is someone that I admire, in particular because he served 31 years and he served with a commitment to this country. He

was someone, as the chair of the powerful Subcommittee on Oversight of the Committee on Ways and Means, that cared about a good Medicare system, a good health care system, and worked hard to guarantee all Americans receive basic health care. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security, his work is credited with extending the life of the social security system.

I remember him telling me of his friendship with the Honorable Barbara Jordan, one of the predecessors of this particular congressional district, the Eighteenth Congressional District. I guess I remember him most by looking at a picture of the signing of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and saw a number of Texans who were Congresspersons at that time gather in the room with President Lyndon Baines Johnson to sign that historic act.

But I am most mindful of the time that that occurred and the courage that was taken. I heard my colleague from Texas make a statement about his father, Henry Gonzalez. But I am reminded about the courage of Jake Pickle to sign the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and to give opportunities to those who did not have them. He was courageous in that, he was courageous in his service. Mr. Speaker, he is truly a great Texan and truly a great American. This building will truly be a very historic building by being named after J.J. Jake Pickle, H.R. 118. I ask my colleagues for support.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 118. This bill designates a federal building in Austin, Texas as the "J.J. Jake Pickle Federal Building." It is fitting, Mr. Speaker, that the building in which he worked for 28 of his 31 years in Congress, bear his name.

It is an appropriate memorial to a man who dedicated himself to his community and to his constituents. The residents of Austin remember Representative Pickle for his tireless dedication to the community he loved. When asked to describe his career as a Member of Congress, all sight his effective and efficient constituent service. I know that Representative Pickle gave selflessly of his time and energy. His 31-year career stands as a memorial to current and future Members, on how to conduct constituent relations.

During his 31-year tenure Congressmen Pickle took on several legislative challenges. In spite of the political risk he voted in favor of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This vote was to be the first in the line of a career dedicated to ensuring civil rights and equal opportunity for both minorities and women.

As chair of the powerful Ways and Means Oversight Subcommittee, Congressmen Pickle recognized the value of the Medicare system. He worked to guarantee that all Americans would receive basic health care. As Chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee his work is credited with extending the life of the Social Security system.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear from his 31-year career in congress, his selfless dedication to his country and to the State of Texas, that the federal building in Austin should bear his name. J.J. "Jake" Pickle has set a proper example for this body to emulate and as testimony to that example I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 118, legislation that would name the federal building in Austin, Texas in honor of former Representative Jake Pickle.

The building is located at 300 East 8th Street in Austin. It houses district offices for Congressman Pickle's successor, Representative LLOYD DOGGETT, and Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, as well as local offices for the IRS, FBI and other federal agencies.

It is all together appropriate that these offices be named for Representative Pickle since they are where he worked for 28 of his 31 years in Congress.

For those of us fortunate enough to know him, former Representative Pickle is a very skilled storyteller and a man steeped in Texas and U.S. history. One can not speak with him for any amount time without departing having heard one of his "yarns" about the legislative process or his work with President Johnson.

James Jarrell "Jake" Pickle was born in 1913 in Big Spring, a small town in the northwest part of Texas represented today by Congressman CHARLIE STENHOLM. He is a product of the Big Spring public schools and the University of Texas at Austin, where he received his BA in 1938.

After working as Area Director for President Roosevelt's National Youth Administration, Jake served 3½ years in the navy in the Pacific during World War II. Upon returning to Austin, he entered the radio and public relations business, later serving as director of the Texas State Democratic Executive Committee and as an appointee to the Texas Employment Commission. He resigned from the TEC to run for Congress in a special election called after the resignation of Homer Thornberry. He began his Congressional career in December, 1963.

Congressman Pickle wasted little time in demonstrating what sort of Member of Congress he intended to be. Despite well-founded fears that his actions might end his fledgling political career, Representative Pickle joined only five other Southern members who voted in favor of Lyndon Johnson's Civil Rights Act in 1964. Looking back on it, Representative Pickle says that is the one vote of which he is most proud and recalls with great fondness a personal phone call at 2:00 a.m. after the vote from President Johnson to thank him. Jake followed this vote a few months later with a vote in support of the Voting Rights Act and then spent the next 30 years working on behalf of civil rights and equal opportunity for minorities and women.

This was not the first or last time Representative Pickle faced the challenge of being the President's Congressman. He was a close friend and ally of both President Johnson and Lady Bird Johnson. His friendship with the former First Lady remains strong to this day.

Naming this federal building in Jake's honor is particularly appropriate because it houses his friend LBJ's apartment and office suite, preserved in all its early 1970's splendor. Jake's stories of working with Johnson on the Great Society, often in these rooms, are the stuff of Texas political legend. Jake stands as one of the few remaining personal historians of one of the greatest American Presidents.

Representative Pickle also distinguished himself as Chairman of the Ways and Means Oversight Subcommittee. From that post, Jake worked tirelessly to rid the Medicare system of

waste and fraud, constantly laboring on behalf of those who rely on the Medicare system for their basic health care.

In addition, former Congressman Pickle served as Chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee in the 98th Congress and is widely credited with shepherding through Congress a legislative package that has extended the life of the Social Security system by decades. His work on behalf of the poor and the elderly complements perfectly his long-time commitment to civil rights.

Based on his long service to Texas and the nation, I believe H.R. 118 is a fitting tribute to Representative Pickle's legacy. I urge all Members to support its passage.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to preside over the House during the consideration of a bill naming a Federal building in Austin, TX, after Congressman J.J. (Jake) Pickle.

Congressman Pickle served in the House for more than 31 years. For 30 of those years he served with either my father or me.

In their service on the Ways and Means Committee, he and my father became the closest of friends.

I remember being told that on the plane returning from my father's funeral in Louisville, Congressman Pickle led the plane's passengers in singing some old-time hymns.

In fact Congressman Pickle was famous within the Congress for the stories he used to tell about the hymns sung at the Thursday morning House prayer breakfasts. Some people wondered if the stories were totally accurate or were, at least in part, made up by Congressman Pickle as he went along.

At any rate, Congressman Jake Pickle was a great and dedicated Member of the House. His love for others and for this institution shown through in everything he did.

I join my colleagues in supporting this bill, a very fitting tribute to a very kind man and great American, Congressman Jake Pickle.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 118.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSE V. TOLEDO UNITED STATES POST OFFICE AND COURTHOUSE

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 560) to designate the Federal building located at 300 Recinto Sur Street in Old San Juan, Puerto Rico, as the "Jose V. Toledo United States Post Office and Courthouse," as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 560

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building and United States courthouse located at the intersection of Comercio and San Justo Streets, in San Juan, Puerto Rico, shall be known and designated as the "José V. Toledo Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "José V. Toledo Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 560, as amended, designates the Federal Building and United States Courthouse in Old San Juan, Puerto Rico, as the "Jose V. Toledo Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

Jose Toledo was born in Arecibo, Puerto Rico. He received a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Florida and a Juris Doctor in law from the University of Puerto Rico Law School. Judge Toledo served on the Federal bench in the United States District Court, District of Puerto Rico, from December 1, 1970 until February 1980, when he died in office at the age of 49. At the time of his death, Judge Toledo was the chief judge for the Puerto Rico District.

Prior to his appointment to the Federal bench, Judge Toledo served as an Assistant United States Attorney, as a lawyer in local government in Puerto Rico, as a partner in private law practice, and served in the United States Army as a member of the Judge Advocate Corps. This legislation is a fitting tribute to honor the career and judicial contributions of the late Judge Jose V. Toledo.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. Speaker I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 560 is a bill to name the Federal facility in Old San Juan as the "Jose V. Toledo United States Post Office and Courthouse." The gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) introduced this bill in February of 1999 and is to be commended for his diligence in ensuring its passage.

Judge Toledo served the District of Puerto Rico with great distinction from 1970 to February 1980, when he died an untimely death at the age of 49 years.

Integrity, loyalty, patience, fairness, keen intellect and perseverance are words used by Judge Toledo's friends

and colleagues to describe him. Judge Toledo was born in Puerto Rico in 1931. He received his Bachelor's Degree from the University of Florida and his law degree from the University of Puerto Rico Law School.

In addition to private practice, Judge Toledo served as an Assistant United States Attorney and in the local government of Puerto Rico. Judge Toledo also served in the U.S. Army as a member of the Judge Advocate Corps.

The building in old San Juan to bear Judge Toledo's name is an imposing structure, signifying solidarity and safety, and has guarded the entrance to Old San Juan for more than 300 years. It is fitting and proper this building then bear the name of Judge Jose V. Toledo, and I am proud and pleased to support this legislation.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ), the sponsor of H.R. 560.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS), and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE), as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for pushing this bill through the committee and getting it on the floor for consideration today, and I would like to commend the clerk for his excellent Spanish accent. Very few people here pronounce those words the same.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the outstanding service of the late Judge Jose V. Toledo, today I am asking all of my colleagues to support this bill to designate the United States Post Office and the Courthouse in Old San Juan, Puerto Rico, as the "Jose V. Toledo United States Post Office and Courthouse." Judge Toledo served on the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico from December of 1970 to February 1980, when he died at the early age of 49. He rose to the position of Chief Judge of the U.S. District Court, and he served with great distinction in that capacity until the moment of his untimely death.

Pepe Toledo, as he was known to his family and friends, was regarded as a man of paramount integrity and a loyal public servant. He was born on August 14, 1931, in Arecibo, Puerto Rico, and he received his Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Florida in 1952. In 1956, he received his Juris Doctor from the University of Puerto Rico Law School, where I had the good fortune and the privilege of studying and graduating with him. During our law school years we became very close friends and studied together for our bar exams, and that close friendship lasted until his premature death.

Prior to his appointment to the Federal bench, Judge Toledo served as the

Assistant United States Attorney. He was a partner in several law firms, one of which he and I and another fellow started, and an attorney within the local government of Puerto Rico. He also served in the U.S. Army as a member of the Judge Advocate General Corps. Judge Toledo was also a distinguished leader of the Exchange Clubs of Puerto Rico. He demonstrated his value to the organization through his involvement and commitment at both the local and the national levels.

As expressed by the Chief Judge of the U.S. District Court in Puerto Rico, the Honorable Carmen Consuelo Cerezo, on behalf of the judges of the Federal Court of Puerto Rico, Judge Jose V. Toledo earned the respect of the public, the bar and the bench for his patience, impartiality, fairness and decorum in the adjudication of the controversies brought before him. Judge Toledo set high standards for himself, yet he had a refreshing humility and capacity to understand the problems of others. His hallmarks were learning and wisdom, tempered by a tremendous feeling for people.

The U.S. Post Office and Courthouse in Old San Juan, built in 1914, stands above the foundations of the ancient city wall that has guarded the harbor entrance to the city for more than 300 years. As a matter of fact, San Juan is the oldest city under the American flag.

Built only 15 years after Puerto Rico became a U.S. territory, it is listed in the National Register with the U.S. Department of Interior's National Park Service. The site represents the eclecticism of American architecture of the late 19th and early 20th century as it integrates American-Spanish Revival architecture, Sullivanesque and Beaux Arts Neoclassical Revival styles. It has a 6-story annex which was built in 1940. It also demonstrates influences from the Vienna School and the Avant Garde movement. The Correo, as it has been known to generations of Puerto Ricans, is an imposing and beautiful structure which has stood magnificently within the old city walls as a symbol of greatness in times past with the importance of the U.S. Postal Service in Puerto Rico.

It is fitting that this structure so dear to us should carry the name of Judge Jose V. Toledo. The judges of the United States District Court, District of Puerto Rico, voted unanimously to recommend the naming of the Federal Courthouse in Old San Juan, Puerto Rico, in honor of Jose V. Toledo, referred to the late judge as a learned jurist, outstanding citizen and an excellent human being.

Mr. Speaker, I am immensely proud to honor his memory and with this bill to designate the U.S. Post Office and Courthouse in Old San Juan, Puerto Rico, as the "Jose V. Toledo United States Post Office and Courthouse."

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 560, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at the intersection of Comercio and San Justo Streets, in San Juan, Puerto Rico, as the 'José V. Toledo Federal Building and United States Courthouse'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GARZA-VELA UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 686) to designate a United States courthouse in Brownsville, Texas, as the "Garza-Vela United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 686

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse located at the corner of Seventh Street and East Jackson Street in Brownsville, Texas, shall be designated and known as the "Garza-Vela United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Garza-Vela United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 686 designates the United States Courthouse in Brownsville, Texas, as the Garza-Vela United States Courthouse.

Reynaldo Garza and Filemon Vela are two distinguished judges who sit on the Federal bench in Brownsville, Texas.

Judge Garza began his distinguished career in public service with the Air Force during World War II. Upon his return from the war, Judge Garza returned to private practice until 1961, when President Kennedy appointed him to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas.

In 1974 he became the Chief Judge for the Southern District, until he was ap-

pointed by President Carter to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. In April of 1997 Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist appointed him Chief Judge of the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals of the United States.

Judge Vela, whose career in public service is equally distinguished, served in the United States Army, was the Commissioner for the city of Brownsville, and Judge on the 107th Judicial District, Cameron-Willacy County, Texas.

Judge Vela was a member of the Judicial Conference Committee on the Administration of the Magistrate Judges System until 1991, a member of the Judges Advisory Committee to the United States Sentencing Commission, and active in a number of local and State associations associated with civic and community activities.

This is a fitting way to honor two great judges who have dedicated their lives to serving their community and their country. I encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Brownsville, Texas (Mr. ORTIZ) in supporting H.R. 686, a bill to name the courthouse in Brownsville, Texas, as the Garza-Vela United States Courthouse.

Mr. Speaker, this bill honors the life and works of two extraordinary Mexican-Americans. Judge Reynaldo Garza was born in Brownsville in 1915. He graduated from Brownsville Elementary School as well as Brownsville High School. After graduating from Brownsville Junior College, he attended the University of Texas, where he received a combined degree of Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Law.

Judge Garza served his country during World War II in the Air Force. After the war he returned to Brownsville to practice law. In 1961 President Kennedy appointed Judge Garza to the District Court for the Southern District of Texas. President Carter appointed him to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in 1979.

In addition to his judicial duties, Judge Garza has long been interested in educational issues. He served former Governors John Connally and Governor Mark White on commissions to improve the quality of education in Texas. Judge Garza recognized the importance of education in judicial proceedings and his concern for the uneducated man at the mercy of the unscrupulous people.

Judge Garza is very active in his church, and has served the Knights of Columbus in the Brownsville area for many years. Pope Pious XII twice decorated Judge Garza for his work on behalf of Catholic Charities. In 1989, Judge Garza was honored by the University of Texas with the Distinguished Alumnus Award.

His record of public service includes work with the Rotary Club, the Latin American Relations Committee of Brownsville, trustees at his law school, the Advisory Council for the Boy Scouts, and he was elected as City Commissioner of the city of Brownsville.

It is fitting and proper to honor Judge Garza's outstanding, rich life, his commitment to excellence, and his numerous public contributions.

Judge Filemon Vela is also a native of Texas and a veteran of the United States Army. He attended Texas Southmost College and the University of Texas. His law degree is from St. Mary's School of Law in San Antonio.

Judge Vela served as Commissioner of the city of Brownsville. He was an active member of the Judges' Advisory Committee to the U.S. Sentencing Commission. Judge Vela is a former law instructor and an attorney for the Cameron County Child Welfare Department.

His civic activities include being the charter president for the Esperanza Home for Boys and cosponsor of the Spanish radio program *Enrich Your Life, Complete Your Studies*.

Judge Vela's other civic activities include membership on the Independent School District Task Force and membership in the General Assembly of the Texas Catholic Conference. He is also an active member of the Lions Club. Judge Vela was nominated by President Carter for the Federal bench, and was confirmed by the United States Senate in 1980.

Judge Vela's career is filled with successes, commitment to his family, devotion to his religion and his church, love for his work, and respect for his colleagues. It is most fitting to honor Judge Vela with this designation. I join the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ) in supporting H.R. 686.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, Texas is known for many things—among them is an embarrassment of riches in the Southern Judicial District of Texas.

In South Texas, we have two judicial giants in the Rio Grande Valley for whom citizens throughout the area have asked that the new federal courthouse in Brownsville be named.

Judge Reynaldo Garza was appointed to the federal bench by President John F. Kennedy in 1961 and Judge Filemon Vela was appointed to the federal bench by President Jimmy Carter in 1980.

Both of these men have become legends in the South Texas area by virtue of their commitment to education and community.

Each have shown their respective dedication to the betterment of the next generation of South Texans by working actively with schools and young people.

Judge Vela has focused on the young people who have made mistakes or erred, by working with the Esperanza Home for Boys, heading activities to keep young people in school called "Enrich Your Life, Complete Your Studies," being part of the Texas Business and Education Coalition, and working with the Texas Young Lawyers Association Dropout Prevention and Literacy Committee.

Judge Garza has served on the Brownsville Independent School Board, and turned his attention to the cause of higher education by serving on the Texas Education Standards Committee, the Coordinating Board of Colleges and Universities, and the Select Committee on Higher Education.

He is revered for a story he relates about his father, while dying, who told the Judge and his siblings that while he did not leave them with wealth, he left them with the gift of education, one which no one can ever take away.

Both these legends have schools named in their honor.

When construction began on the federal courthouse, all across the Valley, people wondered whose name would grace the courthouse upon completion.

I was moved at the number of letters that came to my office relating personal stories about one or the other and advocating naming the courthouse after either Judge Vela or Judge Garza.

After reading all the heart-felt expressions on behalf of both judges, and listening to people who sought me out while I was in the District, I realized how rich we were in judicial talent and thought that the only way to satisfy the concerns of all South Texans was to name this courthouse after both judges.

This name is a reflection of the will of those people whose interests will be served in the new courthouse, and of those people for whom justice will be dispensed there.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 686.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1121, S. 453, S. 460, H.R. 118, H.R. 560, as amended, H.R. 686 and H.R. 1162, the measure just considered by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

COMMENDING THE REVEREND JESSE L. JACKSON, SR., ON SECURING THE RELEASE OF U.S. SERVICEMEN FROM CAPTIVITY IN BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 156) commending the

Reverend Jesse L. Jackson, Sr., on securing the release of Specialist Stephen Gonzales of Huntsville Texas, Staff Sergeant Andrew Ramirez of Los Angeles, California, and Staff Sergeant Christopher Stone of Smiths Creek, Michigan, from captivity in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 156

Whereas, on March 31, 1999, Specialist Steven Gonzales, Staff Sergeant Andrew Ramirez, and Staff Sergeant Christopher Stone were captured while patrolling the Kumanovo area;

Whereas the Reverend Jesse L. Jackson, Sr., on April 29, 1999, led a delegation of religious and civic leaders from the United States in a faith-based effort to secure the release of Specialist Steven Gonzales, Staff Sergeant Andrew Ramirez, and Staff Sergeant Christopher Stone;

Whereas against great odds and in the face of grave personal risks, the Reverend Jesse L. Jackson Sr. and his party successfully secured the release of Specialist Steven Gonzales, Staff Sergeant Andrew Ramirez, and Staff Sergeant Christopher Stone;

Whereas the Reverend Jesse L. Jackson, Sr. is recognized around the world as a humanitarian, an advocate for civil and human rights, and an ambassador of freedom; and

Whereas, as a highly respected world leader, the Reverend Jesse L. Jackson, Sr. has acted many times as an international diplomat in sensitive situations and in October 1997, he was appointed by President Clinton and Secretary of State Albright as Special Envoy of the President and Secretary of State for the Promotion of Democracy in Africa: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the Reverend Jesse L. Jackson, Sr. for securing the release of Specialist Steven Gonzales, Staff Sergeant Andrew Ramirez, and Staff Sergeant Christopher Stone from captivity in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; and

(2) joins with the people of the United States in celebrating the return to freedom of Specialist Steven Gonzales, Staff Sergeant Andrew Ramirez, and Staff Sergeant Christopher Stone.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this resolution introduced by the gentlewoman from

Florida (Mrs. MEEK) which accords proper credit to the recent efforts of Reverend Jesse Jackson and his accompanying delegation of clergymen in successfully securing the release of our three POWs held in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

□ 1900

The Reverend Jackson has a distinguished record of utilizing his considerable powers of persuasion in the service of humanitarian objectives. When American citizens and others find themselves held in captivity in a hostile country as a result of circumstances beyond their control, Reverend Jackson has proven on several occasions against the odds that he can secure their release.

Our Nation should be grateful to the good Reverend for his special skills in that regard. We are also grateful that our three young service people who were unjustly held by the government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia have finally been returned to their families, to their friends and fellow countrymen. We salute their dedicated service to our Nation.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues in the House to support H. Res. 156 commending the Reverend Jesse L. Jackson and his fellow clergymen for acquiring release of Specialist Steven Gonzales, Staff Sergeant Andrew Ramirez, and Staff Sergeant Christopher Stone.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 156 offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK). Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 156 provides for a special commendation and tribute to Reverend Jesse Jackson, Sr., for his services and leadership, whereby he led a special delegation of religious leaders and even one of our fellow Members, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH) to travel to Belgrade, Yugoslavia to meet with President Slobodan Milosevic with the hope of trying to break the stalemate and crisis in Kosovo through a negotiated peace settlement or agreement, and with the hope that the three men, soldiers who had been held captive, could also be released from prison.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my commendation also to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the House Committee on International Relations, for his endorsement and support of this resolution; also, the ranking Democrat of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), both gentlemen, for supporting and endorsing this resolution.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, Reverend Jackson has done it again. Following an intensive 3-hour-long meeting with President Milosevic with a good amount of praying and heart-to-heart discussions, President Milosevic decided to release our three soldiers. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that our Nation, the families and friends of our three soldiers, we all owe a debt of gratitude and appreciation for Reverend Jackson's commitment and devotion to the cause of peace. And, more especially, his ability to properly negotiate and persuade parties with varying views to come to the table and seek solutions to the problems certainly is most commendable.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Jackson deserves our gratitude for his successful efforts to secure the release of our soldiers, Steve Gonzales, Andrew Ramirez, and Christopher Stone. I might add, Mr. Speaker, those soldiers showed tremendous courage and loyalty to our Nation.

I need not remind my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that the crisis in Kosovo is far from over. The debate in this Chamber last week, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is indicative of the seriousness of the issues and with so very many varying opinions and claims of facts of the truth and the crisis in the Balkans, definitely in my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, has proven one basic fact: Our leaders and the American people simply do not know enough about the history and legacy of the Balkans. Almost like a repeat of a ritual that America went through when we were confronted with a crisis in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need and we do not want another Vietnam in the Balkans. We must remember that President Milosevic is continuing to wage a brutal campaign against the Kosovar Albanians. Thousands of Kosovar Albanian refugees continue to stream into the neighboring countries. Many of these refugees have terrible tales to tell of rape, of beatings, of atrocities and murder at the hands of Serbian forces. The NATO campaign is designed to deny Milosevic the ability to wage his brutal repression against the Kosovar Albanians.

Mr. Speaker, we must remain steadfast in our resolve to see our mission through. Again, I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for his support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 156 offered by the gentlelady from Florida, Mrs. MEEK.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 156 provides for a special commendation and tribute to the Reverend Jesse Jackson, Sr., for his services and leadership—whereby he led a special delegation of religious leaders and one of our fellow Members, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, to travel to Belgrade, Yugoslavia—to meet with President Slobodan Milosevic—with the hope of trying to break the stalemate in the current crisis in Kosovo through a negotiated peace settlement or agreement, and with the hope also that the three American soldiers who have been held captive could also be released from prison.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, Reverend Jackson has done it again. Following an intense three-hour long meeting with President Milosevic, with a good amount of praying and heart-to-heart discussion, President Milosevic decided to release our three soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite certain that our nation, the families and friends of our three soldiers, we all owe a debt of gratitude and appreciation for Reverend Jackson's commitment to peace, but more especially his ability to properly negotiate and persuade parties with varying views to come to the table and seek solutions to the problems, is most commendable.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Jackson deserves our gratitude for his successful efforts to secure the release of our soldiers, Steve Gonzales, Andrew Ramirez, and Christopher Stone. I might add, Mr. Speaker, these soldiers showed tremendous courage and loyalty to our nation.

Mr. Speaker, I need not remind my colleagues that the crisis in Kosovo is far from over. The debates in this Chamber last week—I submit, Mr. Speaker—is indicative of the seriousness of the issues and with so many varying opinions and claims of "facts," or "the truth"—the crisis in the Balkans definitely has proven one basic fact: our leaders and the American people simply do not know enough about the history and legacy of the Balkans; almost like a repeat of the ritual that America went through when we were confronted with the crisis in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, we don't need and we don't want another Vietnam in the Balkans.

DAYS OF JOY, PAIN AND HOPE

(Los Angeles Times Editorials.—May 3, 1999)

Finally, in a period of missteps and accidental NATO attacks in Yugoslavia and confusion on Capitol Hill over whether the House supports or opposes the air war, there is good news: the release Sunday of the three American prisoners of war. The sight of the smiling faces of Army Staff Sgt. Andrew Ramirez, 24, of East Los Angeles, Spc. Steven Gonzales, 21 of Huntsville, Texas, and Staff Sgt. Christopher J. Stone, 25, of Smith's Creek, Mich, provided a temporary respite from the hard decisions that lie ahead and that, we hope, will set the stage for further diplomatic progress.

Full credit in securing the release of the three soldiers should go unbegrudgingly to the Rev. Jesse Jackson and a private delegation of religious leaders, including Los Angeles' Rabbi Steven Bennett Jacobs and Dr. Nazir Uddin Khaja of the American Muslim Council.

The religious leaders had been publicly urged not to go to Belgrade by the Clinton administration and had been warned that the mission was dangerous and ill-timed. No one can know the cynical reasoning that might well have motivated President Slobodan Milosevic to release the soldiers. But the point is that Jackson delivered, winning the release of the prisoners without apparent conditions.

For the families of the soldiers, seized on the Macedonian border March 31, the nightmare is over. Relatives of Ramirez, Gonzales and Stone are on their way to Germany to be reunited with their sons, husbands and brothers.

For the Kosovars, however, the future does not look so bright. "This gesture on his [Milosevic's] part cannot overcome the stench of evil and death on the killing fields of Kosovo," Defense Secretary William S. Cohen said Sunday. The White House already

has rebuffed Jackson's call for direct talks between Clinton and Milosevic, and we agree that such a meeting is at best premature. The air bombing campaign in Yugoslavia is a NATO operation. Beyond that, Milosevic first would have to lay the groundwork necessary for success. In short, that means the end of Milosevic's pogrom in Kosovo, the safe return of the refugees and some form of autonomy for the Kosovars that is diplomatically secured.

Today we celebrate the release of U.S. soldiers from captivity. The diplomatic avenues toward peace appear to be opening up, through the increased interest of the Russians and others. Americans must not forget, however, that diplomacy was tried and failed for many months in the absence of a military campaign. In the presence of a military campaign, the diplomatic approach might finally have been given the incentive it needed.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 3, 1999]

JACKSON TRIP IS LATEST IN SERIES OF SUCCESSFUL, RISKY ONE-MAN MISSIONS

WASHINGTON.—The White House asked him not to go and said it couldn't guarantee his safety in a city under attack by NATO bombing.

But the diplomatic coup by the Rev. Jesse Jackson, winning the release of three U.S. soldiers held captive in Belgrade, highlights the kind of risky, personal diplomacy that sometimes works where White House action cannot.

Jackson, who has acted as Clinton's special envoy in the past, went to Yugoslavia as a private citizen to negotiate with Slobodan Milosevic. It's a role he's played before in Syria, Cuba and Iraq dating to the mid-1980s.

The administration had ruled out official negotiations for the soldier's release since their capture near the Yugoslavia-Macedonia border on March 31, and vowed to press forward with the air war aimed at stopping hostilities in Kosovo.

While the White House has cautiously welcomed Jackson's success, the administration may still worry his mission may further Milosevic's efforts to soften his image, said Barnett Rubin, the director of the Center for Preventive Action at the Council on Foreign Relations.

"The danger is that a free-lancer like that, unauthorized, dilutes your message," Rubin said. "They portray Milosevic as a war criminal, but this could show him he has alternatives."

Rep. Floyd Spence (R-S.C.), chairman of the House Armed Service committee, said the Jackson maneuver gave a "diplomatic victory" because "the world is going to look upon him in a different way, to some extent, by releasing the prisoners this way."

Spence said on CNN's "Evans, Novak, Hunt & Shields" that a temporary bombing halt "would be appropriate." He added that "I don't think we should be there in the first place," noting that he was among the 213 House members voting last week against a resolution backing the bombing. Jackson has a history of private intervention in international crises.

He went to Syria in 1984 to arrange the release of a Navy pilot whose bomber was shot down by Syrian anti-aircraft guns in Lebanon. Several months later, he worked out arrangements with Cuba for the release of 48 American and Cuban political prisoners. And he played a similar role helping foreign women and children in Iraq in 1990.

Sometimes this type of citizen diplomacy works, and sometimes it doesn't.

Former President Carter helped diffuse a crisis over North Korean efforts to develop nuclear weapons in 1994 by personally intervening with that country's late leader, Kim

Il-Sung. When Carter said he want to go, Clinton reportedly told him to go ahead, as long as Carter understood he was acting as a private citizen and not an official emissary.

But a similar Carter visit with Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic in 1995 failed to produce a lasting cease-fire, and Carter was later criticized for meeting with an indicted war criminal.

Clinton has often favored using high-profile, one-man diplomatic missions to resolve international crises, counting on the reputation and clout of his messenger.

He employed Bill Richardson—a congressman from New Mexico and later U.S. ambassador to the United Nations—as a diplomatic firefighter, trying to extinguish problems in Iraq, central Africa and North Korea.

He asked a former rival, Republican Bob Dole, to travel to Kosovo to convince the Kosovar Albanians to sign a settlement Molosevic eventually rejected.

And he teamed Carter with former Sen. Sam Nunn and retired Gen. Colin Powell in 1994 to persuade Haiti's military rulers to back down and allow a peaceful U.S.-led military intervention that restored ousted President Jean-Bertrand Aristide.

One of Clinton's most frequent emissaries is Richard Holbrooke, the former State Department official, ambassador, and architect of the 1995 Dayton accord that ended the war in Bosnia. Holbrooke, now the nominee to succeed Richardson as ambassador to the United Nations, negotiated with Milosevic seeking a peaceful solution to Kosovo right up until the NATO bombing began.

But Rubin said Jackson's mission differs greatly from that of official envoys.

"Holbrooke was representing the United States and NATO, saying, 'If you don't agree, we're going to bomb you.' That's the same message whether you're alone in the room or if you're with 10 other people," Rubin said.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), chief sponsor of this resolution.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA), my colleague, for giving me this opportunity to express my feelings about the Reverend Jesse Louis Jackson.

When the history of the world is written, Mr. Speaker, the name of Jesse Louis Jackson will head the name of those who loved peace. I am pleased that the House is today considering a resolution introduced yesterday commending the Reverend Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., for his extraordinary efforts in securing the release of our three brave American soldiers from captivity in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Reverend Jesse Louis Jackson gives us something for all of us to be proud of: leadership, bravery, courage.

I particularly want to thank Speaker HASTERT; the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) our minority leader; the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN); the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) ranking Member; and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) of the Committee on International Relations, who worked together in a bipartisan effort to bring this resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, last Thursday Reverend Jackson led a dele-

gation of religious and civic leaders from the United States, including our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH), to Yugoslavia in a faith-based effort to secure the release of Specialist Gonzales, Staff Sergeant Ramirez, and Staff Sergeant Stone. Against great odds and in the face of grave personal risk, Reverend Jackson and his party entered the war zone and on Saturday May 1, Reverend Jackson, with the help of God, secured the release of these brave American soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, I and millions of Americans and others around the world, we watched with pride, we watched with joy and amazement as Reverend Jackson and his delegation emerged with our three brave soldiers. It was at that point that I decided to introduce this resolution.

On this floor today we celebrate Reverend Jackson's achievement and our soldiers' return to freedom. We want the world to know, Mr. Speaker, that we are extremely proud of the Reverend Jesse Louis Jackson.

This is not the first time that Reverend Jackson has successfully secured the release of prisoners in other countries. In 1984 he secured the release of United States Navy Flyer, Lieutenant Robert O. Goodman, Jr., from Syria. Again in June of 1984 he secured the release of 22 Americans and 26 Cubans from Cuba; and in 1990 he secured the release of 700 women and children who were being detained in Iraq.

Jesse Louis Jackson is certainly a man of peace. Mr. Speaker, he is recognized around the world as a humanitarian, an advocate for civil and human rights, and an ambassador of freedom. Time and again he has been willing and able to enter into difficult situations and to go into harm's way that very few of us would go into. His diplomacy has been effective when conventional diplomacy has not been effective. He has achieved success due to his determination and the strength of his beliefs.

Reverend Jackson is a soldier for peace and freedom with deep roots in the nonviolence movement. For over a generation he has acted in the highest tradition of Gandhi and Martin Luther King.

Reverend Jackson has proven time and time again that he will go anywhere and to any lengths to help those in need, especially those who are unable to help themselves. It is a great honor and privilege to know him and to have him as a friend, and to know that this House does itself proud by honoring someone who has done so much to help so many.

Mr. Speaker, the Bible said: "Blessed are the peacemakers." The Reverend Jesse Jackson, Sr., is indeed blessed. God has given him great gifts and he has used them fully to help his fellow men and women. He deserves our thanks and our praise. We are so proud.

Mr. Speaker, we all serve with his son, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JESSE L. JACKSON, Jr.), and I know that

he is even more proud of his father than we are. I am very proud to offer this resolution honoring this great American, an outstanding leader, and I urge all of my colleagues to give it their enthusiastic support.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 40 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), my friend and colleague.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking the distinguished gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for this opportunity, and I certainly want to begin by commending and thanking the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) for sponsoring today's resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am overwhelmed that the gentlewoman would be so kind as to think of Reverend Jackson and all of the members of this delegation who sought to bring about an opportunity for peace in this crisis. I am only troubled in that the present signals that we are getting are not ones that indicate that we are going to take advantage of the opportunity that Reverend Jackson has created.

I could talk about Reverend Jackson, my father, for hours. Maybe for a lifetime. But I want to take the few minutes that I have, that has been given me, just to mention the names of those ministers who participated in this event.

The Reverend Jesse Jackson, Sr., founder and president of the Rainbow/PUSH Coalition. The Reverend Dr. Joan Brown Campbell, general secretary, National Council of Churches. Mr. Nazir U. Khaja, medical doctor, chairman of the board of the American Muslim Council, head of the Islamic Information Service.

Father Leonid Kishkovsky, Orthodox Church of America. The Reverend James Meeks, Salem Baptist Church, Chicago, Illinois. The Reverend Father Irinej Dobrijevic, Serbian Orthodox priest, International Orthodox Christian Charities. Landrum Bolling, Senior Advisor, Conflict Management Group, Director-at-Large, Mercy Corps International.

John Wyma, chief of staff to Congressman ROD BLAGOJEVICH. Father Raymond G. Helmick from Boston College in Boston, Massachusetts. Amy Toensing, photographer. Walter Rogers from CNN. Yuri Tadesse, the director of International Affairs at Rainbow/PUSH Coalition.

David Steele, Center for Strategic and International Studies of Washington, D.C. James George Couchell, His Grace Bishop Dimitrios of Xanthos, Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America. His Grace Right Reverend Bishop Mitrophan, Serbian Orthodox Bishop of Eastern America. Bishop Marshall "Jack" Meadors of the United Methodist Church.

Rabbi Steven Bennett Jacobs, Temple KOL Tikva from Los Angeles, California. Mr. Zoran S. Hodjera, president of the Saint Luke Serbian Orthodox Church in Washington, D.C. Our colleague, Congressman ROD BLAGOJEVICH from the Fifth Congressional District in Illinois. Obrad Kestic, Director of Governmental Affairs, IGN Pharmaceuticals. Reverend Roy Thomas Lloyd, Broadcast News Director of the National Council of Churches.

Jonathan Alpert from HBO. Susan Sachs from the New York Times. Bryan Puchaty, CNN. Marie Nelson, the director for Africa Policy, Rainbow/PUSH Coalition.

Mr. Speaker, this interfaith delegation made it possible to bring our prisoners of war home.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) for listing all the clergymen. I had not seen that list published any place and it was certainly a wonderful delegation. And I commend him for giving them the proper attributes for their work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for his generosity and for his constant advocacy for peace. And I thank the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALOMAVAEGA), the ranking member, for his leadership. I also thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) for bringing this to a point when we could acknowledge a great man of peace.

Mr. Speaker, ringing throughout the halls of many places over the weekend, and particularly in our houses of worship, were the words, "glory, glory, hallelujah," for it was that which caused the efforts of Reverend Jesse Louis Jackson to be put at the pinnacle of our eyesight in terms of what he accomplished. We had always known him as a man of peace who was courageous, but as he brought forth the three young men and presented them to us this past Sunday there was a ringing of celebration, one long overdue.

I rise to support this resolution and support Reverend Jesse L. Jackson, Sr., and as noted by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), all of the others, part of the delegation, the religious and civic leaders, including our colleague from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH).

It is important to acknowledge the fact that there can be peace.

□ 1915

I am grateful that specialist Steven Gonzales, Staff Sergeant Andrew Ramirez, and Staff Sergeant Christopher Stone, who were captured on patrol along the border of Kosovo and Macedonia, are now free. I am delighted that Reverend Jackson, in prayer and

with courage, left the shores of this land and went forth to deliver them.

As I traveled in Albania and Macedonia this weekend, it was clear that all eyes were on Reverend Jackson and his delegation. First, we were offering up prayers, Mr. Speaker; and then, of course, we were hoping for the very best.

We know that President Milosevic has brutally murdered many of the ethnic Albanians. We know that women and children have been displaced, along with their husbands and men. We know that the men have been murdered and taken off to war. We know the refugee camps are in terrible condition in terms of the living conditions, and we know we must prevail to stop ethnic cleansing. But Reverend Jackson rose above those issues to proceed to declare peace and to receive these individuals back.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply take my hat off, if I had one, to salute Reverend Jesse L. Jackson, Sr., for being a courageous man of peace.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD Reverend Jackson's entire resume and bio.

REVEREND JESSE L. JACKSON, SR., PRESIDENT AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, RAINBOW/PUSH COALITION, INC.

The Reverend Jesse Louis Jackson, President and founder of the Rainbow/PUSH Coalition, is one of America's foremost political figures. Over the past thirty years he has played a pivotal role in virtually every movement for empowerment, peace, civil rights, gender equality, and economic and social justice.

Reverend Jackson has been called the "conscience of the nation" and "the great unifier," challenging America to establish just and humane priorities. He is known for bringing people together in common ground across lines of race, class, gender, and belief.

Born on October 8, 1941 in Greenville, South Carolina, Jesse Jackson attended the University of Illinois on a football scholarship and later transferred to North Carolina A&T State University. He attended Chicago Theological Seminary until he joined the Civil Rights Movement full time in 1965.

Reverend Jackson began his activism as a student leader in the sit-in movement and continued as a young organizer for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference as an assistant to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. He went onto direct Operation Breadbasket and subsequently founded People United to Save Humanity (PUSH) in Chicago in 1971. PUSH's goals were economic empowerment and expanding educational and employment opportunities for the disadvantaged and communities of color. In 1984, Reverend Jackson founded the National Rainbow Coalition, a national social justice organization devoted to political empowerment, education and changing public policy. In September 1996, the Rainbow Coalition and Operation PUSH merged into the Rainbow/PUSH Coalition to continue both philosophies and maximize its resources.

Long before national health care, a war on drugs, dialogue with the Soviet Union and negotiations with the Middle East were popular positions, Reverend Jackson advocated them. By virtue of Reverend Jackson's advocacy, South African apartheid and the fight for democracy in Haiti came to the forefront of the national conscience.

Reverend Jackson's two presidential campaigns broke new ground in U.S. politics. His

1984 campaign won 3.5 million votes, registered over one million new voters, and helped the Democratic Party regain control of the Senate in 1986. His 1988 candidacy won seven million votes and registered two million new voters and helped to sweep hundreds of elected officials into office. Additionally, this civil rights leader won a historic victory, coming in first or second in 46 out of 54 contests. His clear progressive agenda and his ability to build an unprecedented coalition inspired millions to join the political process.

As a highly respected world leader, Reverend Jackson has acted many times as an international diplomat in sensitive situations. In 1984, for example, Reverend Jackson secured the release of captured Navy Lieutenant Robert Goodman from Syria, as well as the release of 48 Cuban and Cuban-American prisoners in 1984. He was the first American to bring hostages out of Kuwait and Iraq in 1990.

In 1990, in an impressive victory, Reverend Jackson was elected to the post of U.S. Senator from Washington, D.C., a position also known as "Statehood Senator." The office was created to advocate for statehood for the District of Columbia, which has a population higher than five states yet has no voting representation in Congress.

A hallmark of Reverend Jackson's work has been his commitment to youth. He has visited thousands of high schools, colleges, universities, and correctional facilities encouraging excellence, inspiring hope and challenging young people to award themselves with academic excellence and to stay drug-free. He has also been a major force in the American labor movement—working with unions to organize workers and mediate labor disputes. It is noted, Reverend Jackson has probably walked more picket lines and spoken at more labor rallies than any other national leader.

A renowned orator, Reverend Jackson has received numerous honors for his work in human and civil rights and for nonviolent social change. In 1991, the U.S. Post Office put his likeness on a pictorial postal cancellation, only the second living person to receive such an honor. He has been on the Gallup List of Ten Most Respected Americans for the past ten years. He has also received the prestigious NAACP Spingarn Award, in addition to honors from hundreds of grassroots and community organizations from coast to coast. Reverend Jackson has been awarded more than 40 honorary doctorate degrees, and frequently lectures at Howard, Yale, Princeton, Morehouse, Harvard, Columbia, Stanford, and Hampton Universities, among others.

Since 1992, Reverend Jackson has hosted "Both Sides With Jesse Jackson" on Cable News Network. He is the author of two books: *Keep Hope Alive* (South End Press, 1989) and *Straight From the Heart* (Fortress Press, 1987). In 1996, Reverend Jackson co-authored the book *Legal Lynching: Racism, Injustice, and the Death Penalty* (Marlowe & Company) with his son, U.S. Representative Jesse L. Jackson, Jr.

In October 1997, Reverend Jackson was appointed by President Bill Clinton and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright as "Special Envoy of the President and Secretary of State for the Promotion of Democracy in Africa." In his official position as Special Envoy, Reverend Jackson traveled to Kenya and Zambia in November 1997. Reverend Jackson met with His Excellency Daniel T. Arap Moi of Kenya and President Frederick J.T. Chiluba of Zambia during his trip.

Reverend Jackson married college sweetheart Jacqueline Lavinia Brown in 1963. They have five children: Santita Jackson, Cong. Jesse Louis Jackson, Jr., Jonathan

Jackson, Yusef DuBois Jackson, Esq., and Jacqueline Lavinia Jackson, Jr. The Jacksons reside in Chicago.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in support of H. Res. 156, a resolution to honor not only the work of the Honorable Reverend Jesse Jackson but also the work of the entire delegation who traveled with him against insurmountable odds and came back victorious.

Especially would I like to single out the work of our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROD BLAGOJEVICH), and the Reverend James Meeks, whom I happen to know and have a tremendous amount of respect for.

I think, once again, Reverend Jackson has demonstrated his astuteness, his ability, his agility. Some of us thought maybe Reverend Jackson was getting a little bit older, and somebody else said, no, Jesse is not getting older, he is just getting better. And so he has gotten better, he is better, and we commend and congratulate him once again on a tremendous piece of humanitarian work for all of the world to see.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues on both sides of the fence for bringing this today to this floor.

I especially want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CARRIE MEEK), for authoring House Resolution 156, which commends the Reverend Jesse Jackson for his wonderful and great work in securing the release of our brave servicemen, Staff Sergeant Andrew Ramirez, Staff Sergeant Christopher Stone, and Specialist Steven Gonzales.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution and honored to have the opportunity to address the Nation about it today.

Reverend Jesse Jackson has once again proven himself a man of great ability, of great compassion and of great faith. His mission to Yugoslavia brought relief and joy to the families of these three servicemen and to all Americans who prayed for their freedom.

Our Nation owes Jesse Jackson a great debt of gratitude. His skillful diplomacy in this case, as well as his other successful missions to free hostages and prisoners throughout the years, serves to remind us of Reverend Jackson's steadfast dedication to peace and freedom.

With regard to Staff Sergeant Steven Ramirez, I am especially thankful to Reverend Jackson for his courageous mission and am proud to join the Nation in honoring this exemplary American today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 156, to commend, thank and congratulate the Reverend Jesse Jackson and his delegation and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROD BLAGOJEVICH) for securing the release of the three American soldiers.

There has been great discussion criticizing independent diplomatic efforts as dangerous, out of line and inappropriate. I stand to commend the efforts of this faith-based delegation made up of more than 20 religious leaders as the right move at the right time and in the best interests of the soldiers and this Nation.

I am the mother of a 16-year-old man-child named Mervyn Jones, the love of my life. I place myself in the shoes of the mothers of these three American soldiers, experiencing the anxiety, loneliness, regret, love, longing and desperation of not being able to remove my son from the arms of Milosevic. Thanks to the efforts of Reverend Jackson and his delegation, I stand in the shoes of these same mothers exuberant, relieved, happy, proud, grateful and blessed that God allowed the Reverend Jackson to speak for me and my son.

In the midst of apprehension, discouragement, criticism and mistrust, this faith-based delegation had the courage and most of all the faith, hope and belief that they could accomplish that which others had been unable to accomplish—the release of three young American soldiers.

There comes a time when all criticism should cease and all voices should now be heard in unison, thanking these great Americans for their efforts, thanking these great Americans for their belief, thanking them for their audacity to believe that they could, thanking them for their service.

Reverend Jackson, Representative BLAGOJEVICH and other members of the delegation, I join with the United States Congress and the American people to laud, commend, congratulate and praise your good work.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for having this, and I want to thank the leadership of the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) for offering this resolution.

I rise in support of H.R. 156, a resolution to commend Reverend Jesse Jackson, Sr., for securing the release from captivity of three United States soldiers: Specialist Steven Gonzales of Huntsville, Texas; Staff Sergeant Andrew Ramirez of Los Angeles; and Staff Sergeant Christopher Stone of Smiths Creek, Michigan.

For 5 weeks these soldiers reportedly were held isolated from each other and

their units and held captive in a hostile land. Members of their families, people in their home communities and concerned citizens around the world prayed for their safe return. We were disappointed by the unsuccessful diplomatic efforts to secure their release.

In answer to the call of conscience, who will go to seek the release of these young men, Reverend Jesse Jackson boldly and courageously answered, I will. Despite the risk of failure, despite the risk of danger to his personal security, despite the risk of criticism from those who would say he had no business whatsoever, Reverend Jesse Jackson and his faith-based mission answered the call.

And, indeed, we want to commend our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH), to go to this foreign country and to urge the country of that Nation to let our soldiers go home.

He succeeded and we are glad. Perhaps this humanitarian gesture by the Yugoslavian President, to set free our soldiers, will be followed by more substantial concessions on his part to hasten an end to the destruction of that region and the suffering he has caused in so many lives there. However, today, we should take time, on behalf of a nation that is grateful and very relieved by the safe return of our soldiers, to say thank you to Rev. Jesse Jackson for answering the call of conscience and for a job well done.

Rev. Jesse Jackson, by his bold actions, displayed the wisdom implicit in the old maxim that we should live, learn, love and leave a legacy. By his actions, Rev. Jackson displayed courage to go into a dangerous situation to accomplish his mission, to seek the release of our soldiers. He did it and we say thank you.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much more time do I have on this side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) has 4¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

(Ms. WATERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and though 1 minute is not enough, I will try.

I simply want to, first, thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman, and our ranking member, as well as the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CARRIE MEEK) for stopping and focusing us and getting us together to give our thanks to Reverend Jesse Jackson.

Reverend Jesse Jackson is truly a remarkable man. He is a man who truly believes in the power of prayer and the ability to argue the moral and humane position, no matter how difficult it looks, no matter how difficult it seems.

He was criticized. They said, do not go, Jesse; do not mess up our diplomatic relations, even though we had none. But Jesse went in spite of that,

with a faith-based coalition and our own Congressman, to say to Mr. Milosevic, let them go.

And despite the fact that we all believe that Mr. Milosevic is without a moral center, that this is a man who has been involved in ethnic cleansing, that this is a man who had lost his moral compass a long time ago, Jesse convinced him.

He did not stop on the first try. They told him it was not on the agenda. Jesse Jackson went to bed; and he said, it is on my agenda. And he got up the next morning, and he continued with the mission, and he made it happen.

We are pleased. The mothers of these young men are pleased. We are so glad we have a Jesse Jackson. The world should thank Jesse Jackson.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to also thank the sponsor of this outstanding resolution, H.R. 156. I also want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and also the ranking member of the subcommittee for this occasion.

Today, I would like to commend Reverend Jesse Jackson and the entire Jackson peace delegation, which included the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROD BLAGOJEVICH) and the Reverend James Meeks, both who reside in the City of Chicago, for their heroic efforts in bringing our soldiers back home.

It took people of monumental strength and enormous moral courage to accomplish such a noble feat. I know that all of America, including the parents of our soldiers, thanked God when on Sunday it was announced that our soldiers were released.

One word about Reverend Jackson. Reverend Jackson is, indeed, a remarkable man, a man of enormous courage and enormous talent and abilities. Reverend Jackson's moral plea to Milosevic for the release of our soldiers was not an easy task. However, once again, Reverend Jackson has demonstrated to us the power of diplomatic negotiations.

Reverend Jackson certainly deserves every word, every symbol, every indication that we have giving him thanks.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD).

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I commend the Reverend Jesse Jackson. For many years, the Reverend Jesse Jackson has served the cause of peace and human dignity. Once again, Reverend Jackson has traveled to the battlefields of a world at war to return captive servicemen. Once again, he has brought a message of peace and human unity to a situation many thought was beyond hope. Once again, Reverend Jackson has put his faith to the test, opened his heart in love and brought hope to the hopeless. Once again, Reverend Jackson has made himself an example of a committed American and an international peacekeeper.

Leading a delegation of Christian, Muslims and Jewish representatives, Reverend Jackson made a way where there seemed to be none. It is my hope that we may use the relationships which he has developed to find a way to end this war but, more importantly, that we find a way to end the oppression which caused it. It must always be our goal to establish a peace not based on oppression and to rebuild an arc of the covenant between all people. Reverend Jackson has done his part. Let us now do ours.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Reverend Jackson for his efforts.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our ranking member and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and my very dear friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CARRIE MEEK), for bringing this resolution forward.

People can say what they want about this country. This is the greatest country in the world. Men like Reverend Jesse Jackson, as well as my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROD BLAGOJEVICH), who have the courage to risk their lives, and the other delegation, and to go on foreign soil to free three heroes are to be commended.

I want to add my voice to all those who have spoken before me in thanking Reverend Jackson and our colleague and their delegation. This world will be a better place. We hope we can end this war and bring peace to our Nation.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH), the gentleman who accompanied Reverend Jackson and made it possible for Reverend Jackson to visit in Yugoslavia.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Sergeant Ramirez and Sergeant Stone and Specialist Gonzales are soon to be home with their families due to the hard work and effort of Reverend Jesse Jackson. He worked very hard. He was constant in his pursuit of negotiations to achieve this mission. There were peaks, and there were valleys. I know, because I was there with him.

□ 1930

Reverend Jackson did it in Iraq and Kuwait. He did it before in Cuba with hostages. He did it before and was successful in Syria with Robert Goodman. And he did it again in Yugoslavia. Reverend Jesse Jackson is four for four, and Jesse Jackson is the man.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 35 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I just want to add my voice of congratulations to Jesse Jackson, who in many ways is like a father figure to me. I have known the family for so long. I am not surprised what Jesse Jackson was able to accomplish. And I say to my dear friend who came with me in the same class in 1996, that great Congressman from Chicago, he was one heck of a wing man and the Reverend could not have done it without him.

Congratulations, Reverend Jackson. And to the Ramirez, Stone and Gonzales families, I thank them for producing three great men like they have.

God bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) has 25 seconds remaining.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I certainly want to commend and thank my colleagues for the statements that have been presented to pay this very special tribute and this resolution to Reverend Jesse Jackson for the performance and for the contributions that he has made, especially in bringing home these three soldiers who had been imprisoned for the past 31 days.

In saying that, I certainly thank my good friend the gentlewoman from Florida for her sponsorship of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from American Samoa has 1 minute remaining. That 1 minute is yielded to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 156.

I want to thank the Reverend Jesse Lewis Jackson for the wonderful job he has done getting the three American prisoners released. Our Nation and the families of the three soldiers who were held for a month are very grateful to Reverend Jackson's work.

Reverend Jackson has only recently been named as a diplomat, but he has been doing this work for a very long time. I am very hopeful that Reverend Jackson's success will encourage the two sides to find a peaceful end to the crisis.

On that note, I want to say that I joined several of my colleagues this weekend in Vienna, where we had meetings with the Russian Parliament. We tried to set a framework for peace negotiations between the two sides, and I am very pleased with our results. We cannot underestimate the power of negotiators like the Reverend Jackson, and I am very encouraged that his efforts, along with the discussions with the Russian officials, will lay the

groundwork for peace and end this conflict.

God bless America. And, of course, we all love the Reverend Jesse Lewis Jackson.

I would like to congratulate the Reverend Jesse Jackson in his successful efforts in bringing home the three United States servicemen, Staff Sergeant Christopher J. Stone, Staff Sergeant Andrew A. Ramirez and Specialist Steven M. Gonzales, who were abducted in Macedonia near the Yugoslav border where they were on patrol while participating in a NATO force that was to move into Kosovo as peacekeepers in case of a settlement. Mr. Jackson's trip to Yugoslavia as a negotiator on behalf of the soldiers was indeed courageous, and his diplomatic talents are more than commendable.

Indeed, in obtaining the release of the captured soldiers, Reverend Jesse Jackson succeeded where no one else could through his immeasurable perseverance, faith, and persistent negotiating with the Serb leader. It is interesting to note that this was not the Reverend's first success as an international mediator. In 1984, he won the freedom from Syria of a U.S. Navy flyer, Lt. Robert O. Goodman, Jr., who had been shot down in a raid on anti-aircraft positions in Lebanon. I also recall that in June of that same year he persuaded Fidel Castro to release 22 Americans and 26 Cubans from Cuban prisons. Additionally, Jesse Jackson has participated in numerous domestic "missions," and has mediated in several disputes on behalf of African Americans, labor and the poor. One example of his efforts was his success in prodding the aircraft maker Boeing into a \$15 million settlement of two class action lawsuits that accused the firm of discriminating against its African American workers. I wholeheartedly admire the Reverend for his tactics in dispute resolution, for his siding with the underdogs, the poor, minorities, and the oppressed.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Again, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) for bringing this resolution to the floor. I want to thank our senior member of our committee, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMVAEGA) for his participation, and thank all of those who participated in this tribute to Reverend Jesse Jackson, and to his fellow clergymen who participated with him in this admirable undertaking in releasing our prisoners.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Rev. Jesse Jackson is truly one of America's unsung heroes, and today I stand before you to sing his praises.

For many years, conservatives have held Jesse Jackson up as the poster child for liberal causes.

They have chastised him and demonized him.

They have cursed him and mocked him.

And at the same time they wear their version of Christian values on their lapels, they look down on everyone that does not conform to their narrowly interpreted set of rules.

However, if ever there was a person who exemplified the morals and the values espoused by Christ, that person is the Rev. Jesse Jackson. In the Book of Matthew, Chap-

ter 5, our Savior, Jesus Christ tells us which values will be looked upon favorably in the kingdom of Heaven. Some of the ones he mentions who will be blessed are:

"The poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

The Rev. Jackson has dedicated his life to representing the most marginalized, disenfranchised members of American society.

"Those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they will be filled."

The Rev. Jackson has made filing the souls of Americans as important as filing the bellies of the hungry.

"The merciful, for they will be shown mercy."

The Rev. Jackson has stepped into the chasm of propaganda and demonization to meet with the leaders of our nation's "enemies" and bring America's sons and daughters back from captivity in foreign countries.

"The pure in heart, for they will see God."

The Rev. Jackson's approach to solving problems clearly illustrates the innocence and humility of his altruistic intentions, his love of all people, and his dedication to making the world a better place for everyone.

"The peacemakers, for they will be called sons of God."

The Rev. Jackson has been a strong, outspoken advocate of diplomacy and nonviolent conflict resolution.

"Those who are persecuted because of righteousness, for their is the kingdom of heaven."

The Rev. Jackson has stood on the front lines of our nation's struggle to recognize the civil rights of all its citizens.

Rev. Jackson, we appreciate you and the work you are doing to walk the path. We commend you for your tireless efforts to bring home American soldiers who have become prisoners of war. However, your selflessness does not stop there. On a number of occasions, your intervention has freed citizens being held as human shields by Saddam Hussein and political prisoners from Cuban jails. Hold your head up Brother Jackson. You are somebody! Keep the faith! When you are feeling a little unappreciated, just remember.

Blessed are you when people insult you, persecute you and falsely say all kinds of evil against you because of me. Rejoice and be glad, because great is your reward in heaven, for in the same way they persecuted the prophets who were before you. You are the salt of the earth. But if the salt loses its saltiness, how can it be made salty again? It is no longer good for anything, except to be thrown out and trampled by men. You are the light of the world. A city on a hill cannot be hidden. Neither do people light a lamp and put it under a bowl. Instead they put it on its stand, and it gives light to everyone in the house. In the same way, let your light shine before men, that they may see your good deeds and praise your Father in heaven.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thought that I should go to Andrews Airport Air Force Base yesterday to welcome Jesse Jackson home. Reverend Jackson had helped raise the consciousness of the nation to freedom concerns in the District of Columbia when he was statehood senator and lived here a few years ago. I thought that I should be there to greet him for bringing a freedom message to President Slobodan Milosevic, who heard Jesse Jackson and freed the three American servicemen.

I listened intently to Rev. Jackson's comments at the airport. He detailed how he had

managed to free the three soldiers, and it was clear that he had done it with great care and skill without undermining U.S. foreign policy concerns and military aims. Reverend Jackson carried the NATO four conditions and urged them on Milosevic at the same time that he urged our country to look for diplomatic openings. Through the efforts of the former Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin, who coincidentally arrived at Andrews shortly after the Jackson delegation, these openings are beginning to appear now. Rev. Jackson's work has not hurt our goals, and may have helped in ways we cannot yet know. What we do know is what Jesse Jackson, through an act of will and skill, has produced the three young men before the war's end. Jesse Jackson deserves credit not only for what he did but for the way he did it. Today's special order is a well deserved tribute.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to recognize my good friend and colleague, Reverend Jesse Jackson, for his diplomacy in Yugoslavia and his work to bring an end to the crisis in Kosovo. Thanks to the work of Reverend Jackson and his delegation, three servicemen who had been held in Yugoslavia have been freed and allowed to return home safely. We must continue to take every measure possible to ensure the safe and expeditious return home of all the men and women of the United States Armed Forces who have been dispatched to Yugoslavia.

In the same spirit, I hope that we can seize upon this moment to further these diplomatic efforts to bring about an immediate end to Slobodan Milosevic's campaign of terror. At this juncture, I am convinced that our best hope for peace and stability in the region is the negotiation of an immediate cease fire and the dispatch of an international peace keeping force. It is my strong belief that the United States and NATO must reach out to the United Nations, Russia, China, and others to work together toward a new internationally negotiated peace agreement and to secure Serb compliance with any and all of its terms.

As a person who strongly believes in the teachings and work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., I profoundly subscribe to the principles of nonviolence and implore us to consider the teachings of Dr. King as we address the crisis in Kosovo. In speaking about the Vietnam war in his speech A Christmas Sermon on Peace found in his last book, *The Trumpet of Conscience*, Dr. King wrote: "But one day we must come to see that peace is not merely a distant goal we seek, but that it is a means by which we arrive at that goal. We must pursue peaceful ends through peaceful means. All of this is saying that, in the final analysis, means and ends must cohere because the end is pre-existent in the means and ultimately destructive means cannot bring about constructive ends."

Based upon these principles of non-violence, it is with enthusiasm and pride that I applaud Reverend Jackson and his delegation for opening important, new diplomatic channels. While I have not seen Milosevic's letter to President Clinton, I am very hopeful that our President will view the letter as a possible opportunity to renew dialog to seek a political settlement to this horrific crisis. I pray that this will set in motion a process that ends the bloodshed in Yugoslavia and leads to sustainable and long-term peace in the Balkans.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 156, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution commending the Reverend Jesse L. Jackson, Sr. on securing the release of Specialist Steven Gonzales of Huntsville, Texas, Staff Sergeant Andrew Ramirez of Los Angeles, California, and Staff Sergeant Christopher Stone of Smiths Creek, Michigan, from captivity in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

"WE, THE PEOPLE, CITIZEN AND CONSTITUTION PROGRAM"

(Mr. HILL of Montana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week more than 1,200 students from across the United States were here in Washington to compete in the national finals of the "We, the People, Citizen and Constitution Program."

I am proud to announce that a high school class from Polson High School in Polson, Montana, represented the State of Montana in this national event. These young scholars have worked diligently to reach the national finals and, through this experience, have gained a deep respect and a greater knowledge and a greater understanding of the fundamental principles and the values of our constitutional Republic.

"We, the People" is the most extensive education program in the country that was developed to educate young people about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. This program has provided classroom materials at elementary and middle and high school levels for more than 26½ million students across the country.

I am proud of the students from Polson, Montana, and I commend them for their dedication to a better understanding of their Government.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following newspaper article for the RECORD:

NONTENURED TEACHERS CUT; BOARD VOTES TO SLICE 60 POSITIONS TO HELP SAVE \$1M

(By Leslie McCartney)

The teaching contracts of more than 60 nontenured teachers will not be renewed, Helena School District trustees reluctantly voted Tuesday night.

The district is facing serious financial problems. The district is seeking ways to slice \$1 million expenses from its 1999-2000 school year budget.

"This is an unpleasant task," said Bill Rasor, personnel program manager for the district.

Many of the trustees lamented the necessary move—by contract the district must give teachers notice—but it was not unexpected.

Tuesday's meeting included more proposed considerations for reductions as part of the ongoing budgeting process that has been consuming the district and the trustees for at least a month.

A new consideration presented to the board Tuesday included eliminating a \$15,000 contract for high school students with the Montana Science Institute, based at Canyon Ferry Lake.

Also discussed were a few revised proposals, including that of the gifted and talented program. The program would not be completely eliminated as was suggested earlier this month.

Under a new model, the district would retain two gifted and talented staff members to coordinate services and consult with classroom teachers.

"We're regrouping . . . maybe we're not quite ready to hand it off entirely," Superintendent Bruce Messinger noted.

Also revised was the issue of increasing class size, which of district hoped to boost to save money. Under a new proposal, class sizes in the early primary grades (kindergarten through second grade) (kindergarten through second grade) would stay small.

However, class sizes would be raised to 26 students in third grade, 28 in fourth grade and 30 in fifth grade. The changes in staffing, coupled with savings in physical education and the music program, could save \$116,000, according to district projections.

Trustees also mulled a revision in the "significant writing" program to cut four full-time positions at a savings of \$116,000.

This year's budget crunch is not an anomaly. Messinger presented a glimpse of a budget picture for the next four years that points to a further decline in enrollment. Enrollment in Montana is directly linked to the amount of funding a district receives.

"It's not going to get any prettier," said trustee Brenda Nordlund.

Many trustees also had strong words for the Legislature, which they accused of not paying attention to the plight of many of the state's larger districts that are unable to legally raise additional funds.

"We're pushing hard against the ceiling and it's coming down on us," Messinger noted.

The district's difficulties—along with the hours spent poring over numbers and finances—brought at least one trustee to near tears at the board meeting.

"I find this a tremendously humbling experience," said trustee Julie Mitchell.

She added that she realizes the district must pare its expenses, but the task is unpleasant and unavoidable.

"In the end we have to decide and someone's going to be mad," she said.

But she admonished both the public and trustees to remember that the district delivers a quality education and will continue to do so, in spite of the financial crunch.

"There are some incredibly cool things going on . . . we give our kids a fantastic education."

Trustees also reminded the public that none of the proposed reductions have been decided and urged continued public input.

"This is not set in concrete," Trustee Rich Moy said.

A public hearing on the budget is set for March 16.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that time allocated to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and the time allocated to me be reversed on the schedule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

IDEA FUNDING

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, today the House passed House Concurrent Resolution 84, which I think is important for a number of reasons. There is no higher priority, I believe, than our children's education.

I have a third grader and a fifth grader who attend Oscar Howell Elementary, the public school system in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, in the Sioux Falls School District. The school board election is coming up in June. There are no fewer than 12 people running for one position on the school board, and we will have the opportunity to choose a very qualified member of the school board. I am delighted to have that many people who are interested in seeking and holding that very important position.

The concurrent resolution that we passed today in the House was a non-binding resolution. But, nevertheless, I think is important, for several reasons. It compels the will of this House that special education be funded before any other new education initiatives are funded. That makes basic sense. The special education mandate, IDEA funding, is a Federal mandate and, therefore, should be federally funded.

Twenty years ago the Congress committed to fund special ed at 40 percent of the total funding level. We are not even close to that today, not even close. I am pleased that the Republican Congress in the last years has begun moving in that direction. In fact, we have backed up our rhetoric with our action.

If we look at where the President's budget has been in the last several budget years, in fiscal year 1997 the Republican Congress upped the President's request for IDEA funding for special ed by 19 percent. In 1998 we increased the funding level for special ed

by 17 percent over the President's request. And in 1999 the Congress increased the level of spending over the President's request by 13 percent.

There is a pattern and a history and a commitment on the part of this Congress to see that the Federal Government honors the commitment that it has made to local school district across this country. So it is very important, I think, that this resolution expresses the will of the House that we will fully fund special ed and move in that direction.

The other thing I think is important with respect to this resolution is that whenever the Federal Government imposes mandates on local school districts and school boards, we take away and deprive them of critical decision-making authority.

I just mentioned that we have 12 people seeking the school board position for one position in the Sioux Falls School District. Using the resources that they have to fund the special ed mandate deprives them of using resources that could be allocated for other important things like building new schools, hiring new teachers, reducing class sizes, or buying more computers.

I will use my State of South Dakota as an example. If we were fully funding the mandate on special education today, we would be looking at an additional \$18 million coming into South Dakota. And if each State would look at their own statistics, I think they would find similar types of relationships between the current funding levels and where it should be if the Federal Government was living up to the mandate.

As I said earlier, there is no higher priority than providing quality education to children with disabilities and at the same time freeing up resources that local decision-makers can use to improve the quality of education for all of our students across this country.

And so I believe that the vote that we made today in the House is important, as we move down that direction and look at what we can do to further increase the funding level, to honor the commitment that the Federal Government has made to the local school boards across this country, to see that those Federal mandates that we impose upon local school boards are fully funded so that our school districts and those decision-makers at the local level have an opportunity to do what they do best, and that is try and give our children the very best education possible.

And I again would simply say that, as a matter of principle, I believe that this Republican Congress is committed to seeing that more of that decision-making authority is retained at the local level and that our parents, our teachers, our administrators and our school boards are those who are in the best position to make decisions about the quality and the funding of our children's education. And that frankly, in

my view, is where we ought to put the point of control.

And so the resolution that we acted upon today, I think, speaks loud and clear that this Congress will continue to move in the direction of seeing that the Federal mandate special education, which we have a responsibility for 40 percent of, that we continue to move in the direction, as we have here in the past few years in this Congress, to see that we honor that commitment to all of our students across this country and particularly to those who have disabilities.

I look forward to working toward that end and as we go through the appropriations process within the confines of a balanced budget agreement to see that that gets done.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 833, BANKRUPTCY REFORM ACT OF 1999

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-126) on the resolution (H. Res. 158) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 833) to amend title 11 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

(Mr. BAIRD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMMENDING OAK PARK, ILLINOIS, ON 150 YEARS OF TOWNSHIP GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 150 years ago in 1849, Oak Park, Illinois was just 10 years old, with a total population of less than 500 people.

There were no streets lined with Frank Lloyd Wright architecture. There was no elevated train system for rapid transit to the City of Chicago. There was no light bulb, no telephone or automobile. No one had heard of the computer, Internet, or e-mail.

□ 1945

In 1849, township as a local form of government was established in Illinois, and since then, voters in 85 of Illinois'

102 counties have benefited from this most intimate form of government.

Today, Oak Park is a thriving community of more than 53,000 people, known for its architectural heritage. Within its 4.5 square miles lives a diverse mix of people with different cultures, races and ethnicities, professions, lifestyles, religions, ages and incomes.

Primarily a residential community bordering the city of Chicago, Oak Park is the birthplace and childhood home of novelist Ernest Hemingway. An annual festival has traditionally been held to celebrate his July birth date.

Architect Frank Lloyd Wright lived in Oak Park from 1889 to 1909, and 25 buildings in the village were designed by him, including his first public building, Unity Temple, a Unitarian Universalist church. His restored home and studio is open for daily hours, and there are many architecturally significant homes ranging from Victorian to prairie style in the village's two historic districts.

Other famous Oak Parkers include Edgar Rice Burroughs, the creator of Tarzan; Dr. Percy B. Julian, an outstanding African American chemist whose research led to the development of cortisone; Joseph Kerwin, an astronaut on the first NASA Skylab team; Ray Kroc, the founder of McDonald's; and Marjorie Judith Vincent, the 1991 Miss America.

Oak Park is also home to former president of the Illinois Senate and recently appointed chairman of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the honorable Phillip Rock.

The Oak Park River Forest High School is recognized as one of the best public high schools in the Nation, Fenwick is an outstanding Catholic school, and the city is currently involved in the redevelopment of downtown Oak Park with new retail anchors and an intermodal transportation facility.

In 1968, the village board approved one of the Nation's first local fair housing ordinances outlawing discrimination. In 1973, the board approved its first Oak Park diversity statement; and, in 1976, Oak Park was designated an all-American city.

One thing that has not changed in Oak Park during the past 150 years is the person-to-person service provided by township officials and township government in Illinois. When Illinois voters chose township government, they chose the oldest form of government on the North American continent. The Pilgrims brought the concept of township government with them when they landed on the eastern seaboard in 1636. More than a century before the Revolutionary War, townships were giving communities a local and independent voice in matters of government and order.

Today, as we prepare to move into the 21st century, government in Illinois still thrives. More than 8 million

Illinoisans are served by the 1,433 townships in the State. This year, on April 3rd, townships held their annual meetings, which is unique to this form of government, where any citizen can step up to the plate and voice any concern that they have about the government. In this regard, townships are truly the government closest to the people they govern as they continue to provide functions and services which are vitally important.

I take this moment after 150 years to commend and congratulate the people of Oak Park, Illinois, for demonstrating that democracy can be made real and that township government can in fact and does in fact work.

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

(Mr. HULSHOF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be given the time of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) and that he be given my time on the list so that I can resume my place in the chair following the 5-minute special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

AIR FORCE BOONDOGGLES COST TAXPAYERS BILLIONS

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, last week it was reported by the Associated Press that an Air Force communications satellite worth \$800 million had ended up in the wrong orbit. This was the third failure in a row for the Air Force Titan IV program, at a total loss to the taxpayers of over \$3 billion. This latest satellite not only ended up in the wrong orbit, it ended up in a lopsided orbit thousands of miles below its intended orbit.

I have taken the floor many times over the years to point out examples of wasteful or exorbitant Federal spending. John Martin has for several years had a segment called It's Your Money on the ABC national television news, pointing out almost every week some example of horrible Federal waste. He has performed a great service to this Nation in bringing this series to the attention of the American people.

The examples, unfortunately, are far too easy to find. Examples of ridiculously wasteful Federal spending are everywhere. It has made me wonder if the Federal Government can do any-

thing in an efficient or economical way.

But this Titan IV program really takes the cake. Three failures at a cost of \$3 billion; \$3 billion down the drain.

What really adds insult to injury, Mr. Speaker, is that, because this is the Federal Government, no one will really be held accountable for this. In the private sector if a company had three major failures like this, heads would roll in a big way. Of course, in the private sector, no company could afford \$3 billion in failures unless possibly it was a big-time Federal contractor subsidized by the taxpayer.

The Appropriation Committees of the House and Senate should demand accountability here. They should not stand for \$3 billion from three failed launches.

But the easiest thing in the world, Mr. Speaker, is to spend other people's money. So what are we going to do? Thursday we are going to give big increases in pay and pensions and funding for the same Air Force that has sat around and allowed this \$3 billion in failures to occur.

Federal employees are great at rationalizing or justifying even ridiculous losses. I am sure that the Air Force will have some great excuses, and everyone connected with this will be able to explain why it was not their fault. Well, somebody is at fault and probably several people, and they should lose their jobs over this.

Even though we talk about a billion dollars up here like it was very little, \$3 billion is still an awful lot of money. This satellite, as I said earlier, cost \$800 million. Last Friday's mission alone cost \$1.23 billion. Just think how much good could have been done with the total \$3 billion in losses in this Titan IV Air Force program.

Now, I favor a strong military and I believe we should have a strong Air Force, but I do not believe we should just sit back and allow any part of the military to throw away \$3 billion. We should not just cavalierly accept this.

Several years ago, Edward Rendell, the Democratic Mayor of Philadelphia, said at a congressional hearing, "Government does not work because it was not designed to. There is no incentive for people to work hard so many do not. There is no incentive for people to save money so much of it is squandered."

How true this statement was and is. This is why it has been proven over and over and over again all over this world that the more money that can be left in the private sector, the better off everyone is; the lower prices are, the more jobs that are created, the better the economy is.

Competitive pressures force the private sector to spend money wisely, to spend it in economical, efficient, conservative, productive ways. Private companies do not have the luxury the government has of being able to waste billions with almost no meaningful repercussions.

The Air Force should publicly apologize for dropping this \$3 billion down this Titan IV rat hole. The Congress should be assured that nothing like this will ever happen again.

It is really sad, Mr. Speaker, to take \$3 billion from the families and children of this country, many of whom are barely getting by, to give to highly paid bureaucrats and Air Force officers to just blow in this way. What would be even sadder would be if the Air Force and everyone associated with these failures is not deeply embarrassed and ashamed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CRISIS IN KOSOVO

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, last week we had a historic symbolic vote on the war. This House voted against ground troops. We also voted against, in a tie vote, a resolution to support the air war. This week we have the real vote. Are we going to fund the war? Are we just talk or are we going to actually cut off the funds for the war?

There are three goals that have consistently been stated by NATO and by our government. One is to degrade the military forces or sufficiently degrade the military forces of the Yugoslav government so that we can move hundreds of thousands of refugees back, and then manage it with a peace-keeping force. I would put forth that anybody who has listened to any of the military briefings we have had, who have listened to the public reports, understand fundamentally that this is an unachievable goal. Milosevic understands that. When are the American people going to be told the truth, that our fundamental goals are unachievable?

First off, the military has been saying all the way along, this cannot be accomplished just by an air war. They are hopeful that they can bring him to the table, but what do they mean when they say this cannot be accomplished just by an air war?

He has dug in, he is fighting in mountainous terrain, he has supplies that are going to last him an extended period of time, and we read just last week that our military says that after 30 days of bombing, we have a net degradation of his military forces of zero. That does not mean that we have not impacted his long-term ability to wage war, we have blown up a lot of factories so he cannot reproduce, we have reduced some of the supply of gasoline

into the country but he only needs 10 percent and they are saying currently that 75 percent of their oil supplies are still there, we have only degraded 25. Three weeks ago they told us we had degraded 35, 2 weeks ago 30, now it is 25. We are headed the wrong direction.

They say, well, that is because of bad weather. The Balkans, when you read history books, always has bad weather. Furthermore, mountains in this time of year always have bad weather. This was no surprise. The Apache helicopters were not designed to go in to take out tanks. They were designed to go in with American forces on the ground as support. We are going to lose a lot of pilots and not accomplish our goal if we are not careful with how we use Apache helicopters.

The American people need to understand the air war cannot solve the problem of getting the refugees back. The ground war cannot, either. A fundamental map, and you cannot see a lot of the details with this map but fundamentally you can tell one thing right away, there is lot of brown and yellow down here. This is Albania, this is Macedonia, and here is Kosovo.

Now, to force your way in there, you have to go through mountains of 8,000 feet. That is why the Ottoman Empire stopped when it came in here. That is why Hitler could not make it through this part. There is no way we can put ground troops in through Albania or Macedonia or come in through Thessaloniki because, A, they do not want us to go through there but, B, even if they wanted to and even if we rebuilt airports and even if we built more roads through the mountains, we are not going to dislodge him through the mountains. It does not work.

Our military understands. Any general who has ever looked at this understands that if you have a ground war, you are coming through the top where all this green area is. That is where invasions of the Balkans have always occurred. But now we are not just talking a few thousand troops, we are talking potentially 400,000 troops, potentially all or mostly American troops, a minimum, according to estimates, of 20,000 dead up to 50,000 dead, and having to fight our way through Belgrade and Yugoslavia.

The people need to understand this is not just a magic little war where we are going to drop a few bombs and he is going to surrender. The truth needs to be told. Those who advocate a ground war and those who advocate an air war need to explain, it is not going to deliver. The only hope is to get him to the table. We have to have the courage. Before we pass a bill this week, if we do, we should first try to take the funds out. I will have a series of amendments and other Members will, too, to take the funds out to continue this war.

I know some people are concerned that the President is then going to blame Congress for having lost the war. I tried to explain, we did not lose the

war. It was an ill-conceived war. We bluffed something that we cannot deliver. We saw this in Vietnam. We saw it with the Russians in Afghanistan. We cannot win this on the ground or in the air alone without multiple years and destruction beyond imagination, and then we are still just bogged down.

The bottom line is this. If we give him \$12.9 billion, this current President, then he could potentially, without a lot of protection for this bill, divert it to the ground war without ever coming to Congress. This is not just the \$3.3 billion to continue the war. While our intent is to rebuild a military that he has devastated, our good intent could be used to fund a war, an expanded war where thousands of lives are lost, where the negotiated settlement in the end is just like the negotiated settlement we would have roughly had in the beginning.

If we get blamed this week because we stopped the funding and the President of the United States says the Republicans stopped the war, which would be untrue because it was an ill-conceived war in the first place, so what? If we saved American lives, that is what we are here to do, not to play politics.

At this point it is the job of this Congress to stand up and say, we know, both from the public statements and our private briefings that this cannot be accomplished. It is time to get to the table, because at most what we are arguing about is how to divide Kosovo at this point. It is not even clear in the end that we are going to have a better arrangement than we had in the beginning because now after all this bombing, after the Kosovars are legitimately upset about the slit throats, the massacres and so on, they want to be independent.

What are we going to tell the Palestinians when they want to be independent? And what are we going to tell the Kurds when they want to be independent? And what about the subsections of India? And what about the Chechnya area of Russia?

□ 2000

Are we going to intervene all over and, all of a sudden, have a new international policy because we got in a bad war with an ill-conceived strategy? And if we continue this, and we continue to fight this and we continue to put the money in, we only dig ourselves deeper in more graves.

It is time for this Congress to stand up and say:

"Get to the table now. We're not going to fund this war. It's unwinnable. The settlement you are going to get now is probably as good a settlement as we're going to get later, only with fewer Americans' lives lost, with fewer dollars spent and with less international problems than if we settle it right now."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). Under a previous order of

the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. TOOMEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. SMITH of Washington addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. DEMINT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. BATEMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WE ARE SPREADING OUR
MILITARY TOO THIN

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, later this week we are going to be asked to take a very, very difficult vote, and it will involve how much should the Congress authorize to spend for this war in the Balkans, and as a previous speaker, my colleague from Indiana, just said, there are many of us, not only here in Congress but around the country, that have serious concerns about this war. What my colleague from Indiana did not mention is history, and there is an old expression, and I think it is from Montezuma, who said that those who refuse to learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

Mr. Speaker, let me give the Members a very important history lesson that the Germans learned in the 1940s, in World War II. In World War II the Germans sent 400,000 troops into the Balkans, they suffered 70,000 casualties, and at the end of the war they controlled less ground than the day that they marched in.

Mr. Speaker, this is a war that I think we need to think long and hard before we get even more deeply involved, but we had the debate last week on that, and we had our votes, we had a chance to vote. This week, though, we are going to get a chance to vote on whether or not we should fund the war; and then secondly, if the Republican leadership is successful in the Committee on Rules, whether or not we should vote for even more funding than the President requested.

I want to talk a little bit about history as well because we are continually told that we have spread our military too thin, and I agree with that. The truth of the matter is we have spread our military too thin, but I think the best analogy is an analogy of peanut butter and jelly. We have spread our peanut butter and jelly entirely too thin, but it is not because we are not giving our military enough money.

I want to talk a little bit about what is happening. We have been told, for example, in the last several weeks that we are about 14,000 sailors short in terms of our Navy, but do my colleagues know what? We are not short a single admiral, we are not short any generals. In fact, as this chart indicates, in 1945 when we had 12.1 million Americans in uniform, we had 31 generals above the rank of four star. Today we have 1.3 million Americans in uniform, and we have 33 generals. So, we may be short on Army personnel, we may be short on people in the Navy, but we are certainly not short on generals.

Let me point out another chart, and this is really for the benefit of my Republican colleagues.

As my colleagues know, just 4 years ago we passed a 7-year balanced budget plan, and in that balanced budget plan

we said that in Fiscal Year 1999, the year that we are in right now, we said that we would spend \$267 billion on defense. That is what we said we would spend this year. Well, according to the Congressional Budget Office, we actually will spend this year \$273 billion. So, in other words, we are already spending \$6 billion more on defense than we said we were going to be spending.

Now despite that we are being asked this week to fund an additional \$13 billion. Now I go back to my analogy of the peanut butter and jelly. It is not that we are not giving the military enough money or enough peanut butter and jelly, the problem is that we are spreading it far too thin. We currently have troops in 135 different countries. We are prepared to fight a war in Korea, we are prepared to fight a war in the desert, and now we are apparently going to have to fight a war in Kosovo. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, we are spreading ourselves too thin, and at some point we in the Congress have to say the problem is not that we do not give enough money to the Pentagon, the problem is that the administration wants to spread that money too thinly.

I simply want to ask my colleagues and the Members of the House a couple of very simple and straightforward questions, and frankly as it relates to defense policy, as it relates to foreign policy and ultimately as it relates to budget policy. We ought to get clear and simple answers to tough questions, and I would like to propose two questions to my colleagues in the House:

First of all, should we borrow from Social Security to pay for a war in Kosovo? My answer is no.

The second question is: Should defense spending get preferential treatment in the appropriations process, or should we give them a special appropriation now? And again my answer is no, and I think the numbers speak for themselves.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, we are going to be asked, Republicans and Democrats alike: Is this such an important policy, is this such an important war, that we are going to take money out of the Social Security Trust Fund? I hope we will say no.

Now my proposal will be that we give the President exactly what he asked for. He is asking for \$6.05 billion in emergency supplemental appropriations, but I believe we ought to offset that with spending cuts in other parts of the government, and that can be done. In fact, if we do that, it means that every other department will have to cut its appropriations in the next several months by about 1 percent.

Now that is a big cut, but we are talking about a \$6 billion cut out of a \$1,700 billion budget. I think we can tighten those belts, and that will mean that we will not be stealing money from Social Security.

It was only a couple of weeks ago that we here on the House floor said we

are going to pass a budget for the first time in American history or for the first time in recent history that actually balances the budget, and for the first time saying that every penny of Social Security taxes will go only for Social Security. That was just a few weeks ago. Well, I meant it when I said it then, and I think most of my colleagues meant it, and I think we ought to make the tough choice when we have to vote on this emergency supplemental where we will already be spending more money than we said we were going to spend just a few years ago in defense. I am willing to give defense the extra money the President has requested, but I think it ought to come out of other parts of the budget.

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

(Mr. ALLEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. BRADY of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

CENSUS 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise to point out that the experts support the use of scientific methods to correct the census for undercounts and overcounts. Yesterday the National Academy of Sciences released the first report from the fourth panel to review the Census Bureau's plans for the 2000 census. Yet again, the experts convened by the Academy endorsed the Census Bureau's plan to use science to evaluate and correct the census counts.

At the end of 1998 the Census Bureau asked the National Academy of Sciences to convene a fourth panel to evaluate the Census Bureau's design for Census 2000. This independent panel, like the three that preceded it, has unequivocally stated that statistical methods work. The Academy panel stated yesterday that the design of the quality control survey represents, and I quote from the panel, "good, current practice." In fact, the panel explained, and I quote:

"Because it is not possible to count everyone in a census, a post-enumeration survey" using modern scientific methods "is an important element of census planning."

Currently the Census Bureau intends to use a post-enumeration survey entitled the Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation or A.C.E. The A.C.E. Survey was designed in light of the Supreme Court

decision regarding the use of statistical methods for the purpose of apportionment. Mr. Speaker, we are beginning to hear criticism of the A.C.E. This Academy report should finally put that criticism to rest.

Yes, the A.C.E. is a different program in its design and size than the survey that had been planned for Census 2000 prior to the court case. Those who are critical of these differences are not reviewing the details of A.C.E. As the Academy reports, changes in sample size as a result of the Supreme Court decision, quote, should not affect the quality, end quote, of the results. In fact, the panel comments that since the Bureau will no longer be using statistical methods for apportionment, there is no need for the larger survey envisioned prior to the court decision. In addition, the Academy notes that it is appropriate to combine information across States.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday's report demonstrates the professional community's continued strong support for the Census Bureau's plan for the year 2000 census. In 1994 the Academy issued its first report which laid the foundation for the current plans. In 1995 a second panel reviewing Census Bureau plans at the request of Congress in a bipartisan way reported that spending more money on traditional methods would not improve the accuracy of the counts or the census. Earlier this year a third panel of experts convened by the National Academy of Sciences said that it strongly supports the use of a quality control survey to correct for errors in the census.

I support counting everyone. The National Academy of Sciences has stated for the fourth time that the best way to count the population is to use modern scientific methods. I am going to rely on the opinion of these independent, impartial scientists at the National Academy of Sciences. These experts say the plan devised by the professionals at the Census Bureau will give us the most accurate count. That is the plan that I support.

If my colleagues agree with me, that we should count everyone, then they should join me in getting out of the way of the professionals at the Census Bureau. Let us let the professionals do what they are hired to do, count people, and let us let them do it in the best way they can. We should be encouraging the use of modern scientific methods in Census 2000, not preventing them.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put into the RECORD the report from the National Academy of Sciences, the fourth report that has come out in support of the use of modern scientific methods for the most accurate count in counting all Americans.

The report referred to as is follows:

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, COMMISSION ON BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES AND EDUCATION,
Washington, DC, May 3, 1999.

Dr. KENNETH PREWITT,
Director, U.S. Bureau of the Census,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DR. PREWITT: As part of its charge, the new Panel to Review the 2000 Census offers this letter report on the Census Bureau's plans for the design of the Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation (ACE) survey, a new post-enumeration survey. This survey is needed in light of the recent U.S. Supreme Court ruling regarding the use of the census for reapportionment.

In general, the panel concludes that the ACE design work to date is well considered. It represents good, current practice in both sample design and post-stratification design, as well as in the interrelationships between the two. In this letter the panel offers observations and suggestions for the Census Bureau's consideration as the work proceeds to complete the ACE design.

BACKGROUND

Because it is not possible to count everyone in a census, a post-enumeration survey is an important element of census planning. The survey results are combined with census data to yield an alternative set of estimated counts that are used to evaluate the basic census enumeration and that can be used for other purposes. For 2000, an Integrated Coverage Measurement (ICM) survey had been planned for evaluation and to produce adjusted counts for all uses of the census.¹ The recent U.S. Supreme Court ruling against the use of sampling for reapportionment among the states eliminates the need for a post-enumeration survey that supports direct state estimates, as was originally planned for the ICM survey. (The state allocations of the ICM sample design deviated markedly from a proportional-to-size allocation in order to support direct state estimation. Specifically, the ICM design required a minimum of 300 block clusters in each state.) Alternative approaches are now possible for both sample and post-stratification designs for the 2000 ACE survey. As a result, the planned ACE post-enumeration survey will differ in several important respects from the previously planned ICM survey.

PLANS FOR ACE SAMPLE AND POST-STRATIFICATION DESIGN

Our understanding of the current plans for the ACE survey is based on information from Census Bureau staff.² Building on its work for the previously planned ICM, the Census Bureau will first identify a sample of block clusters containing approximately 2 million housing units and then will independently develop a new list of addresses for those blocks.³ In a second stage, a sample of block clusters will be drawn from the initial sample to obtain approximately 750,000 housing units, which was the number originally planned for the ICM. (Larger block clusters will not be drawn in their entirety; they will first be subsampled to obtain sampling units of 30-50 housing units. Because the costs of interviewing are so much greater than the costs of listing addresses, this subsampling approach allows the interviewed housing units to be allocated in a more effective manner.) Finally, in a third stage, a sample of block clusters will be drawn from the second-stage sample to obtain the approximately 300,000 housing units required for the ACE sample. The target of 300,000 housing units for the ACE, which may be modified somewhat, will be based on a new set of criteria that are not yet final.

The Census Bureau is considering three strategies for selection of the 300,000 ACE subsample from the 750,000 sample: (1) reducing the sample proportionately in terms of state and other block characteristics from 750,000 to 300,000; (2) reducing the sample by using varying proportions by state; or (3) differentially reducing the sample by retaining a higher proportion of blocks in areas with higher percentages of minorities (based on the 1990 census).⁴ These options for selection of the 300,000 ACE housing units from the 750,000 units first selected will be carefully evaluated. The plans include three evaluation criteria for assessing the options: (a) to reduce the estimated coefficients of variation for 51 post-stratum groups (related to the 357-cell post-stratification design discussed below); (b) to reduce the differences in coefficients of variation for race/ethnicity and tenure groups; and (c) to reduce the coefficients of variation for estimated state totals. (Option (3) above is motivated by criterion (b)). Without going into detail, it is also useful to mention that the Census Bureau has instituted a number of design changes from the 1990 post-enumeration survey for the ACE that will reduce the variation in sampling weights for blocks, which will reduce the sensitivity of the final estimates to results for individual blocks. This represents a key improvement in comparison with the 1990 design.

The current plan to produce post-strata involves modification of the 357-cell post-stratification design suggested for use in 1990-based intercensal estimation. Current modification under consideration by the Census Bureau include expansion of the geographic stratification for non-Hispanic whites from four regions to nine census divisions, adding a race/ethnicity group, changing the definition of the urbanicity variable, and adding new post-stratification factors, such as mail return rate at the block level. Logistic regression, modeling inclusion in the 1990 census, is being used to help identify new variables that might be useful, as well as to provide a hierarchy of the current post-stratification factors that will be used to guide collapsing of cells if that is needed. (In comparison, the analysis that generated the 357-cell post-stratification was based on indirect measures of census undercoverage, such as the census substitution rate.)

The Census Bureau plan demonstrates awareness of the interaction of its modification of the 750,000 housing unit sample design with its modification of the 357 post-strata design. (On the most basic level, the sample size allocated to each post-stratum determines the variance of its estimate.) The plan also makes clear that even though much of the information used to support this modification process must be based on the 1990 census, it is important that the ultimate design for the ACE survey (and any associated estimation) allows for plausible departures from the 1990 findings. For example, significant differences between the 1990 and 2000 censuses could stem from the change in the surrounding block search for matches, the planned change in the treatment of ACE movers, or changes in patterns and overall levels of household response.

OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

Sample design to select the 300,000 housing units

Because of the need to keep the ACE on schedule by initiating resource allocations that support the independent listing of the 2 million addresses relatively soon, as well as the need to avoid development and testing of new computer software, the Census Bureau has decided to subsample the 300,000 ACE housing units from the 750,000 housing units of the previously planned ICM design. The panel agrees that operational considerations support this decision.

¹Footnotes at end of attachment to the letter.

The cost of the constraint of selecting the 300,000 ACE housing units from the 750,000 ICM housing units, in comparison with an unconstrained selection of 300,000 housing units, is modest. While the constrained selection will likely result in estimates with somewhat higher variances, the panel believes that careful selection of the subsample can limit the increase in variance to that it will not be consequential. (By careful selection, the panel means use of the suggested approaches of the Census Bureau, or new or hybrid techniques, to identify a method that best satisfies the criteria listed above.) This judgment by the panel, although not based on a specific analysis by itself or the Census Bureau, takes into account the fact that a large fraction of the 750,000 housing units of the ICM design are selected according to criteria very similar to those proposed for the ACE design.

In addition, the panel notes that the removal of the requirement for direct state estimates permits a substantial reduction in sample size from the 750,000 ICM design in sparsely populated states, for which ACE estimates can now pool information across states. As a result the ACE design could result in estimates with comparable reliability to that of the previously planned, much larger ICM design.

Given the freedom to use estimates that borrow strength across states, the final ACE sample should reduce the amount of sampling within less populous states from that for the preliminary sample of 750,000 housing units. However, there is a statistical basis either for retaining a minimum ACE sample in each state, or what is nearly equivalent, for retaining a sample to support an ACE estimate with a minimum coefficient of variation. The estimation now planned for the ACE survey assumes that there will be no important state effects on post-stratum undercoverage factors. In evaluating the quality of ACE estimates, it will be important to validate this assumption, which can only be done for each state if the direct state estimates are of sufficient quality to support the comparison, acknowledging that for some of these analyses one might pool data for similar, neighboring states. (Identification of significant state effects would not necessarily invalidate use of the ACE estimates for various purposes but would be used as part of an overall assessment of their quality.)

This validation could take many forms, and it is, therefore, difficult to specify the precise sample size or coefficient of variation needed. We offer one approach the Census Bureau should examine for assessing the adequacy of either type of standard. Using the criteria for evaluating alternative subsample designs (i.e., the estimated coefficients of variation for 51 post-stratum groups, the differences in coefficients of variation for race/ethnicity and tenure groups, and the coefficients of variation for state totals), the Census Bureau should try out various state minima sample sizes to determine their effects on the outputs. It is possible that a moderately sized state minimum sample can be obtained without affecting the above coefficients of variation to any important extent. There are a variety of ways in which the assumption of the lack of residual state effects after accounting for post-stratum differences could be assessed, including regression methods. We encourage the Census Bureau to consider this important analytic issue early and provide plans for addressing it before the survey design is final.

The panel makes one additional point on state minima. The state minima will support direct state estimates that will be fairly reliable for many states. The Census Bureau should consider using the direct state esti-

mates not only for validation, but also in estimation—in case of a failure of the assumption that there will be no important state effects on undercoverage factors. Specifically, the Census Bureau should examine the feasibility of combining the currently planned ACE estimates at the state level with the direct state estimates, using estimated mean-squared error to evaluate the performance of such a combined estimate in comparison with the currently planned estimates. We understand that the necessity of prespecification of census procedure requires that the Census Bureau formulate an estimation strategy prior to the census, which adds urgency to this issue.

Finally, the panel has two suggestions with respect to the criteria used for assessing the ACE sample design. First, there should be an assessment of the quality of the estimates for geographical areas at some level of aggregation below that of states, as deemed appropriate by the Census Bureau. (This criterion is also important for evaluating the ACE post-stratification design, discussed below.) Second, the importance of equalizing the coefficients of variation for different post-strata depends on how estimates for specific post-strata with higher coefficients of variation for post-strata that do not have much effect have less need to be controlled, assuming that the estimates for these post-strata do not have other uses.

Post-stratification plans

The 1999 census adjusted counts used 1,392 post-strata, but post-production analysis for calculating adjusted counts for intercensal purposes resulted in the use of 357 post-strata. The panel believes that the use of these 357 post-strata (and the hierarchy for collapsing post-stratification cells) was a reasonable design for 1990, and that, in turn, the 1990 design is a good starting point in determining the post-strata to be used in the 2000 ACE. The Census Bureau is considering four types of modifications to the 357 post-strata design, although it has not yet set the criteria for evaluating various post-stratification designs. Logistic regression will be used to identify new variables and interactions of existing variables that might be added to the post-stratification. Finer post-strata have the advantage of greater within-cell homogeneity, potentially producing better estimates when carried down to lower levels of geographic aggregation. Some gains with respect to the important problem to lower levels of geographic aggregation. Some gains with respect to the important problem of correlation bias might also occur. However, stratifying on factors that are not related to the undercount will generally decrease the precision of undercount adjustments. The tradeoff between within-cell homogeneity and precision needs to be assessed to determine whether certain calls should be collapsed and whether additional variables should be used.

It is also important to examine the effects of various attempts at post-stratification on the quality of substate estimates, especially since certain demographic groups are more subject to undercoverage, and so substate areas with a high percentage of these groups will have estimates with higher variances. (This argument is based on the fact that, as in the binomial situation, the mean and the variance of estimated undercounts are typically positively related.) We believe it is extremely important that analysis at substate levels of aggregation be conducted to inform both the sample design and the post-stratification scheme. Furthermore, this issue needs to be studied simultaneously with that of the effect of the design and post-stratification on the post-stratification on the post-stratum estimates. The fact that anal-

ysis of substate areas appears in both sample design and post-stratification design is an indication of the important interaction between these two design elements and justifies the need for studies of them to be carried out simultaneously. The panel encourages the Census Bureau to work on them at the same time.

The panel notes that the decision to use a modification of the 357-strata system from 1990 for the ACE post-stratification design will probably not permit many checks against estimates from demographic analysis that use direct estimates from ACE. This limitation may increase the difficulty of identifying the precise source of large discrepancies in these comparisons. However, the panel does not view this as a reason not to proceed, since the precision of direct estimates at the finest level of detail of post-stratification (using 1,392 strata in this context) could make such comparisons more difficult to interpret, and the estimates from demographic analysis are not extremely useful for this purpose (except for blacks, and then only nationally).

As work on both the sample design and post-stratification design progresses, the Census Bureau should not rely entirely on information from the 1990 census: substantial differences might occur between the 1990 and the 2000 censuses that would lead to either a sample design or a post-stratification design that was optimized for 1990 but that might not perform as well in 2000. Instead, the Census Bureau should use a sample design that moves toward a more equal probability design than 1990 information would suggest. Similarly, the Census Bureau, using whatever information is available since 1990 on factors related to census undercoverage, should develop a post-stratification design that will perform well for modest departures from 1990.

Finally, when considering criteria for both sample design and post-strata, it is important to keep in mind that the goal of the census is to provide estimated counts for geographic areas as well as for demographic groups. Since the use of equal coefficients of variation for post-strata will not adequately balance these competing demands, the Census Bureau will need to give further attention to this difficult issue. The balancing of competing goals is not only a post-stratification issue, but also a sample design issue. For example, if block clusters that contain large proportions of a specific demographic group are substantially underrepresented in the ACE sample, the performance of the estimates for some areas could be affected.

Documentation

Given the importance of key decisions and input values for the ACE design, it is important that they be documented. In particular, the Census Bureau should produce an accessible document in print or in electronic form that (1) gives the planning values for state-level, substate level, and post-stratum level variances resulting from the decisions for the sample and post-stratification designs and (2) provides the sampling weights used in the ACE selection of block clusters.

SUMMARY

From its review of the Census Bureau's current plans for design of the ACE survey, the panel offers three general comments;

The panel concludes that the general nature of the Census Bureau's work on the ACE design represents good, current practice in sample design and post-stratification design and their interactions.

The panel recognizes that operational constraints make it necessary for the Census Bureau to subsample the ACE from the previously planned ICM sample. The subsampling, if done properly, should not affect the

quality of the resulting design if compared with one that sampled 300,000 housing units that were not a subset of the 750,000 housing units previously planned for the ICM.

The panel believes that removal of the constraint to produce direct state estimates justifies the substantial reduction in the ACE sample size from the ICM sample size. The planned ACE could result in estimates with comparable reliability to that of the larger ICM design.

The panel offers three suggestions for the Census Bureau as it works to finalize the ACE design, some of which the Census Bureau is already considering: (1) a method for examining how large a state minimum sample to retain; (2) some modifications in the criteria used to evaluate the ACE sample design and post-stratification, namely, lower priority for coefficients of variation for excessively detailed post-strata and more attention to coefficients of variation for sub-state areas; and (3) a possible change in the ACE estimation procedure, involving use of direct state estimates in combination with the currently planned estimates. In addition, the Census Bureau should fully document key decisions for the ACE design.

The panel looks forward to continuing to review the ACE design and estimation as the Census Bureau's plans are further developed. The panel is especially interested in the evolving plans for post-stratification design, including the use of logistic regression to identify additional post-stratification factors; plans for the treatment of movers in ACE; and the treatment of nonresponse as it relates to unresolved matches in ACE estimation. In addition, after data have been collected, the panel is interested in the assessment of the effect of nonsampling error on ACE estimation and the overall evaluation criteria used to assess the quality of ACE estimates.

We conclude by commending you and your staff for the openness you have shown and your willingness to discuss the ACE survey and other aspects of the planning for the 2000 census.

Sincerely,

JANET L. NORWOOD, *Chair*,
Panel to Review the 2000 Census.

Attachment: Panel Roster.

PANEL TO REVIEW THE 2000 CENSUS

Janet L. Norwood (*Chair*), Urban Institute, Washington, DC

Robert M. Bell, RAND, Santa Monica, CA
Norman M. Bradburn, National Opinion Research Center, Chicago, IL

Lawrence D. Brown, Department of Statistics, University of Pennsylvania

William F. Eddy, Department of Statistics, Carnegie Mellon University

Robert M. Hauser, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin

Roderick J.A. Little, School of Public Health, University of Michigan

Ingram Olkin, Department of Statistics, Stanford University

D. Bruce Petrie, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Ontario

Andrew A. White, *Study Director*
Constance F. Citro, *Senior Program Officer*
Michael L. Cohen, *Senior Program Officer*

FOOTNOTES

¹See National Research Council (1999), *Measuring a Changing Nation: Modern Methods for the 2000 Census*. Michael L. Cohen, Andrew A. White, and Keith F. Rust, eds., Panel to Evaluate Alternative Census Methodologies, Committee on National Statistics, National Research Council. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

²See Kostanich, Donna, Richard Griffin, and Deborah Fenstermaker (1999), *Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation Survey: Plans for Census 2000*. Unpublished paper prepared for the March 19, 1999, meeting of the Panel to Review the 2000 Census. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

³The use of the term block cluster refers to the adjoining of one or more very small blocks to an adjacent block for the purpose of the ACE sample design. Large blocks often form their own block clusters.

⁴The Census Bureau is aware that mixtures of strategies (2) and (3) are also possible, although such mixtures are not currently being considered.

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

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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 of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

END THE HOSTILITIES BEFORE OUR MILITARY RESOURCES ARE FURTHER DEPLETED

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

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this special order today so that we may share with the American people and all the Members of Congress the results of our peace mission this past weekend to Vienna which was led by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON). As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I felt a special responsibility to our service men and women to find a way to end the hostilities before their lives are further endangered and before our military resources are further depleted.

□ 2015

As a Member of Congress, I felt that the people of my congressional district wanted me to pursue a peaceful and diplomatic end to a conflict that could escalate into wider hostilities.

I believe that the eleven Members of the House delegation significantly increased the opportunity for a diplomatic settlement to the current hostilities in Kosovo without further loss of life. We did so in a way that will help accomplish the U.S. and NATO goals of ending ethnic cleansing and providing for the return of the refugees to an autonomous Kosovo.

We met extensively with our counterparts this weekend in the Russian Duma who are also committed to bringing a peaceful resolution to this conflict. Russia is a key player in finding a diplomatic resolution, and we must keep in mind that our continued involvement in the bombing campaign threatens future relations between the United States and Russia.

The members of the Russian Duma we met with agree that the Balkan crisis poses a tremendous threat to inter-

national security, and they share our desire for a diplomatic solution rather than military escalation. Failure to find such a solution not only will undermine Russian-American relations but will further exacerbate the human suffering caused by the terrorism, the ethnic cleansing and massive refugee problems in the region.

The end product of our sessions with the Duma provides a realistic framework for the administration to negotiate an end to the Balkan crisis. We call for practical measures to achieve three equally important tasks: withdrawal of Serbian armed forces from Kosovo, an end to the NATO bombing of Yugoslavia and a cessation of the military activities of the KLA. All three of these goals must be accomplished to recognize a lasting peace.

We can accomplish these tasks by allowing a voluntary return of all refugees and the unhindered access to them by humanitarian aid organizations. NATO would be responsible for policing Yugoslavia's borders to ensure that weapons do not reenter Yugoslavia with the returning refugees. An armed international force, not composed of the major combatants, would administer the peace in Kosovo, and the Russians are very willing to participate in that armed international force.

A sense of the Congress resolution is being finalized which would put Congress on record in support of our framework for peace. It is our hope that such a resolution will be voted on later this week and that the administration will also pursue the diplomatic route to peace, including further discussions with the Russians.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution when it comes to the House Floor for a vote. Neither our congressional delegation nor the members of the Russian Duma were negotiating on behalf of our respective governments, but we are confident that the framework we jointly developed clears the path for a solution to the crisis that will both end the ethnic cleansing and stop the bombing.

I am proud to have been a part of this bipartisan peace mission. The eleven Members of Congress who sat at the same table for 19 hours with members of the Russian Duma are committed to finding a diplomatic avenue acceptable to all parties that will bring peace to the region. I am convinced that the framework we established will pave the way for a lasting peace.

Unlike some of my colleagues, I am very confident in the ability of our Armed Forces to win this war. But I believe that we must continue to prepare for all-out war, and we must fund our Armed Forces, but we must also search for peaceful solutions.

The time is ripe. The Russians will help, and the Serbs are ready to avoid a wider war that will totally destroy their country and also sacrifice the lives of our brave young men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces.

GIVE PEACE A CHANCE IN THE BALKANS WAR

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, this evening I join my colleagues down here in the well of the House on the floor to join myself with their remarks. My colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN), I am sure are going to speak eloquently on this very subject that we are talking about this evening and that is that our hope as we stand here this evening is an opportunity to give peace a chance in the Balkans war.

No war, no conflict and certainly no humanitarian crisis has ever been resolved by bombing a country into oblivion. May I say that, as a veteran of two wars myself, that diplomacy is always preferable to war. And I am sure that we all recognize that this Balkan crisis, the war over there in Yugoslavia, the ethnic cleansing, the terrorism, the human tragedies, are an enormous crisis that this world faces; and military escalation by itself will not end, nor will it solve, this crisis. In fact, it may even precipitate an increase with the threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Perhaps I can explain that in just a few words. Whenever a small country is opposed by an organization of 19 other nations, the propensity of that country to defend itself may reach extremes. To that end, it may reach for those arsenals that it could acquire from some other country of a weapon of mass destruction, whether it is chemical, whether it is biological or even whether it is nuclear, in order to defend itself from the onslaught of an attack.

I urge this administration and I urge my colleagues here this evening to seriously consider the efforts and the recommendations of the U.S. Congress and the Russian Duma meeting that was held in Vienna, Austria, this last weekend. I urge them to consider the recommendations in order to bring about a fair, an equitable and a peaceful settlement between the warring factions in Yugoslavia.

This meeting that was held with the leaders of the Russian factions in their Duma, which is our equivalent of the House of Representatives here in Congress, reached consensus, reached an agreement, on areas that we thought would form a framework for the resolution, the peaceful resolution, I might add, of the Yugoslavia crisis.

Those include, first, ending the ethnic crisis, the ethnic cleansing and terrorism; an end of the NATO bombing; an absolute removal of the Serbian military forces; an emplacement of an international peacekeeping force that will ensure the peaceful repatriation of the refugees back into Kosovo, and wide autonomy is the final goal for Kosovo.

I think all of us here in this room this evening can agree that these are

elements that we can all consider as a solution for this crisis, elements which will allow us to resolve this.

May I say that later this week my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will have an opportunity to deal with the concurrent resolution that is the result of the recommendations of this meeting in Vienna, Austria, a historic meeting, and now this resolution will simply state a sense of Congress as to the meaning that diplomacy is always better than warfare.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will give peace a chance as we debate this issue and vote on it later this week.

May I also say that it has been a great pleasure to work with my friends on both sides of the aisle when we have a common goal, a common goal of peace, not only in the Balkans but peace in the world.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to have stood down here to associate myself with my colleagues' remarks as we go forward in this process of seeking an alternative to an escalated war in Yugoslavia. I would like to thank them for the bipartisanship and the friendship and the collegiality that was demonstrated throughout this meeting. It is indeed a great honor for me to stand here, arm in arm, shoulder to shoulder, in this effort to bring peace to this world.

VIENNA PEACE TALKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Duma-U.S. Congressional Study Group, I want to take a moment to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) for his leadership in this area.

I traveled with my colleagues to Vienna, Austria, last weekend to help bring cooperation between members of the Russian parliament and the United States Congress.

The United States-Russian Duma Study Group was created 5 years ago, and I have been an active participant in the organization for the last 3 years. As a group, our members meet to discuss national security, military affairs, housing, economic development and social welfare policies.

The importance of the working group cannot be overstated, since personal relationships by members of each of the respective governments are created, thus permitting for greater openness and increasing trust between the two governing bodies of each country.

Because Russia and Serbia have close ethnic and historical ties, I believe that members of the Russian Duma can play an important role in convincing the Serbian government to put a halt to the ethnic cleansing and help stop the refugee crisis.

I believe that the humanitarian crisis cannot be solved by just a bombing

campaign and that a diplomatic solution is much more desirable than military escalation. A spread of the violence will only bring about increasing division, hatred and resentment and violence, but a diplomatic solution could lead to the increase of communication and understanding between the two sides and save countless lives.

As a Member of Congress, I feel that it is my responsibility to do everything I can within my capacity to help end this war.

I would like to point out that the congressional delegation's discussions with the Duma were not meant as a slight to the administration nor an undermining of NATO's authority. Rather, members of our group traveled to Austria to increase communication between the warring sides and act as a conduit to the present talks taking place between President Clinton, foreign policy experts and members of the Russian Government.

The main point of contention which I brought to the talks with the Russian Duma was that ethnic cleansing is, in essence, the root cause of the conflict. As the only mother in the room during the talks, I felt that it was necessary to recognize the tragedies of the refugee families.

The Russian delegation originally refused to acknowledge that it was the ethnic cleansing that began this conflict and not the NATO bombing, but before they walked away from our discussion they acknowledged that it was the ethnic cleansing that began this conflict.

Our discussion resulted in a framework for peace negotiations. One of the guidelines I would like to see during the peace negotiations is a cease-fire, a time-out from the fighting, so that both parties can refrain from fighting in order to negotiate with one another in a diplomatic fashion.

In order to smooth out the road to diplomacy, the Congressional-Duma Study Group suggests a threefold approach to resolving the conflict. This includes a temporary end to the NATO bombing, along with the withdrawal of the Serbian Armed Forces from Kosovo and the KLA military activities.

We demand a recognition of the basic principles of the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia, including greater autonomy for Kosovo and just treatment of all Yugoslavian people.

□ 2030

We also support efforts to provide international assistance to rebuild the destroyed homes of the refugees, as well as other humanitarian assistance.

This was a productive meeting, and I am hopeful that it will not be our last. We are all in agreement that we want a quick and peaceful end to the crisis, while keeping positive relationships between Russia and the United States.

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

(Mr. SAXTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

A FRAMEWORK FOR SETTLING THE KOSOVO CRISIS

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, some of us have recognized for a long time that it was terribly important that Russia become increasingly involved in the crisis in Yugoslavia.

Russia is, I think as everybody knows, Yugoslavia's major ally and major supporter. If Russia could be brought into the process supporting the humanitarian goals of the stopping of ethnic cleansing, it would be a major step forward in solving what is increasingly becoming a very, very horrible situation in the Balkans.

Within that light, I was very delighted to learn about a trip to Vienna, Austria, that was being organized by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CURT WELDON), who has done an excellent job in trying to improve relations between the United States Congress and the Russian Duma. He was organizing a trip which would involve 11 Members of the United States Congress to meet with the leaders of the Russian Duma.

On that trip, in addition to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), were the gentleman from New York (Mr. MAURICE HINCHEY), the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. NEIL ABERCROMBIE), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DENNIS KUCINICH), the gentleman from Florida (Ms. CORINNE BROWN), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DON SHERWOOD), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. ROSCOE BARTLETT), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. JIM GIBBONS), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOSEPH PITTS). There were six Republicans, four Democrats, and myself, who is an Independent.

Mr. Speaker, in arriving in Vienna and meeting with the Russians, I think we were all delighted that the Russians shared our strong concerns about bringing peace to Yugoslavia. We were able, after a lot of discussion, to come up with an agreement.

As others have said, we were not there to negotiate the fine points of a treaty. That was not our job. But we were there to see if we could come together on the broad outlines of what a peace process would mean for the Balkan area, and I think we did that.

Mr. Speaker, let me just touch on some of the important points that the Russians and our delegation agreed upon.

"We call on all of the interested parties to find practical measures for a parallel solution to three tasks, without regard to sequence;" in other

words, to do it in a simultaneous manner. That is, "the stopping of the NATO bombing of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; the withdrawal of Serbian Armed Forces from Kosovo, and the cessation of the military activities of the KLA."

What we have said is that these steps should be accomplished through a series of confidence-building measures, which include but should not be limited to the following:

A, the release of all prisoners of war. When we stated that, our three POWs were, of course, still being held by Yugoslavia, and a few hours after this agreement was reached Milosevic, as it turns out, released our three POWs.

My own view is that, consistent with this agreement, in an act of good faith on our part, we should release the two Serbian POWs that we are holding. But our agreement called for the release of all prisoners of war.

Second of all, what we said is the voluntary repatriation of all refugees in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and unhindered access to them by humanitarian aid organizations. In other words, what we were agreeing to is that the people who have been driven out of their homes whose villages were burned by Yugoslavia should be allowed to return to their homes and be allowed all of the humanitarian help they can receive.

Thirdly, and on a very important point, there was agreement on the composition of the armed international forces which would administer Kosovo after the Serbian withdrawal.

The composition of the group should be decided by a consensus agreement of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, in consultation with Macedonia, Albania, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and the recognized leadership of Kosovo.

This is a very important step forward, because what this means is the Russians are saying very clearly that there should be armed international forces, something that many of us understand is absolutely necessary if the people of Kosovo are to return safely and with protection to their homes.

I think increasingly, within our own administration and all over the world, there is an understanding that that armed international force need not strictly be NATO. That is what we are saying here, and that is what the Russians have agreed to.

Then we said that the above group would be supplemented by the monetary activities of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think that this trip was a significant step forward in bringing the Russians into the peace process. I was very proud and delighted to be there with my fellow representatives from the United States Congress.

AGREEMENT REACHED IN VIENNA PROVIDES A FRAMEWORK FOR RESTORING PEACE IN YUGOSLAVIA AND KOSOVO

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewomen for giving me the opportunity to go forward.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, had the opportunity to join my colleagues in the trip to Vienna to meet with leaders of the Russian Duma.

Mr. Speaker, in this audience tonight we have some young people who are visiting our Nation's Capitol, and as I was looking up there getting ready to speak, I was reminded of the time when I was in school at that age, and we had in this country a different type of relationship with Russia.

It was the height of the Cold War, and at school they used to do drills. Some people will remember the drills. They were called duck and cover drills. We would have to, anticipating there would be a nuclear attack, we would actually have to get down under our desks, cover our heads, and close our eyes so we would not see the flash that was supposed to be a nuclear attack.

Mr. Speaker, that was an era of terror. It was an era when the United States and Russia were at odds over the great global consequences of whether capitalism or communism would rule the earth.

Have we come a long way from those days? Yes. We worked throughout the seventies to build down nuclear arms, we worked throughout the eighties to reestablish a relationship with Russia, and in the nineties we have in the United States been responsible for helping Russia rebuild itself economically, and assisted in so many ways as partners in peace.

But yet, Mr. Speaker, that very peace and that partnership has been threatened by the Balkan conflict, because Russia has seen this conflict in other terms, and only a week ago the leader of the Yablako faction in Russia, Vladimir Luhkin, was quoted in worldwide news reports as saying a blockade of the port in Montenegro would be a direct path to nuclear escalation, setting aside years and years of progress that we made and launching us right back into the Cold War.

How important it was to have Members of this Congress go to Vienna, Austria, to sit down with that very same leader and other leaders of the Duma, the leader of Mr. Chernomyrdin's party, one of the leaders of the Communist party, to sit down with those individuals face-to-face, sharing our common human interest in protecting the life of this planet and sharing our interest in relieving the suffering of the Kosovar Albanians and of the people who are being bombed throughout the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

So we came together as brothers and sisters in search of peace. We came together hoping to create a framework for peace which we could bring back to our Nation and give our nations an opportunity to reconstruct, in this fragile and even grim climate, an opportunity to set the world on the path of light instead of the path of might, on the path of negotiation instead of the path of annihilation; to create for the world a new opportunity towards peace.

We came in peace, and we departed as brothers and sisters in search of peace, with a framework which I am pleased to have a copy of here.

Mr. Speaker, I include this framework for the RECORD.

The material referred to is as follows:

REPORT OF THE MEETINGS OF THE U.S.
CONGRESS AND RUSSIAN DUMA
VIENNA, AUSTRIA
30 April—1 May 1999

All sessions centered on the Balkan crisis. Agreement was found on the following points

I. The Balkan crisis, including ethnic cleansing and terrorism, is one of the most serious challenges to international security since World War II.

II. Both sides agree that this crisis creates serious threats to global and regional security and may undermine efforts against non-proliferation.

III. This crisis increases the threat of further human and ecological catastrophes, as evidenced by the growing refugee problem, and creates obstacles to further development of constructive Russian-American relations.

IV. The humanitarian crisis will not be solved by bombing. A diplomatic solution to the problem is preferable to the alternative of military escalation.

Taking the above into account, the sides consider it necessary to implement the following emergency measures as soon as possible, preferably within the next week. Implementation of these emergency measures will create the climate necessary to settle the political questions.

1. We call on the interested parties to find practical measures for a parallel solution to three tasks, without regard to sequence: the stopping of NATO bombing of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, withdrawal of Serbian armed forces from Kosovo, and the cessation of the military activities of the KLA. This should be accomplished through a series of confidence building measures, which should include but should not be limited to:

a. The release of all prisoners of war.

b. The voluntary repatriation of all refugees in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and unhindered access to them by humanitarian aid organizations. NATO would be responsible for policing the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia's borders with Albania and Macedonia to ensure that weapons do not re-enter the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia with the returning refugees or at a later time.

c. Agreement on the composition of the armed international forces which would administer Kosovo after the Serbian withdraw. The composition of the group should be decided by a consensus agreement of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council in consultation with Macedonia, Albania, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and the recognized leadership of Kosovo.

d. The above group would be supplemented by the monitoring activities of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

e. The Russian Duma and U.S. Congress will use all possibilities at their disposal in

order to successfully move ahead the process of resolving the situation in Yugoslavia on the basis of stopping the violence and atrocities.

2. We recognize the basic principles of the territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which include:

a. wide autonomy for Kosovo

b. a multi-ethnic population

c. treatment of all Yugoslavia peoples in accordance with international norms

3. We support efforts to provide international assistance to rebuild destroyed homes of refugees and other humanitarian assistance, as appropriate, to victims in Kosovo.

4. We, as members of the Duma and Congress, commit to active participation as follows:

Issue a Joint U.S. Congress-Russian Duma report of our meetings in Vienna. Concrete suggestions for future action will be issued as soon as possible.

Delegations will agree on timelines for accomplishment of above tasks.

Delegations will brief their respective legislatures and governments on outcome of the Vienna meetings and agreed upon proposals.

Delegations will prepare a joint resolution, based on their report, to be considered simultaneously in the Congress and Duma.

Delegations agree to continue a working group dialogue between Congress and the Duma in agreed upon places.

Delegations agree that Duma deputies will visit refugee camps and Members of Congress will visit the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement begins with stopping the bombing, a withdrawal of the Armed Forces from Kosovo, a cessation of military activities of the KLA, releasing all prisoners, returning all refugees, providing for their safekeeping with an international peacekeeping force, rebuilding their shattered homes, and helping to rebuild their shattered lives.

This is such a great country with such a great heart, because we care about people all over this world. We want to bring peace to those who are suffering.

Our delegation, Mr. Speaker, gave us a chance, at a moment when it looked like escalation was the only recourse, with the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CURT WELDON), with the participation of our leader, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. NEIL ABERCROMBIE), we finally had the opportunity to begin anew to look at each other as brothers and sisters in search of peace, to come up with a framework which we would all hope would be the start of a new opportunity to look forward to perhaps a cease-fire, to a cessation of bombing, to restoring the refugees and rebuilding the war-ravaged area.

Let us continue to pray for peace, and let us continue to act in consonance with our prayers.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must remind all Members that it is not permissible to introduce or bring to the attention of the House any occupant of the gallery.

BIPARTISAN DELEGATION TRAVELS TO BRUSSELS TO SEEK PEACE IN THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the other Members who are here this evening. I will not take the full time, but I will merely read a brief excerpt as an addendum to the remarks that have been made at this point.

We are very grateful to our colleagues who are here on another matter tonight who have graciously consented to allow this interruption because of the serious nature of the business that was conducted this past weekend.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read just some excerpts from a letter addressed to the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. IKE SKELTON), a letter sent to him today in conjunction with the report that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) just cited and the activities that we engaged in in Vienna this past weekend.

The letter was a cover letter also containing the resolution that we expect to bring forward to all of our colleagues here on the floor shortly that we hope will provide a path towards reconciliation and resolution of the crisis in Kosovo.

Mr. Speaker, I will just read briefly from the letter:

Dear Ike, as you are aware, I recently returned from a trip to Vienna as the senior Democrat on a congressional delegation that met with the leadership of the Russian Duma. My earlier trip to the region prompted me to lead a group comprised of Corinne Brown, Maurice Hinchey, and Dennis Kucinich. Since you are the ranking member on the Committee on Armed Services, I wanted you to have a copy of the report of the meetings to review.

Not only did we arrive at a viable framework around which the Congress and the Duma can facilitate an end to the violence in the Balkans, we learned much from our Russian colleagues. Our Duma counterparts represented the full spectrum of ideology and Russian politics. Together we reached agreement on three important components of peace and a possible road to implementation.

More than ever, I am convinced that the road to peace is through Moscow. Without movement towards peace, I see escalating costs, increasingly convoluted options, and unacceptable casualties just over the horizon.

Undermining the Administration's objectives was certainly not our desire, and I wish to reiterate that the delegation was not on a mission to negotiate peace. Instead, we were on a mission to reach out to our Russian counterparts. Because of her unique historic and cultural ties to Serbia, Russia has the credentials to act as an intermediary in achieving a negotiated peace in the Balkans.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this letter for the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

NEIL ABERCROMBIE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 4, 1999.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SKELTON: As you are aware, I recently returned from a trip to Vienna as the senior Democrat on a Congressional delegation that met with leadership of the Russian Duma. My earlier trip to the region prompted me to lead a group comprised of Corrine Brown, Maurice Hinchey, and Dennis Kucinich. Since you are the ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services, I wanted you to have a copy of the report of the meetings to review.

Not only did we arrive at a viable framework around which the Congress and the Duma can facilitate an end to the violence in the Balkans, we learned much from our Russian colleagues. Our Duma counterparts represented the full spectrum of ideology and Russian politics. Together we reached agreement on three important components of peace and a possible road to implementation. More than ever, I am convinced that the road to peace is through Moscow. Without movement toward peace, I see escalating costs, increasingly convoluted options, and unacceptable casualties just over the horizon.

Undermining the administration's objectives was certainly not our desire, and I wish to reiterate that the delegation was not on a mission to negotiate peace. Instead, we were on a mission to reach out to our Russian counterparts. Because of her unique historic and cultural ties with Serbia, Russia has the credentials to act as an intermediary in achieving a negotiated peace in the Balkans.

The bipartisan delegation prepared a resolution expressing the sense of Congress in supporting the recommendations of the Vienna meeting to bring about a fair, equitable and peaceful settlement in Yugoslavia. That draft resolution is attached. Additionally, I have attached a letter I sent to minority Leader Gephardt. I ask that you also support a bipartisan caucus so that the delegation can brief all members of Congress. Absent a bipartisan caucus, I ask your support for the delegation to brief the Armed Services Committee.

This meeting with members of the Duma represents a singularly important step toward a negotiated solution. I seek your counsel and recommendations on how to best proceed.

Sincerely,

NEIL ABERCROMBIE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude my remarks by merely saying that the road to the resolution of this crisis is not in Belgrade and is not in Brussels, but is in fact in Moscow.

□ 2045

The 11 of us, the bipartisan delegation which went to Vienna, had as its sole purpose the reaching out to the Members of the Russian Duma in an attempt to bring resolution to this crisis and bring it to a resolution at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the time and I thank my colleagues for their generosity in providing it.

MOTHER'S DAY: A TIME TO REFLECT ON THE IMPACT OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE ON AMERICAN WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as we embark upon Mother's Day this coming Sunday, distinguished women of the House thought it was really fitting to come and talk again on women and Social Security and Medicare and how these two critical issues will impact women leading into the 21st century. I have gathered with me tonight a distinguished core of women of the House to speak on these critical issues.

As the Co-Vice Chair of the Women's Caucus, I think it is vitally important that we ensure retirement security for women as we work to strengthen Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the two women who have been in the forefront on these issues, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. THURMAN). Each will speak to these issues as we progress tonight.

Social Security has played a very vital role in ensuring financial security for most elderly women; however, there are still far too many elderly women living in poverty. In our work here in the House to establish a better and more secure retirement system, we must not exacerbate this situation but rather do all we can to resolve the discrepancy now and for all future generations.

Mr. Speaker, tonight is the night for women to speak to the two issues and to voice their concerns from their constituents in their respective states. So I will call on them tonight as they come to speak to this issue as we embark upon Mother's Day this coming Sunday.

I have tonight the great gentlewoman from the State of Florida (Mrs. MEEK), who will speak to this issue as she relates to it in the State of Florida.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank very much the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) my colleague, friend, and sister who is the Co-Vice Chairman of the Women's Caucus for yielding me this time, and acknowledge my associates in the Women's Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be a member of the Women's Caucus. It gives me a special chance to come before this body and talk about not only the contributions of women, but the issues and concerns of all women. Therefore, being a Member of Congress gives us a special platform where we can say to the Nation that as women we do have special concerns and special problems that this Congress should address.

Mr. Speaker, our government has a Social Security system. It is affecting women and it affects them in terms of their security and their retirement. But the truth is Social Security provides benefits on a gender-neutral basis. Benefits are based on an individual's earning record, employment history, and family composition.

Mr. Speaker, I am an older woman so I do know the benefits of Social Security and the benefits of retirement. I am not so sure the younger women who are in here tonight will be able to benefit from the Social Security system as I have. Hopefully, they shall. If it is up to this Women's Caucus, the women will get a chance to benefit.

Thus, while women tend to collect benefits over a longer period than men do because we live longer, our life expectancy is longer, women on an average have lower monthly Social Security benefits since they have lower earnings, more frequent breaks in employment because of our childbearing years, and we are more likely to be widowed or unmarried in retirement.

This occurs despite Social Security's inclusion of certain safety net provisions that generally narrow the gap in benefits between men and women. Some of the Social Security reform options currently being contemplated will change or eliminate the social adequacy components of the program, thus disproportionately affecting women relative to men.

It is important to note that women are generally paid less than men and women are more likely than men to leave the workforce. Our government must do everything possible to preserve Social Security. That is why the Women's Caucus is focusing on this. And it is very fitting. It is near Mother's Day. It is our day coming up.

We know that Social Security is perhaps the most important and the most successful antipoverty program ever adopted. Without Social Security, over 50 percent of the elderly would be in poverty. Social Security is a major source of income for 65 percent of beneficiaries over age 65.

Mr. Speaker, it is sort of important that we stress the many good benefits of Social Security. We are not saying that the Social Security system is the best in the world and it is the only thing and it cannot be improved on. The Women's Caucus is not saying that. They are saying to take a look at it to be sure that it does what it purports to do and it continues to keep women out of poverty.

The problem many times in Social Security is worse for minority women because of our earnings over the years, and we are much poorer than white women, particularly white women age 65 years of age or older. As a Member of the Women's Caucus, particularly one over the years that has stressed older women, I ask my dear colleagues to consider the unique issues of women: Lower earnings, longer life spans, shorter work histories, greater dependency on spouses, divorce, and outliving

their spouse. The current Social Security system contains provisions that mitigate but do not eliminate these concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the women in the caucus and I want to thank our cochair, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for putting together this special order so they we could come tonight near Mother's Day in this fitting time and say that we want to help America understand that the unique issues of women should be carefully studied because women are extremely important to this country.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) for her comments. Now we will hear from the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and our cochair.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from California, for organizing this special order and calling attention to the plight of older women as we approach Mother's Day this weekend. I also thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for working on putting this special order together.

Social Security is tremendously important to all Americans, but particularly to women. Many women come to rely heavily on the Social Security system when they retire for a number of reasons. First of all, women earn less than men. For every dollar men earn, women earn 74 cents, which translates into lower Social Security benefits. I remember when I began working, it was 52 cents to the dollar. We got a raise. We are now at 74 cents to the dollar, but it is still terribly unfair and our Social Security benefits in our elderly years reflect this unfairness.

In fact, women earn an average of \$250,000 less per lifetime than men. Considerably less to save or invest for retirement. Therefore, they rely more on Social Security.

Women are half as likely than men to receive a pension. Twenty percent of women versus 47 percent of men over age 65 receive pensions. Further, the average pension income for older women is \$2,682 annually compared to \$5,731 for men.

Women do not spend as much time in the workforce as men. In 1996, 74 percent of men between the ages of 25 and 44 were fully employed full-time compared to 49 percent of women in that same age group. Women spend more time out of the paid workforce than do men in order to raise their families and to take care of their aging parents.

Women live longer than men by an average of 7 years. Social Security benefits are the only source of income for many elderly women. Twenty-five percent of unmarried women, widowed, divorced separated or never married rely on Social Security benefits as their only source of income. Not only will these women find themselves widowed, they are likely to be poor.

A recent report by the General Accounting Office showed that 80 percent of women living in poverty were not poor before their husbands died. The "feminization" of poverty is another reason why Social Security must be there for our senior citizens, particularly women in their elderly years.

The financial outlook for elderly women is pretty grim. The poverty rate among elderly woman would be much higher if they did not have Social Security benefits. In 1997, the poverty rate among elderly women was 13.1 percent. Without Social Security benefits, it would have been 52.3 percent. For elderly men, the poverty rate is much lower at 7 percent. If men did not have Social Security benefits, the poverty level among them would increase to 40.7 percent.

Social Security's family protection provisions help women the most. Social Security provides guaranteed inflation protected lifetime benefits for widows, divorced women, and the wives of retired workers. Sixty-three percent of female Social Security beneficiaries aged 65 and over receive benefits based on their husband's earning records, while only 1.2 percent of male beneficiaries receive benefits based on their wives' earning records. These benefits offset the wage disparity between men and women.

As we move forward with reform of our Nation's Social Security system, we must remember that women face special challenges. It is my hope that many of the contributing economic factors, particularly pay inequity, will soon be eliminated. In the meantime, Congress must take the economic well-being and security of women into account when discussing reform. Women clearly are at a disadvantage when facing retirement and poor elderly women have the most at stake in the Social Security debate. Any reform that is enacted must keep the safety net intact. Our mothers, our daughters and our granddaughters are counting on us.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put into the RECORD a story, a story about the life of one of my constituents. Her many years of work, the many things that she did in her life, and how much she now depends on Social Security for a safety net in her own life.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in calling upon Congress on both sides of the aisle to be very cautious in the reforms in Social Security to make sure that this safety net for men and women continues.

I am glad to be here tonight to remind my colleagues that it is critical that we take the different circumstances of women into account as the 106th Congress considers proposals to reform the current Social Security system.

Lucy Thomas' story illustrates many of the key issues.

Mrs. Thomas is 83 years old. She worked for 35 years as a waitress, earning less than minimum wage. At the same time, she reared two daughters, and cared for both her father as he became increasingly disabled with rheumatoid arthritis, and for her grandmother, a

farm woman who had virtually no income. She now depends solely on Social Security—\$650 a month. At age 71, she moved in with her daughter, Marilyn, because she could no longer work outside the home to supplement her Social Security income.

As a waitress and a bartender, Thomas and her husband barely made enough money to pay for their daily living expenses. Mrs. Thomas does not have a pension, nor does she have income-generating savings. Her current income consists of about \$8,000 a year from Social Security. She is one of the nation's elderly poor. Of that amount, \$1,600 is used for secondary health coverage. Last year she paid an additional \$1,000 in medical costs and another \$1,400 for a hearing aid. In the fall, a bout with stomach ulcers forced her to pay over \$200 for prescription drugs. Her daughter purchased most of her clothing and paid for her room and board for the past 12 years. Social Security is a real factor in her ability to survive with some dignity in her old age.

Mrs. Thomas' story is not unique. Many women come to rely heavily on the Social Security System when they retire, for a number of reasons.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) the distinguished cochair of the Women's Caucus, for her comments tonight.

Mr. Speaker, indeed America's older women do depend upon Social Security and Medicare for their security and their well-being. We have now another distinguished Member of the House who we will hear from as she voices her concerns for the women of North Carolina, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend my colleagues, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for having this special order, and the leadership of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) as the President of the Women's Caucus. Indeed they will bring the awareness to an issue that should be given and be a major concern to all women, because it is of economic value to us.

Mr. Speaker, Social Security provides an important base for the economic security of American women. Women represent 60 percent of all Social Security recipients. Today, the Committee on the Budget in their task force hearing shared with us that women actually receive 53 percent of all the benefits because, in fact, we live longer and how the Social Security progressivity is structured so that women who earn lower wages actually get a greater benefit because it is designed to be that kind of bridge.

□ 2100

However, because women live longer on average than men, they represent 70 percent of Social Security recipients after the age of 85. Unmarried women, including widows aged 65 and older, receive just about half of their total income from Social Security. So, indeed,

Social Security is very, very important, but it is also the survivor's safety net for a large number of women who are on Social Security.

Women also have a different work pattern. Many of them work part-time. Some of them, indeed, do not work at all for a period of time. Nearly three-fourths of 4 million older poor persons in this Nation are women, and older women are twice as likely as older men to be poor.

In 1996, older Caucasian women had a median personal income of \$9,990, while older black women's median income was \$7,110, and older Hispanic women's median income was \$6,372. One-fifth of older black women received less than \$5,000, and nearly three-fourths had an annual personal income under \$10,000 in that same year.

Women are also more likely to work part time and take out time from the work force. Therefore, they do not build up as much investment in Social Security. In fact, women are more likely to be out of the work force an average of 11.5 years to raise their children or to attend to ailing relatives.

Social Security has been a tremendous success in reducing the number of women in poverty since 1940. Now, this is not to say Social Security does not have problems, but it is to recognize that Social Security has been a safety net for women. And as we reform Social Security, we certainly need to make sure that the structure that aids in securing women, and particularly those women who are disadvantaged by receiving less money and disadvantaged by not being in the work force, are, indeed, protected.

Again, as I referred to the hearing in the Committee on the Budget today, there are several proposals out there, some looking to the private sector, some providing some transitional costs, talking about consumer taxes, and we need to make sure that those transitional costs are taken into account both for women with disabilities as well as those who are indeed at the end of the lower economic ladder.

Again, as we have this special order we want to bring to everyone's attention the value Social Security has been to women; and as we reform Social Security we want to urge those individuals looking at the various options to certainly understand that we should not have any less protection for women who have depended on this safety net being there. And, indeed, Social Security has been the one program that has worked for all Americans but particularly for women.

I want to commend, Mr. Speaker, again the Women's Caucus for bringing this issue and allowing us to bring to the Nation's attention how important Social Security is to the economic vitality of all women in this country.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

A woman who has kept the focus on women as it relates to Social Security is a former co-chair herself. I would

like to now yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. EL-EANOR HOLMES NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership; and I commend her and the gentlewoman from Connecticut for their work in organizing this special order to draw attention to the various special needs of women in Social Security.

We are told that there may well be no Social Security reform this year. I would regret that, though I want to go on record to say that it is certainly not true that Social Security is going bankrupt. We really do have more than a quarter of a century before that. Nevertheless, it certainly would be better if we could get a bipartisan consensus this session.

Let me say that I would rather see nothing, however, than see a new model based on some of the ideas that have come from the majority on Social Security. We do not need a new model for Social Security. We need a revitalized model.

The reason we do not need a new model is because the present model is a feminized model. It is literally organized around the needs of women, around longer lives, around those with lesser earnings, and, if I may say so, around housewives. In particular, the notions for personal savings accounts do not take into account this feminized model.

Most of the time when we talk about Social Security reform, we have reference to the elderly. I want to talk for my few minutes not about the elderly but about women whose Social Security is most endangered, because we are talking about Social Security in 2030, not Social Security in the year 2000.

Older women have been grandfathered in. Neither the Republican majority or anybody else in his right mind would dare touch Social Security today. They would not dare recommend personal savings accounts for Social Security today, not when 53 percent of those receiving Social Security would be at the poverty line without it; not when it is a major source for two-thirds of today's beneficiaries.

I want to focus on the baby boomers and the younger women whose earnings today translate into pensions or Social Security tomorrow. Those are the women who are not secure.

The last time women Members came to the floor to talk about Social Security, I spoke from my past work as chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, because it is from that work that I learned to focus on women's earnings. It is by focusing on women's earnings today that we have any idea of their pensions or their Social Security tomorrow. Only by looking at younger women in particular can we evaluate the notion of personal savings accounts.

I want to be clear that we should all be saving, and we should be doing more

in this Congress to encourage more saving: 401(k)s, IRAs, IRAs for homemakers. There is ever so much more we must do to encourage savings. And, indeed, savings in the United States is going down, and that is itself very serious. But the focus on earnings now is how we figure what workers will have tomorrow.

Let us look at women. Women today earn \$24,000, the average woman, year-round worker, \$24,973. For a man, it is almost \$10,000 more, \$33,674. What does a woman who earns less than \$25,000 have to put into a personal savings account? Something, I hope, but I guarantee it is too little. Social Security, as we know it, needs to be there for that woman. She cannot afford to put all of her eggs in a personal savings account basket.

No matter how we look at earnings, we draw the same conclusion. The progressive Social Security model now in place must be there especially for women.

First, for the large number of women with no earnings, what are they supposed to do with a personal savings account? Look at who they are. There are only 7 percent of men who spend time out of the work force; 21 percent of women spend time out of the work force. Look at part time. Seventy-four percent of men work full time; only 49 percent of women work full time. What are they going to put in personal savings accounts? What will their Social Security look like, for that matter?

That is why it has to be progressive, because they will have too little earnings in even to get out enough of Social Security unless we have the present system which benefits low earners.

Look at the labor force participation: 73 percent of men in the labor force, 63 percent of women. This translates into no pensions or pensions that are too small, and it certainly leaves very little for personal savings accounts.

Personal savings accounts are not progressive. They go with the market, not with need. I am with the market. I am in the market. I want more women to be in the market. But I would not want my future, if I earned under \$25,000 a year, to lie with the market.

By all means, go into mutual savings. But women cannot afford to leave Social Security as we know it today behind.

The Republican majority would attribute the difference in wages between men and women to the fact that women are out of the work force more than men, and they tell us that all the time when we complain about women's wages. That is true, but not entirely. And there is a debate between us as to what accounts for that gap.

But let us assume for the moment that they are indeed correct, for purposes of argument, that the difference is because women spend more time out of the work force; and may I ask them to please carry that thinking over to the needs of women into old age. If they spend less time in the work force,

they should be subject to less risk when it comes time for old age.

What will housewives contribute to personal savings accounts? What will part-time workers contribute to personal savings accounts? What will mothers who go into the work force later, who took time out, contribute to personal savings accounts? Where are the family values when it comes to security for today's young mothers?

I am not talking about my mother. Her Social Security is intact, and I think mine will be. But what about my daughters? That is who we must concentrate on now. What about the young mothers who are staying at home? And there are more of them because of the absence of a child care system, and many more are going back home rather than go where they would like to go, to work.

Retirement becomes and is a burden in the thoughts of these women, and we must make it less of a burden by encouraging them to save but also by assuring them that Social Security will be there in the progressive way that their mothers and grandmothers have known it.

Young women are most at risk. They are most in doubt. We cannot restore confidence in the Social Security System by dismembering it. We must look far more closely at the President's plan, where 62 percent of the surplus goes to Social Security and 15 percent to Medicare. Then, of course, we have a balanced notion of means tested personal savings accounts. We encourage savings and help people to save and encourage them to save.

If my colleagues do not like the President's plan, they should draw their own plan, but plan it around women who are the Americans who will most need the security our country has guaranteed for their mothers, for their grandmothers and for their great grandmothers.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California and the gentlewoman from Connecticut for their important work in drawing these issues to our continuing attention.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, Medicare and Social Security, as we know, will be two very important issues here in 1999. I cannot think of a more deserving person to come before us now to talk about these issues as discussion intensifies about the ways to strengthen Social Security and Medicare for the future for women. She has been in the forefront on these issues.

Certainly we recognize now that Medicare is required to cover screenings for osteoporosis and breast cancer. She has been in the forefront to make sure that this took place. We have with us now one of the leaders of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ROSA DELAURO), who will come and speak to us on these two very critical issues as we broach Mother's Day.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I truly am honored to stand here tonight with my colleague from California (Ms. JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD), who has taken a leadership role in our Women's Caucus, along with the Congresswoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), who spoke as well this evening, in trying to forge a unified coalition on two of the most important issues that face this Nation, and that is Medicare and Social Security.

□ 2115

Quite frankly, we cannot talk about one without the other because of their importance in terms of what they have done in lifting older Americans out of poverty in this country, what they have done to change the face of health care for older Americans. They have come to be two programs that working families rely on in retirement security. They have become, if you will, the twin pillars of retirement security.

As my other colleagues who have joined on the floor tonight, they too understand the effect that the Social Security system and Medicare have had on all Americans, and most particularly for tonight's discussion, for the stability and the financial well-being of women in their later years.

They also understand the need to protect these programs, to strengthen these programs, to view them as successful programs upon which we need to build, and to expand so that not only people today who are eligible and women today who are eligible for these programs, but those in my generation and the generation of my children and their children can utilize for their retirement security. That is what is at stake.

I might just say, with regard to Medicare, that what we need to continue in that effort is to make sure that, in fact, there are defined benefits that people know they can avail themselves of in Medicare and that primarily we can build on the Medicare system so that, in fact, we can offer some opportunity for some relief on prescription drugs.

I think all of us today who are talking with seniors with regard to Medicare and their health benefits would tell us that the single biggest difficulty that they have and where they put their health and their safety at risk is because they cannot afford prescription drugs today, and if we are going to strengthen and protect Medicare, that we must not turn it into a voucher program where people are told, "Here is a sum of money, you go out and find it on your own, ferret out a program, you are on your own, my friend," when what we ought to be doing is making sure that this program allows for the benefits to be there that they need and for them to be able to purchase and get some kind of relief for the costs of prescription drugs.

Let me turn, if I can for a moment, to Social Security. Because, as I have said, it is really our country's success

story. More than half of the elderly population would live in poverty today in this country were it not for Social Security.

Now, I have an 85-year-old mother and she said to me, "Rosa, these are supposed to be the golden years, but in many instances they turn out to be the lead years." And what she is doing is expressing the frustration, she gives a voice to that frustration that so many elderly women feel that in their older years. They face all kinds of obstacles to stability and to security, and without Social Security these obstacles would be even greater.

My colleagues have focused tonight on talking about the plight of women and how, in fact, Social Security does work for women today. And it is because they live longer, they are in and out of the work force, they make less money, they are often dependents, they rely on a cost-of-living increase, they rely on a month-to-month lump sum of money which they receive.

Much of that goes away if we follow a program which people are talking about today, and that is to get us to privatize the Social Security system. Those pieces of cost-of-living increases, benefits if you are a spouse, getting a month-to-month lump sum, consideration of less money earned by women, consideration of their being in and out of the work force, all of that is taken into consideration in the Social Security program today. That all goes away if we privatize Social Security.

I will speak for just a moment on my State of Connecticut. Social Security has lowered the poverty rate among elderly women from 46 percent to 8 percent. That means over 100,000 women are lifted out of poverty by Social Security in my State of Connecticut.

I want to mention one proposal that is on the table now that has been offered by the majority party, by the Republican leadership, and that is the Archer-Shaw plan which was promoted last week. I just want to say a few words about this plan, and I want to caution people to look at it very, very carefully.

This plan may be cloaked in the rhetoric of reform, but if we take a closer look at it, it is a risky scheme that will end Social Security and put millions of elderly women and men in jeopardy. We cannot let this happen. This is a delayed execution of the Social Security plan.

Let me just say that that is the goal. But even if the true goal of my colleagues or some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle was to improve retirement security, this plan does not get it done. It is flawed from a policy perspective. It claims to use the budget surplus to create individual retirement accounts. These accounts are personal in name only.

The CATO Institute, which is a very conservative organization, has talked about this proposal, and Michael Tanner of the Institute told the Washington Post last week, and I quote,

that "The individual accounts are phoney accounts. They are made up of a tax credit equal to 2 percent of each person's Social Security taxable wages. It would flip Social Security on its head by allocating, if you will, more money and resources to the wealthiest in our society."

It hurts women particularly. The claim is that the plan would extend Social Security further than the President's plan to protect the program. They hold up a Social Security actuary report that estimates that their plan would keep Social Security solvent for 75 years.

But, my friends, the devil is in the details. They do not talk about the specifics of the program. They hide the fact that ultimately this plan eliminates all the surpluses, it forces the Federal Government to have to increase taxes, cut spending in necessary programs, such as domestic programs that benefit women elsewhere in the budget. They evade the fact that if the rate of return on these individual accounts drops by just one percentage point, that the whole plan goes up in smoke and Social Security will fall short by about 10 percent.

The long and the short of it, one needs to look at it very carefully and very closely. What it attempts to do is deal with, as I talked about earlier, privatizing Social Security in the long run, which in fact is a detriment to the Social Security program, in my view, in general and in particular with regard to women.

One of the purposes of why we are here tonight is to talk about it, is public education. We need to let people know what is at stake and that, in fact, when we take a look at some of the schemes that are on the table, they are meant to turn Social Security on its head, to change the focus and the nature of this program that has meant so much in the lives of families today, and our specific topic, for women's lives today.

Again, we cannot afford to let it happen. I know that my colleagues are committed not only to speaking on the floor of this House but taking this message to the country to start to talk about women and Social Security, what it means, what it has meant in the past, what it means for the present, and what it means in the future, and that we are not going to allow this program, which has meant so much to the safeguard of women and the independence of women in their later lives, be jeopardized in any way.

The American public needs to know what is at stake. The American women need to know what is at stake. And I am proud to join with my colleagues tonight as we begin that program of public education.

I cannot thank my colleagues enough for letting me participate in this effort tonight.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I cannot thank my colleague enough for the leadership that she has

provided for us in this House to ensure that we have Medicare and Social Security as the top issues for women in 1999 and leading into the millennium.

I would like to echo what she said, because public education is important. We must make sure those who are today's citizens in this country, more of them are women and the elderly, do not get hooked and locked on this privatization of Social Security and Medicare, especially Social Security. We must ensure their well-being, their safety, their security by not having privatizing and not privatizing with these private accounts that is being discussed as we move into the discussion of Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now yield to a person who has been on point, who is one of the senior Members of the House, and she has just done a yeoman's job in talking about the unique effects that this proposal, Social Security and Medicare, will have on women. The distinguished gentlewoman from the State of Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) will now speak to us on Social Security and Medicare.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUANITA MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for championing this effort this evening and so many of the other initiatives that she has taken as a sparkling Member of this House, certainly the cause of women in this case, in her role as co-Vice Chair of the Democratic Women's Caucus to bring us all to the floor this evening to talk about Social Security, Medicare, and women in America.

I also want to acknowledge the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ROSA DELAURO), the assistant Vice Chair of our caucus, and so many of the other women that have joined us this evening, our good friend the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CARRIE MEEK), the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. KAREN THURMAN), the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. EVA CLAYTON), the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN MALONEY), and it literally goes from coast to coast.

Without question, Social Security is the lifeboat for a majority of seniors in our country and certainly for women. And even with Social Security, the poorest people in America today are women over the age of 80. So even the current program, as critical as it is to families and to citizens across our Nation, could be made stronger.

Certainly for women, we know that in the way that the formulas were written in past years they do not always receive as much as men because, when they did work, their pay was less. Others this evening have talked about women spending more time out of the work force raising their children, caring for their families, often caring for sick relatives. Women often work in jobs that have no pensions.

I was amazed to go into a little cookie shop in an airport in Chicago a couple years ago and I approached some-

one who worked there and I said, "How much do you pay?" And they said, "Minimum wage." And I said, "What are my health benefits?" They said, "You would not get any of those or retirement. Only management gets that." I said, "I guess I would not want to work here."

But often one of the young women I was talking to did not know the answers to those questions. She had to go back and ask the manager back behind the swinging doors. So many women who are working do not ask the important question, "What are my pension benefits?"

We know that most women who have lost their jobs as a result of ill-fated trade agreements, like NAFTA, lose their pensions as a result and, in fact, most of those who have lost their jobs under trade agreements like this, because they are minimum wage jobs and entry level jobs, are mainly minority women across this country.

We also know that most women do not begin saving for their retirement and they think it will not matter to create a savings account that would be a supplementary account to Social Security. And if they do have a little savings account or an investment account, they do not hold it long enough so that it would grow in a little bit of a larger nest egg. I want to say something about that this evening.

□ 2130

We also know that women who do manage to have a little bit of cash, if they have any at all, often do not look at other investments that they might make during their working years, for example, in buying a home.

Today, with interest rates the way they are, many, many people, if they check it out, this is not just women but people working across this country and paying rent, you would be surprised if you really looked at all the available programs, through your city, through your county, through your locality. You would find you could buy a home today cheaper probably than you could rent it. You ought to check that out. Because a home can become a very important source of equity. You own it. It does not belong to someone else.

It is very important this evening that all of us participate in this session to help educate the American people, and certainly women, about retirement planning. It is important if you are applying for a job to find out if that employer has a pension plan. Is it just Social Security? Or Social Security plus something else, like a 401(k) or an individual retirement account. If they do have a retirement account, what kind of plan is it? And are you, in fact, participating in that plan? Were you asked about it? Did you ask about it?

You really also, if you are married, need to know what your spouse's plan is. I cannot tell you how many women have come to me after the death of their husband and they say, "He didn't check the little box." That means that

my retirement pay from the company, putting Social Security aside for the moment, is less. And they, of course, do receive lower payments from Social Security on the death of a spouse.

So it is very important to know what your benefits are. You need to know which Social Security benefits you are entitled to. And the Social Security Administration will tell you that if you fill out the little card, they will be able to tell you how many quarters you have in, what your potential benefits might be, and you can get ready for that moment ahead of time. One of the biggest mistakes women make is not asking and not finding out soon enough.

Another issue women have to be concerned about, and the American Association of Retired Persons recommends these tips for women in addition to Social Security, think of your retirement security as a necessary expense, and no matter how small your check, take a few pennies or dollars out of that every month and put that in a pension program that is separate from Social Security, that can augment Social Security, which should be your base plan.

Think about setting up an Individual Retirement Account. Your banker, your credit union preferably, your employer can help you do this. But make sure that you control that money and that the employer does not control that money. Make sure you have a voice in that.

Also, figure out ways to try to control your spending. Create a budget with savings in mind, cut unnecessary expenses and pay credit card balances. If you can, think about resoling your shoes rather than buying new shoes or moving up or down the hem in your skirt rather than buying a new one. There are lots of ways to put a little bit of money aside for the future.

Really, it is a good idea to have a budget. Then you will come close to it or perhaps meet it, and you will begin to set up this little extra nest egg.

Whatever you do, invest with inflation in mind. When women tend to invest, they do so in very low-yielding assets. They find out that the income from those assets in later years really does not cover inflation and taxes.

So I think this evening is very important in helping women to think a little bit about planning for retirement. I know when I hold sessions in my own district on women and money, it is the most popular session that we have. Actually, more people attend that than the sessions we do on health. That is because women, though they have tremendous financial responsibilities in our schools, we do not always teach how to manage personal finances anymore. They used to have courses called home economics. Those are sort of outdated now, but we really need to have financial planning for all of our citizens, including women. I know every woman in this country has the ability to do that.

So I think my message tonight as a part of this excellent session that the

gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) has organized along with the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is that Social Security is your base plan, and those of us here will make sure that Social Security remains sound as a promise between generations. It is an insurance program, a program of promise to the Nation.

If there are seniors listening this evening, do not get high blood pressure, do not worry about Social Security. You do not have to contribute to any of those groups that make you pay money to say they will lobby for you here in Washington. We are your best lobbyists. Use us. You pay us through your tax dollars to do your work for you. Save those dollars that you are paying all those lobbying groups. Put it in an investment account for yourself to augment your Social Security.

The most important thing you can do to preserve Social Security and Medicare is to elect the right people to Congress. You know who they are, because they are right at home where you live. You do not have to come here to Washington to meet them.

Then if you have the ability, especially if you are younger or even if you are not that young, to set a little bit of extra money aside in a special savings account that earns interest, get a little bit of advice on that. Talk to some of your friends. Have some sessions where you live, in your neighborhood, in your church, in your senior retirement building. Start little clubs where you talk about investing money and take some of those bingo chips and take some of those little earnings that you have from bridge, even if it is a few dollars, and think about putting those dollars away and seeing what they will earn. Maybe you can do it as a group working with some of your credit union advisers, let us say, in your area.

It is important for you to learn about money. As you learn more, your children will learn, your grandchildren will learn, and the best teachers in America are our mothers and grandmothers. So they can do a lot to help those who are younger than they are to plan for their own retirements.

I really believe you can start saving at a very early age and you can start thinking about your future years, whether it is saving for education or saving for your retirement.

I want to compliment the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) for holding this special order this evening. She is doing a big favor to all the women and families of our country.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for the outstanding contribution she has made tonight and the ongoing leadership and support that she gives to these critical issues.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative

days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to talk about both Social Security and Medicare, we know that the faces of Medicare are really the faces of women you know. They are your mom, your grandma, your wife, your sisters. They might even be the person whom you see in the mirror.

Medicare, being an important issue, is very timely that we speak about it today and we talk about this critical issue as it relates to women age 65 and older. Women are 58 percent of the people who receive Medicare. At the age of 85, that number will rise to 71 percent. At age 85, women outnumber men in the Medicare program two to one. Women's average life expectancy is 6 years longer than men. At every age, women are at greater risk of poverty than men.

There are many gaps in the Medicare program, Mr. Speaker, and there are a number of gaps in this program, most notably the absence of coverage for prescription drugs and long-term care. Also, in Social Security, we know that, on average, women are in the workforce fewer years than men and earn less than men, yet women tend to live longer. Meanwhile, women's pension benefits are based on such factors as years in the workforce and lifetime earnings relative to those of their husband.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember that just 33 percent of women retirees 65 and older versus 53 percent of retired men at that age receive a private pension annuity fund. In fact, in 1994 those were the numbers. Women simply cannot rely on other forms of retirement savings to the extent to which men can. Women must continue to have a strong, secure Social Security and Medicare system that recognizes the need of widows and divorced women to receive their spouse's benefits.

Lastly, any effort to strengthen our retirement system must resolve this vast economic chasm that exists between women and men in America.

SECURITY, PROTECTION, SAFETY NET

Mr. Speaker, tonight Congresswoman DELAURO and I have gathered our colleagues to address two critical issues concerning women. As Co-Vice Chair of the Women's Caucus, I think it is vitally important that we ensure retirement security for women as we work to strengthen Social Security and Medicare. Social Security has played a pivotal role in ensuring financial security for most elderly women, however there are still far too many elderly women living in poverty. In our work to establish a better and more secure retirement system, we must not exacerbate this situation but rather, do all that we can to resolve the discrepancy now and for all future generations.

Mr. Speaker, the Social Security rules provide critical income security for women. The progressive benefit formula provides proportionately higher benefits for low earners than for high earners, which is important for women who continually earn less incomes than men. In 1997, the median annual earnings year-round for full-time workers was approximately \$33,000 for men and \$24,000 for women, which means women are earning 74.1% of the wages men earn.

For working women in their fifties, who should be earning close to their peak salaries, the income differential is equally disturbing. These women earned just 63 percent of what men of the same age earned in 1996. The entire group of older women have less than three-fifths the personal income of older men. In 1996, older women had a median personal income of approximately \$10,000.

Providing higher benefits for women through the current Social Security system helps compensate for the countless paychecks that are at most 73 percent of their male counterparts. Social Security also places the necessary emphasis on the value of raising children by helping homemakers establish retirement security. For these women, Social Security provides a retirement benefit equal to 50 percent of their spouses' benefits. For the homemaker who becomes divorced after at least 10 years of marriage, Social Security provides a retirement benefit based on her former spouse's benefits. In addition, Social Security provides widow's benefits equal to 100 percent of her husband's benefits for the older woman whose husband dies. Social Security survivor's benefits are even provided for younger widows whose children receive survivor's benefits while the widow is caring for them and not working.

For all of these reasons: the pay gap, the fact that women live longer than men, and the current Social Security benefit rules, is why a significant proportion of older unmarried women are solely dependent on Social Security. In 1994, 40 percent of unmarried women 65 and older who received Social Security depended on it for at least 90 percent of their income—and more than one-fifth had no other income. Even more alarming, half of older unmarried women of color relied on Social Security for 90 percent of their incomes, and for more than one-third of these women, Social Security was their only source of income. In real terms, this means that most elderly women are living on just \$10,000 to \$12,000 per year. Social Security clearly serves as a vital safety net for women who are divorced or become widows.

As strong as this system is, however, too many women fall through the cracks. Nearly three-fourths of the nation's four million who are elderly poor are women. Older women are twice as likely as older men to be poor. In addition to the consistently lower income women earn per year as compared to men, the disparity in other retirement options contributes to the feminization of poverty among our elderly women.

In the Nation's pension system, men benefit significantly more than women since most mothers do not have a consistent work history due to the time off for raising children. Just 33 percent of women retirees 65 and older versus 53 percent of retired men that age received a private pension annuity in 1994.

Women simply cannot rely on other forms of retirement savings to the extent to which men can. Women must continue to have a strong, secure Social Security system that recognizes the need for widows and divorced women to receive their spouses' benefits. Any effort to strengthen our retirement system must resolve this vast economic chasm that exists between women and men in America.

I would like to thank the women and men of the House who are joining us tonight to address women's retirement security.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the subject, Social Security, is on the minds of our constituents. Citizens want to know if there will be a system when they need it, and they want to know how the system impacts them as individuals, as family members, and as tax payers. They're asking good questions that require good answers.

It is especially encouraging to see the emphasis being given to the concerns of women. Comparing women to men, statistics demonstrate that women live longer, are paid less, and are more likely to depend on Social Security for retirement benefits. All women, whether or not they have been in the workforce, need to know how the system works.

I am pleased to join in supporting you on Tuesday May 4th as you discuss "Women and Social Security/Retirement". I know that there will be information disseminated that I will be able to share at the 11th District Forum, "Social Security & You", which I will host in Cleveland on May 22nd.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, recently, leaders of the National Council of Women's Organizations came to Washington. Foremost on their agenda was the impact of Social Security reform proposals on women.

These women said "Don't forget about us." Our nation's social security system has had a successful tradition of providing "assistance" to our seniors and disabled. However, changes in our society's economic and social conditions warrant structural revisions.

Although there is no immediate danger to the system, the threat of insolvency has moved us to take action to preserve Social Security for the "baby boom" generation. As such, this debate is not about whether reform is necessary, but what structural revisions would best suit our seniors.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you today that as we evaluate these revisions, I will not forget that Social Security benefits are essential to the women of America.

I will not forget that without Social Security, more than 50% of all women over age 65 would be living in poverty today.

I will not forget that during their most employable years, women earn only about 74% of what men are paid.

And, I will not forget that women are less likely to work full-time and more likely to spend time outside the paid labor force while raising children. As a result, only 26% of women over age 65 received a pension of annuity payment in 1995.

Our current Social Security benefits structure protects workers with lower lifetime earnings—including most women and minority workers. Social Security provides an inflation-protected benefit that lasts as long as the beneficiary lives. Since women tend to live longer than men, they are in greater danger of out-

living their other sources of retirement income; but it is impossible to outlive one's Social Security benefit.

The current system also provides extra benefits to spouses with low lifetime earnings which helps many women, even if they did not work at all outside the home.

Further, Social Security provides benefits to spouses of any age who care for children under 16 if the worker (other spouse) is retired, becomes disabled, or dies. Women represent 98 percent of recipients receiving benefits as spouses with a child in their care.

In the future, Social Security will continue to be important for women. As the labor force participation rates of women rise, women will reach retirement with much more substantial earnings histories than in the past. Therefore the percentage of women receiving benefits based solely on their own earnings history is expected to rise from 37 percent today to 60 percent in 2060. However, this means that 40 percent of women will continue to receive benefits based on their husband's earnings.

These aforementioned provisions allow us to claim that our current retirement system is equitable and just. Significantly, both financial necessity and social justice demand that to maintain this claim, a new system must retain minimum, guaranteed benefits and critical protections so that women are not penalized for inequity in pay and for taking care of the rest of us.

As Franklin Roosevelt stated: " * * * [this] law will take care of human needs." Let's not forget women's needs.

I urge my colleagues to remember women and support social security reform that would bring their real life needs and circumstances into account.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Congresswoman MILLENDER-MCDONALD and Congressman DELAURO for arranging this special order tonight. We must bring attention to the exceptional circumstances of women as we examine the Social Security issue. As other Members of Congress have mentioned tonight, there are a few simple facts that show why women are effected by changes made to Social Security more than their male counterparts. First of all, most women earn a lower salary than men and therefore put a smaller amount into the Social Security Trust Fund with every paycheck. They are also more likely to spend a portion of their lives out of the workforce than men and women are half as likely as men to receive a pension which means they depend on their Social Security check as their sole source of income. Finally, women live longer than men and depend on Social Security for a longer period of time.

Therefore, changes made to the Cost of Living Adjustment and the idea of converting Social Security funds in private accounts will have a drastic effect on the way that retired women live. These factors must be taken into consideration when we decide how to resolve the issue of the potential insolvency of the Social Security Trust Fund. While limiting COLA's may cut costs, it will lower the standard of living for retired women because they rely heavily on Social Security as their only means of income and they live longer and need these adjustments to stay out of poverty. Private accounts may also have a negative effect on the retirement income of women because they may outlive their accumulated funds. Private

accounts may put many women in a position where they live the later half of their retired years in poverty.

While Social Security is the economic mainstay for many women, we must also make a better effort to educate working women today about the benefits of investing in a pension plan. We must give them an opportunity to invest so they do not have to live out their golden years on an annual Social Security income that amounts to less than the minimum wage for most recipients. This coupled with making changes to the Social Security system that helps not harm women will improve the lives of all women in their retirement years.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all of the women who were here tonight. We did not cover this as extensively as I would have wanted to. We will be back, because as we embark upon Mother's Day we must remember the elderly women in this country and their need for Medicare and Social Security.

REGARDING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I serve here in Congress as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military, a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. Before I move into remarks regarding the supplemental appropriation that will deal not only with the funding shortfalls in Kosovo and the funding shortfalls to fund our national military strategy, along with disaster assistance and humanitarian aid, I would like to comment on some remarks made by one of my own Republican colleagues here tonight during the 5 minutes. He put up a chart and on the chart he had lists that in World War II, with a 13 million force, we had 31 four-star generals and with our force of today, we have 33 generals, and that even though we have reduced our force, we still have all of these general officers.

Being responsible for the force structure decisions of the United States military, I would like to advise America that I have held the line on the increase, the demand for the increase out of the Pentagon on general officer strength. The force that fought World War II, that military force, is completely different from the military force of today. We also have encouraged jointness, greater cooperation and interoperability between all the services. When you do that, yes, you end up creating some bureaucracies and an increase in need for general officer strength. But more importantly we are going to maintain the sort of rank-heavy military for a very important reason. Kosovo really is that third scenario, "third scenario" meaning we have a national military strategy to fight and win two nearly simultaneous

major regional conflicts. So you take a circumstance in Korea, you can take a circumstance in Iraq, and now we have the third circumstance with regard to Kosovo. If, in fact, the United States found itself on a three-front war and we had the necessity to have to build a force rapidly, we could do that when we maintain officer strength in the general officer corps along with senior noncommissioned officers. That is the reason we are going to hold the line on those strengths. So the chart that was used tonight is somewhat misleading, and I wanted to correct the record.

Over the next 1 hour, the gentleman from the 52nd District of California (Mr. HUNTER) chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement and myself will discuss why all of the Members, and to inform America why we should support the emergency supplemental appropriation that we will be voting on here later this week.

Let me be very clear that there are some Members that point to this bill as though it were some form of a referendum on the President's actions in Kosovo, or that if we add additional funding to this supplemental appropriation that somehow we are forward funding the Clinton-Gore war. There is a lot of rhetoric, political rhetoric that is being used around here. So what the gentleman from California and I would like to clarify for everyone is what is the purpose of this emergency supplemental funding and why we have an increase in military funding in this bill that is over and above the President's request.

I believe that this bill is mislabeled. It should not be emergency funding with regard to Kosovo. This bill is necessary to fund the national security strategy of this country. The President has the singular responsibility to lay out the national security interest of this Nation. He then turns to the military planners and said, "What is the national military strategy to carry that out?" That is what makes us uncomfortable today.

Let me pose to you this question. Can anyone name this country, a country whereby 709,000 active service personnel, eight standing Army divisions, 20 Air Force and Navy air wings with 2,000 combat aircraft, 232 strategic bombers, 13 strategic missile submarines, with 232 missiles, 500 ICBMs, intercontinental ballistic missile systems, with 1,950 warheads, four aircraft carriers, 121 surface combat ships and submarines. Can anyone name this country with that type of force structure?

□ 2145

Is that country the former Soviet Union?

No.

Is that country Russia?

No.

Is that country China?

No.

Is the country the United Kingdom?

No.

You give up?

That country, the global superpower, no longer exists.

You see, the force structure that I just listed is how much the American military forces have been cut since 1990.

So why does our force structure matter so much?

First, let us look at the success.

In 1990 and 1991, the 45-day Gulf War was highly successful.

Why?

Well, in our active forces in 1990 we had 18 divisions. In the Air Force tactical wings we had 24. Navy ships and submarines, we had 546 as we were coming out of the Cold War era.

Part of the success was not only the force structure, but it was also because we had a highly-trained, well-equipped combat-ready force.

The question that is painful for those of us that serve on the Committee on Armed Services and those who appropriate funds on its behalf, was challenging for the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), and myself and others, is that we have to ask that question:

Could we fight and win a Gulf War today?

You see, that makes us very uncomfortable if you were to ask us that question, because we have forces in Korea on the peninsula, we have our forces in Iraq today, and now the President has us in a third scenario in former Yugoslavia.

So when we look at that force structure in 1990 and we see where President Clinton and Vice President Gore have taken us down to today with those budgets, we today have:

Army divisions, we have 10.

Air Force tactical wings, we only have 13.

And Navy ships and submarines, we only have 315.

The number that is used so often here in Washington is, if we do not hold the line on the Navy, we could dip below a 300-ship Navy, and that is fearful, my colleagues.

What is really concerning about these 10 active divisions: If you were to say, "All right, Congressman. Of those 10 divisions, how many are ready to go right now?" Five, only five because the other five divisions are called the follow-on divisions, and they have been hollowed out. They are short over 300 noncommissioned officers per brigade, over 300.

So we have got some anxiety building up between myself, and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and others about our present force structure today.

Let me put this into real numbers for my colleagues, divisions, wings, submarines, ships. Let me put it into numbers so my colleagues can relate, for those who are not familiar with the military.

The Army has been reduced. When we say taking down the size of these divisions and those who support them, we

have reduced the Army strength by 250,000 personnel. The Navy has been reduced by 200,000 personnel, the Air Force has been reduced by 150,000 personnel, and the selected reserve has been reduced 250,000 personnel. And what is also very difficult today is we are not retaining the qualified personnel, nor are we recruiting the sufficient numbers to meet current service requirements. That is very challenging to many of us.

So why is force structure so important? Why are we talking about that? Force structure is important because earlier when I mentioned the purpose of the military, it is the means to the political objectives laid out by the President with regard to our national security interests.

I am going to read from the annual report to the President and Congress signed by the Secretary of Defense William Cohen here in 1999. He lays out our military strategy. The military strategy is in sum, and says on page 17:

In sum, for the foreseeable future U.S. forces must be sufficient in size, versatility and responsiveness in order to transition from a posture of global engagement to fight and win in concert with our allies two major theater of wars that occur roughly at the same time. In this context they must also be able to defeat the initial enemy advance in two distant theaters in close succession and to fight and win in situations where chemical and biological weapons and other asymmetric approaches are employed.

That is the present national military strategy.

So earlier I used this example of if we are involved in a Gulf War scenario, and North Korea decides to do something foolish, do we have the force structure to fight and win a two-front war? The open secret and the pain that we have to deal with is we do not have the force structure to do that today.

I do not get into the strategy decisions, but I am not going to be just the critic. I want to be the constructive critic. Do my colleagues know what would be different from a Republican administration and the Democrat administration with regard to this military strategy? I would take out where it says in order to transition from a posture of global engagement. I would strike those words from the military strategy. You see, that foreign policy of the President, this engagement around the world is what strains the military force. So the President has our military force stretched so thin in so many different places around the world, that is what makes it challenging, and I am going to speak to that a little bit more here later.

Let me also refer to the difference in the dollars that are used on the defense along with the utilization of the force. You see, the world is not as stable, and this is a paradox. The world is not as stable today as it was during the stand-off of the Cold War. So often we hear in this town that the Russian bear has

been replaced by a thousand vipers. The enemy today is difficult to define. The force structure that we have, we have to be more mobile and more fluid as we think of how to fight and win the next war. If you plan the next war how you won the last one, you have positioned yourself for failure, so we have to be very smart about our business.

But what is clear here by this chart is there is a mismatch between funding and the use of military force. Now you can look at this force here during the Bush administration, and the dollars, and the procurement, and the funding and the readiness to utilization. Some would be quick to say: Well, look, you have got too much money and you are not using the force. I heard our own Secretary of Defense say:

"Well, what's the purpose of the military if you do not use them?"

I am not sure I can follow her logic.

The purpose of the military is to fight and win the Nation's wars and to protect our interests, not to utilize the war in every corner of the world as though we are the world's policemen. You see, that is what gets us in trouble.

When I think of the paradox, it is almost those who say the B-2 bomber, and this is before the Kosovo incident, never dropped a bomb. That is a good thing, my colleagues. If the military never has to fire a shot, that is a good thing. When we are the finest, the best, the most well equipped military in the world, who wants to take us on? Our enemies are not cooperative. They take us on when we are vulnerable, and we are getting vulnerable.

Look at this one right here. From 1993 to 1999, we have reduced the budgets, and we have increased the utilization. So during the Bush administration the War Powers Act reporting to Congress, there were six. President Clinton's term, and AL GORE, 46 reports have been sent to Congress. That is the utilization. So not only has he taken our military force and stretched them to those 135 countries around the world, he has actually placed our military into harm's way in over 46 places around the world. Over utilization.

So what is happening to the force? The wear and tear on our forces, it is showing. It is showing, and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is going to talk about that coming up.

Let me go to this chart for just a second. When I talked about the utilization all around the country, Mr. Speaker, the President has a foreign policy of engagement. Engagement. And he uses our military as though they are diplomats, and military-to-military contacts and everything all around the world. But let us talk about some of the larger ones.

North Korea, we have 40,000 troops. Bosnia, we have the 10,000.

In Iraq we have 20,200 aircraft, 1 carrier battle group.

Kosovo, 30,000 troops, 800 aircraft, one carrier battle group.

But we have got troops all over the place from Haiti, Honduras, Cuba, Ice-

land, Portugal, Spain, Netherlands, Panama, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Colombia, Argentina, Egypt, India, Israel, Kenya, Tanzania, Diego Garcia, Russia, Kazakhstan, Japan, Australia, China, Singapore, Thailand. The list goes on, and on, and on. So, we have taken our military force, we have cut down the structure, and we have spread them all around the world, but you see the President in their force structure says we can transition from spreading our forces all around the world, and then all of a sudden we can bring them together and we can fight and win in two near simultaneous major regional conflicts, and, oh, by the way, if we happen to get bogged down in Kosovo, do not worry, we can win.

No, this is very uncomfortable, Mr. Speaker, very, very uncomfortable.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, I have conducted numerous hearings on the growing problems facing our service men and women. Although pay and benefits is important, there are other equally important issues stressing the force, quality of life issues, health care, lack of spare parts, lack of adequate training time, the aging of equipment, the high depreciation rates on our equipment, increased operational tempo, longer working hours and the family separation, reusing and reusing the same people. Asking them to do more with less is not a strategy for success.

Do not take my word for it, Mr. Speaker. Let me read some excerpts from a letter I received from a young Navy lieutenant:

Honor, courage and commitment are words that are often used in jest. What they should say is honor the sailor, respect the job and the sacrifices that he endures. Have the courage to give those who risk their life every day in the defense of our country and democracy the proper equipment to do their job. Make the commitment to the basic human needs that every human being, even sailors, need for themselves and their families. We need to provide the fleet with all the tools to maintain our assets. Just-in-time manning and ramping up for deployment is ludicrous. People and assets need to be in position and on board to benefit the rigors of the training cycle. Sailors need to be properly trained. They need to have the proper support, equipment to test the systems, be it on a ship or on an aircraft. They need publications that are up to date. They need various hand and automated tools to adequately perform the maintenance and maintain the equipment. I do not know what the fix is, and I do not know all the answers, but I will tell you I have never seen the Navy in such a sad state of affairs. I love this business and have always believed that there is honor in my chosen profession. Every cut back has a cost. In this case I think we cut too deep.

This Navy lieutenant said it in words for which I could not replace. So what have we done? We increased those missions dramatically, we have stressed

the force, and this sailor is sending a basic message to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), and myself, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN), and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) who chair subcommittees in the Committee on Armed Services that we need to take care of the force as much as we can, and that is the purpose of our supplemental. We have asked for some billions of dollars over and above the President's mark, spending mark, and what we are trying to do is to fund this national military strategy.

This is no attempt by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and myself or others to front load some Kosovo war or anything else. We recognize that there are stresses in the force.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) tells a story about some F-16s in the Pennsylvania National Guard that did not have GPS, the global positioning system in the F-16s when they were deployed to Iraq in operation Provide Comfort. So what did the pilots do? They went to Radio Shack, bought it, strapped it onto their legs.

When one is flying an aircraft at high altitude over the desert, there is not much to navigate off of, and one has to have that GPS system. I feel awful, America, that we are not even doing the modernization of our force and pilots are actually going to Radio Shack to modernize their own fighter aircraft.

□ 2200

That is sad.

Let me move now to a quote from Admiral Jay Johnson. He said, we have approximately 18,000 gap billets in the fleet. What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? That means in the Navy today we are 18,000 sailors short.

Navy ships are being deployed at 10 to 20 percent under their strength. What does that mean? That means that when an aircraft carrier or a cruiser, when they leave harbor, they are leaving about 80 percent strength. So when they are deployed at sea and they end up with injuries, a workplace injury, a back or sick call, there are no replacements. They do not send replacements out to sea. Everybody has to then carry the load.

So instead of now working in the boiler room where maybe 10 people are assigned they now have seven. Two people get hurt, five now have to pick up the load. Instead of working 10 hours, they are now working 14 hours. That is what is happening to our force, and it is very, very difficult.

Let me mention Kosovo for a second. Here is something that is also very, very concerning to us. The current Kosovo mission has forced the United States to divert planes from their patrols over Iraq in order to support the ongoing campaign.

This quote here, in the New York Times, in early April, the Navy shifted

its only aircraft carrier in the western Pacific and its 75 combat jets out of the region indefinitely to help wage war in the Yugoslavia campaign.

If we have taken our only carrier now out of that region of the world to support this so-called humanitarian war, how can we satisfy the national military strategy? We cannot. We cannot.

The second quote is, the Pentagon briefly suspended enforcement of the no-fly zone over northern Iraq when fighter bombers and radar-jamming planes were dispatched to the air war in Serbia.

Mr. Speaker, if we are having difficulty here at the moment maintaining the front against the forces in North Korea on the peninsula, maintaining the no-fly zone requirements in Iraq, and we have this war now in Kosovo and we cannot even mix and match, that is a very strong signal to us that we have to take corrective action, and it is immediate.

If all we do is fund what the President's request is, all we do is fund the bullet for bullet which they are firing, shame on us. We have to step forward, bite the bullet, that the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is going to talk about, and do much more than that and go beyond.

I yield to the gentleman from San Diego, California (Mr. HUNTER), a highly decorated Vietnam veteran and well respected in this House, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), for yielding me this time and for making such a superb presentation on the inadequacies of military funding that exist right now.

I have to protest that I did nothing special in Vietnam. I simply showed up, but I did serve with a lot of great people. I want to commend my friend for his participation in Desert Storm.

I think a good point here that the gentleman made very strongly is the fact that, while the military has shrunk by almost 50 percent, and most people do not realize that but some people realize that, they realize it is smaller, the natural tendency is to feel that since it is 50 percent of the original size it has been cut back so dramatically, over 200,000 people in the Navy and 200,000 people in the Army and so on, the team that is left has to be well paid, well armed and well trained.

One would think, boy, the residual people that we have there after we pared it down from this huge military that we had, a lot of people think we had in 1990, 1991, this military has to really be just in great shape, with lots of new equipment and ready to go.

The tragedy is, we have cut the military almost in half; and the half that we have left is not well paid, number one. The gentleman has really done wonders working as chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, and he has been pushing hard to get

compensation, and we know that the average military personnel today are making about 13.5 percent less than their civilian counterparts. That means if someone is an electronics technician in the Navy, they are making about 13.5 percent less on the average than the guy who is working for a private company out in industry.

The real tragedy of that is that, at the end, the bottom line is we have today about 10,000 military personnel on food stamps.

As I watched the stock market go through the roof the other day, I thought about that. Here we are in one of our most prosperous times and people are commenting on the endurance of this prosperity that we have had, the longevity of this prosperity. We have a military that is half as big as it was a few years ago, and the men and women in that military are underpaid, and 10,000 of them are on food stamps.

So, wrong, the first instinctive reaction is this must be a well-paid military since it has been cut in half. Answer, no.

Second, people must think, well, my gosh, it is half the size it was, it must be really well trained since it is pared down to this smaller force.

I think of Colonel Rosenberg, who was one of the national trainers at the National Training Command hearing that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Readiness, held at Nellis Air Force base in Nevada. Colonel Rosenberg said, and I paraphrase him, he said, it is a real tragedy that this military that we built out of the ashes of the Vietnam War, that won so overwhelmingly in Desert Storm, is being destroyed before our very eyes.

When we asked for particulars from Colonel Rosenberg and others who were testifying there, these are the trainers at the National Training Center, it is kind of like the military college where the infantry goes and the armor goes and the artillery units go to get their upper level training. Once they have graduated from high school, so to speak, they go to this military college, which really is a big training ground out in the desert in the West, and they have to perform against a mock enemy, and they are given points.

The trainers said, among other things, the troops that we get often do not know anything about maneuver with armor. They do not know anything about the basics of calling in artillery fire. They do not know how to handle many, many procedures that have to be handled on the battlefield. In other words, this is like getting people in their first year in college and one realizes that they never should have graduated from the 11th and 12th grades in high school and one feels like they have to send them back for a refresher course.

We have fine young people in the military. So why are not they getting the training that is necessary, at least

to get them into the upper training level? Well, the answer is, those dozens of deployments that the gentleman just talked about, that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) just talked about, where the President has pulled people out of school, and a lot of these military schools are very technical, they have to sit there in a classroom and really learn to know their job, but these people are pulled out of their schools before they can finish it. They are kept from going to their schools.

It is like a kid who is in high school. He is supposed to get good grades his last year in high school. His dad has a farm, and his dad pulls him out of class 3 days out of 5 in the week, so he is only going to class about half the time he should have gone to class in his senior year, and all of a sudden he figures out he is not ready for college.

That is what this President has done with this downsized military. He has stretched it all over the world.

The average person will say, wait a minute. Those people that are in Bosnia, that is training. Well, it may train them for deployment, but it does not train them with the simulators. It does not train them with the test ranges that we have. It does not train them with the classroom work that they need.

So the second fallacy most people believe is that this smaller force is well trained, and it is not.

One last example, talking to the Marines, we talk about the V-STOL aircraft that goes straight up off the ground, the jet aircraft, that the Marines use, instead of going down a runway and lift off; very, very difficult aircraft to fly. When one asks the Marines, how many hours do these pilots really need to maintain proficiency in this very difficult aircraft, they will always say, over 20, 22, 24 hours a month. They have to have that to maintain proficiency.

What are they getting? They are getting about 12. They are getting about 12, because there is no money for training. That is just one of the many, many examples of inadequate training.

So that second fallacy that these people are well trained is, in fact, a fallacy.

Lastly, one would think, my gosh, if we have an Army that is 10 divisions today instead of 18 divisions, we have a Marine Corps that has been cut back, we have a Navy that has been cut back, and I noticed the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) is more precise than I am, we had 546 ships when we started, when we did Desert Storm. When we made up our chart last year, we had 346. When I gave my last briefing, it was 325. Now it is down to 315. We are dropping like a rock.

One would think when this Navy has been compressed to such a small fleet those ships that are there must be bristling with armaments. Wrong. It is not well armed. The reason is, we have starved our ammunition accounts. If anything qualifies, if we are talking

about this emergency supplemental, and I hope every single Member of Congress, Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative, I hope we all vote for it tomorrow. Because if there is anything that is an emergency, it is an inadequacy of ammunition. We have a shortage of ammunition.

One of the most important ammunition that we have a shortage of is cruise missiles, long-range missiles, like Tomahawks, like conventional air launch cruise missiles. Because what we see today is a very complex and difficult to penetrate air defense in most of the world where we have to operate. We see that in Kosovo right now, but it is not limited to Kosovo. We are seeing the Iraqis continue to strive to build an air defense that is going to be able to take down American aircraft. They have not done it yet, but they import SAM missiles. We see that with the North Koreans.

So anyplace we go, we figured that the air defense over North Vietnam was more intense than it was over Berlin in World War II because of surface-to-air missiles. So we devised a way to allow our pilots, our neighbors who are pilots, to go out there and fly their mission, release a payload and return to their carrier deck or the tarmac of their runway without being killed.

The way we were able to do that is with cruise missiles. That is stand-off missiles. That means a B-52 does not have to fly into all that flak like they did over North Vietnam in December of 1972 when, as I recall, about 10 were shot down the first day.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. JOHNSON) recalled sitting in his prison cell and watching a B-52 get hit in mid-air by a SAM missile and just explode before his eyes.

We are flying those same B-52s today, but we have missiles on them that are launched from many miles away from the target. The cruise missile takes off, it travels like an unmanned airplane itself, and it hits a target. And, meanwhile, the pilot is hundreds of miles away from that anti-aircraft fire; and he returns safely to his base. We are short on those missiles.

It does not make any sense that this country, as prosperous as we are, as devoted to human life as we are, and especially the lives of our service people, should have a shortage in cruise missiles.

I want to tell my friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), who has made just an eloquent presentation tonight, we are short on cruise missiles. We are short several billions of dollars' worth of cruise missiles.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) this question: I have the sense that the military planners in the Pentagon, in order to maintain readiness levels to their comfort, they have taken money that should have gone to ammunition and they are using it to maintain present operations and they are assuming a risk, are they not?

Mr. HUNTER. That is exactly right.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like for the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) to discuss that assumption of risk, how serious is it, how is it measured and what we are going to do about it in the supplemental.

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman is exactly right. Because every time we have had one of these contingencies where the President wants to send troops, whether it is an operation that we consider justified or not, every time we have one of those operations, to fund the operations initially they take money out of the ammunition accounts. They also take money out of the spare parts accounts. That is why our mission capability rates are dropping below 70 percent on average.

□ 2215

They have dropped more than 10 percent, meaning a plane, out of 100 aircraft that take off that are built to do a particular mission, only about 70 of them now can do that mission.

So the President takes that money, or the military looks around for money, Congress is not giving them any extra money to fund an operation where the President said, you steam over here and do this mission, so they take it out of ammunition. They were going to buy that ammunition, but they will buy it next year, right, when they get the money back?

All of a sudden, they do the mission, they get a little money back, maybe in a supplemental funding bill, but they never get as much as they took out, so the ammunition accounts get lower and lower.

They say, when they appear before us, and the gentleman always asks that great question, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. FLOYD SPENCE) asks that question, as well, our great chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, he says, what is going on here, Admiral? What is going on here, General? Can we win these two wars?

They say, well, we can win those wars, but we now are taking on a higher risk. When we ask them to translate what risks means, it means risk of casualties, heavy casualties. Because we cannot win a war now with overwhelming force, like Norman Schwartzkopf did in Desert Storm, where you just crush the enemy, bring all your body bags empty to the United States. There are no dead Americans to put in them, and they all come home fairly quickly.

We no longer have that overwhelming force. What we have is the ability, like two fairly evenly-matched fighters, to slug it out, taking a blow for every blow that we give. That means taking dead Americans for every casualty we inflict on the enemy. And hopefully in the end, because we have a superior industrial base and because we have a democracy with a strong economy, we overwhelm the enemy at some point, maybe the allies come in and

help, and we finally win. But when we win, it is like one of those boxing matches where the sportswriter said that after looking at the faces of both of the fighters, it was hard to determine who the winner was. Instead of looking at the faces of the fighters, we are looking at body bags stretched out in front of us of dead Americans who ran out of ammunition.

Right now the Marines are \$193 million short of basic ammunition, and the Marines are the 911 force. The Army is \$3.5 billion short of basic ammunition.

That is not a standard that I created, and that is not a standard that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) created or the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. FLOYD SPENCE) or the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILL YOUNG), who is chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who has done such a great job, along with the gentleman from California (Mr. JERRY LEWIS), chairman of defense appropriations, of putting this supplemental together.

We did not go out and set some standard and say, we have decided that instead of 100 million M-16 rounds, we want 200 million, that is a Republican standard. We took the President's standard. We wrote in to the services and said, how many M-16 bullets do you need to be able to fight that two-war contingency that we might have to fight? How much should we have in reserve?

They answered back. In fact, they answered back across the total line of ammunition. I have a summary of that here. In total ammunition across the board, and I have two pages here, but I will show Members just a summary page, we are \$13.8 billion short, according to the President's standard. That is according to President Clinton's own standard of how much ammunition we need.

So when the President says, I do not want you adding extra things to this defense bill, he means that he does not want to give the full load of ammunition to his troops that his own clerks and auditors and generals and admirals have figured out they may need in an extended battle. Somehow, ammunition is no longer a prerequisite to having a strong military.

I would say if there is anything that is an emergency it is ammunition. If I had my way, let me tell the Members, we would have a supplemental tomorrow of not \$13 billion, but one that was \$28.7 billion, because that is what the services told us they could use right now in ammunition and spare parts and equipment. Because we not only want to have enough ammunition for the soldiers' ammunition pouches, we also want to have planes that can take off and lift off the ground. Today, as Members know, our mission capability rates have been dropping like a rock.

Mr. BUYER. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman's concern is as great as mine

that we are unwilling to assume a risk that will increase casualties in a war scenario around the world, the funding shortfall if we do not do even a piece of that in the emergency supplemental, I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), would we not have to wait then until the 2000 budget cycle, which means that the ammunition and the missiles which we are requesting may not even get to the force until about 18 months from now?

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman is exactly right. In fact, we will have to wait for next year's funding, so we will have to wait at least 4 or 5 months before we can even enact the bill and have next year's funding levels start. That means having the Pentagon ready to start making contracts.

And then most of these ammo lines, some of them are closed, so most of these ammo lines will have to be reassembled, the assembly lines. By the time the soldier actually gets the bullets in the field or the airplanes get the cruise missiles or the Navy gets its particular missiles, 18 to 24 months can go by.

Do Members know what is interesting, some of the administration people have argued, well, we cannot execute this contract in the next 12 months, so we do not think we should do it now. They are saying, it takes a long time to get ammunition, so let us not start now.

Well, when do they want to start? Do they want to start when we have a conflict and we discover that we are out, we are empty? And I think our enemies should make no mistake about it, we still have an enormous nuclear arsenal, but I do not think anybody in this Chamber wants to rely on a nuclear arsenal as a deterrent.

In 1950 we did. One of the arguments for drawing down the force, we had 9 million people under arms in World War II. We just stacked arms. We got out of the military so fast and drew those units down so fast, because Americans wanted to come home and have babies and work on their farms and get jobs and enjoy the prosperity of America. We stacked arms.

General Marshall was asked, how is the demobilization going, in 1948? He says, this isn't a demobilization, it is a rout. We are just throwing our guns away. A few years later the Koreans marched down the Korean peninsula, a third-rate military, and almost pushed us into the ocean past the Pusan perimeter.

We were pretty sure that the Chinese would not mess with us. In fact, we didn't think anybody would mess with us because we had nuclear weapons. In fact, in those days we had the only nuclear weapons.

One reason that we allowed our forces to get so small, and incidentally, the Army was 10 divisions, just like it is today, we had drawn it down that small, but we figured that nobody would mess with us because we had nuclear weapons. We had this high technology that everybody was afraid of.

All of a sudden we discovered this third-rate military pushing our people down the Korean Peninsula. They overwhelmed the 25th infantry division, captured the commanding general, William Dean, our bazookas bounced off the T-64 Soviet tanks, because they had not stood still, they had continued to make and develop their weapons systems, and we lost a lot of people.

In my cousin's home in Fort Worth, Texas, we have a picture of my second cousin, Son Stillwell. Son was a Second Lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps, First Lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps who died in Korea. Lots of us in America have pictures on our mantles of people who lost their lives in wars which we were not prepared to fight.

Probably nobody today knows or can remember what social program took priority over a strong military in 1950, when so many of us lost relatives in the Korean War. But everybody that looks at those pictures on their mantles remembers who they lost.

I would say that our number one obligation as Members of the U.S. Congress to our people, and we do lots of things for people that the Constitution never mandated, we know that, and we all participate in it. But our number one obligation is to defend our people.

We have allowed the military to be bled down so low that we can no longer look our constituents in the eye and say, we can defend you and we have a real good chance of your youngsters coming home alive.

Mr. BUYER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, I have heard some comment by Members that some of the emergency supplemental funding will actually be coming out of the social security trust fund. In other words, if Congress had made the pledge that every dollar of the surplus is to go to the social security trust fund, are we not really spending that social security dollar on defense?

We have also recognized that there will be funding in the surplus for payments on the national debt and a tax cut for any dollar that is over and above that allotment towards social security.

I will concur with the gentleman's comment that one of the first requirements of a government is to protect its people. I think what makes me very uncomfortable, the gentleman and I and those that serve in this body, it is easy to be the critic of the President or those in the Pentagon, but we have to become very constructive, because we are responsible.

The Constitution, does it not, I would ask the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), places us with the singular responsibility to build the force and make sure that it has what it needs to meet the legitimate needs of this Nation.

So when the gentleman laid out the scenario of what happened in Korea after World War II, the gentleman almost laid out the scenario that history is about to repeat itself; that those of

us, myself and the comrades who served in the Gulf War, America and the world was impressed with our high-tech military force, so much so that no one would dare take on the United States military, especially in an air-land war, and that we could move anywhere in the world we want.

So in the face of such a deterrent, we drew down the force so rapidly and so quickly that now in force structure it is there, we have people. They are not as well-equipped as we would like. They are not as well-trained. And, oh, by the way, if we have to use them, I guess we will try to use what ammo we can, and we will never be in a two-war scenario, anyway. We hear that rhetoric around the town.

But I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), if we do this plus-up in this emergency supplemental, would the gentleman agree that we can immediately open up these lines for the missiles and begin replacing a lot of the needs?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes. Mr. Speaker, to answer the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), and he has made such an eloquent presentation and made a great case for increasing our national defense funding, if we do in fact come up with this money, one thing we can do is go to the vendors.

If we have an ammunition line or a spare parts line or a missile line, you may have 25 or 30 major suppliers, companies that used to make little parts for that particular unit. You have to go get them and say, hey, you have to go back into business, because we are low on ammo and we need to get this ammo turned out quickly.

We can work with them, with a partnership of business and government. We can get in there and accelerate those lines and get them up and get producing. I think we can start turning out, for example, cruise missiles and other things a lot faster than the Pentagon thinks we can. I think when the Americans really want to do something, they can do it.

With respect to the senior citizens and their concern about social security, my feeling is, I have no qualms about using this money for an emergency. Lack of ammunition is an emergency. The generation that saved Private Ryan is going to want to help save this country. I am reminded that without national security, there is no social security.

With respect to the other programs, the tax cuts and social programs, whether you are a liberal who loves social programs and thinks tax cuts are terrible, or you are a conservative like myself who thinks that tax cuts increase the economy and increase jobs, no matter where your position is on the political spectrum, we should all agree that ammunition comes first. Let us have ammunition before we have tax cuts and before we have social programs. I do not think anybody would disagree with that.

Mr. BUYER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, I want

to ask this question, but I am going to lay out a statement first.

If we do not have access to some of our high tech munitions such as laser-guided munitions, where an aircraft can stay miles up and drop a laser-guided munition through the front door of a target, I have heard comments, the hall comments, that we have all types of dumb bomb munitions that we could access.

But if we are to play into this, that we have so much dumb bomb munitions, are we not asking our pilots, who could stay miles above, to assume a risk? Because in order to drop that dumb bomb, they are going to have to come down into radar coverage, pick up the sight of their target, and immediately pull out. So those who are advocating, well, let us just drop dumb bombs, we will assume risks.

□ 2230

It is stunning for me how some people in this body are willing to let soldiers and sailors, airmen and Marines, pilots assume risks and not adequately equip them. Does the gentleman have a comment?

Mr. HUNTER. I would say there is no sight more gratifying I think to the member of a military family, to a spouse and the kids, than to have their dad get off of that airplane or get off of that ship in the good old United States and welcome them with open arms to come home.

Bringing our pilots home is very important to us. And the thing that allows them to come home alive is for them to be able to keep their plane a hundred miles from the target, launch a standoff weapon that can go in and hit the target while they stay out of range of those surface-to-air missiles. And I think one of the greatest agonies that we ever endure is when we have POWs and when we see what happens to some of them. And we have listened their stories when they come home. We have had some great ones on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans.

Smart weapons, standoff weapons, cruise missiles save lives. It is an absolute disservice to our uniformed people to not give them the very best. They deserve the very best. They are not getting adequate pay right now. We all know that. They are 13 percent below the domestic sector. We are trying to ramp that up. I know the gentleman is leading that charge and he is going to get some fruition to his efforts. That is one reason why the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the other members of the Subcommittee on Defense and the full Committee on Appropriations sat down and added ammunition to this supplemental, they added a lot of smart weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to offer an amendment that I hope is approved by the Committee on Rules that allows us to restart the Tomahawk missile lines,

because I think we have got to have a lot of Tomahawk missiles because we cannot tell how fast we are going to have to use them. And I think we should build at least as many as President Clinton's own analysis say we need for the two-war requirement.

But to answer the gentleman's question, standoff weapons mean that Air Force families get to see their daddy. And having to fly over a target and drop a gravity bomb on that target with all that anti-aircraft fire and all of those very sophisticated surface-to-air missiles shooting back means that we of going to have dead pilots and we are going to have prisoners of war.

Mr. BUYER. As the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement, I would like for the gentleman to comment on some other questions that Members are asking and some of their comments that increasing this billions of dollars over and above the President's number, that we are putting in things that the Pentagon did not ask for and that it is pork laden. So I ask the gentleman to comment on that, because I know the numbers that I put together for the Guard and Reserve, I spoke to each of the chiefs of each of services for their go-to-war requirements. Period. Operational. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me answer the gentleman. I can tell the gentleman that I sent over a request to the services to tell us exactly what they need. I did not ask any contractors what they wanted to sell. And I did not ask any congressmen what they wanted to get for their district.

I think most of the congressmen that I have talked to just want to get what is right for America. They realize we have got to refill the ammunition coffers. This list, it represents a direct response from the services with respect to how much they have right now in terms of cruise missiles and all the other things that we need and how much the President's own analysis says we need and what the shortages are.

So they sent over the shortages. We did not get them from anybody else. We did not set any new standards to try to embarrass the President. We just used his standards. That is what this is.

Incidentally, the cruise missiles I am sorry to say, they used to be built in San Diego in my district. Well, about 10 years they moved out and they are now built in Arizona across the Colorado River, and so Arizonans have jobs building cruise missiles. I do not care. I do not care if they are built in the northeast, the Midwest, wherever. They save pilots' lives. I would like to have them come back to San Diego some day, but I do not think that is going to happen. But I think all Americans just want to see ammunition right now.

Mr. BUYER. Will the gentleman yield? The large request that I put in was in excess of \$800 million. My district: Agricultural. A lot of corn, soybeans, wheat, a lot of pork, cattle,

chickens, duck production, automobiles. I do not have the big defense contractors. So those who want to say that it is pork laden, I do not sell any of my hogs, none of my hogs out of Indiana for this bill.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman who put together this Guard and Reserve package and does it for the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman has always acted with total integrity and has always met the needs of the services. Unfortunately, we have always had to cut what the services need, cut the supply of resources that we are going to give those shortages by about 50 percent. There are lots of things that the Guard and Reserve need right now on their equipment and in their training and in their ammunition and spare parts to be able to go off and serve in a foreign theater.

Mr. BUYER. One of the examples the Chief of the Army Reserve put on the list, he requested fire trucks. It would be very easy for someone who does not know anything about the military to look at the list of equipment necessities under the emergency supplemental and say why are we funding fire trucks?

The answer is very simple. The Army Reserve has the ground support mission for the Apaches that were sent over to Albania and the present fire trucks from the Army reserves are utilized in Bosnia and they need to have the fire trucks.

Mr. HUNTER. People need to know when an aircraft comes in on fire, and this is one thing I learned in San Diego watching our Federal firefighters who handle the jets out there, they have to have incredible training and great equipment to be able to put out those fires on the aircraft and save lives. So they have to carry a contingent of firefighters with them.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield?, he will be happy to have yielded to me because I am going to extend a great compliment to the gentleman. I have been impressed with the gentleman's chairmanship over the years. With his focus on operational requirements, getting to the services what they need to fight and win the Nation's wars.

I want to compliment the gentleman as one of the strongest advocates to make sure that our ammunition bins are filled. Because I can say that, yes, we all share the responsibility on procurement, but it is singular with the gentleman from San Diego in this body because we have to turn to him as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement to tell us what those needs and requirements are. And, actually, we yield to the gentleman's integrity that he will make those proper decisions. That is not just us; America yields to him. America out there whose sons and daughters may be in Korea right now, part of the 37,000 that are right now on the line in Korea or in a ship or in Okinawa or maybe they are

in Iraq right now or wherever they are in the world to face a threat they have to be able to sleep in comfort that the gentleman from California has made sure that their son or daughter can access just in time to get that ammunition. And that is why I compliment the gentleman.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend, I thank him for that compliment. When I see the gentleman from Indiana up there in the Committee on Armed Services, I see a soldier who has a great integrity and devotion to his country and to his people that he serves with and to the people that are still serving. The gentleman has done a wonderful job.

What I think is a great tragedy is that I do not think we are fulfilling our obligation. I do not think we as a body are fulfilling it. And if we get to a point where we have our Marines and soldiers or sailors or airmen coming up short of ammunition, short of spare parts and more of them die on the battlefield because of that, then we will have failed them.

So I hope that every Member votes for this supplemental appropriation tomorrow and I hope they vote for the amendments. And it is going to be in two days. I hope they vote for the amendments that increase the ammunition supply. Even if we vote for those, we are still going to be about \$12 billion short of basic ammunition. So we are not taking care of the problem, but we are taking care of part of the problem.

I really thank the gentleman for his hard work. And maybe the gentleman could share with us his ideas too about how we are going to finally close this pay gap over the next several months and years.

Mr. BUYER. Well, I will close this tonight and reclaim my time that on May 13 we will mark up the Subcommittee on Military Personnel's Chairman's mark and we are going to address the increase in military pay. We are going to change the pay tables to increase retention. We are concerned about the retention not only at the mid-level officer and NCO, but also the retention of general officer strength. They are leaving for other jobs and that is not healthy.

We are going to reform the retirement system. We are looking at creating a Thrift Savings Plan for the military. Part of this emergency supplemental, about \$1.8 billion, is for the funding of the pay package, subject to the authorization that we come up with. So we are going to address the pay differential and we are going to take a very serious look at a lot of other things.

I did not totally concur with the Senate's package, S. 4. It became a huge Christmas tree and everybody wanted to throw their arms around the soldier. But the problems are much greater. It is the quality of life issues. It is the housing issues. It is the readiness. It is the lack of spare parts. It is a large

issue. So we are going to make sure that we try to address it by the breadth and we are going to be smart about our business.

Let me close with this one story that has always moved me, and I think it will go to the heart of the spirit of why the gentleman from California and others work so very, very hard on these issues. I think of the World War II veteran. It is the World War II veteran I believe is a generation that changed the world and left freedom in their footsteps.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by saying that they understand the total sacrifice and they have taught a generation what freedom means. The gentleman's example on Korea here tells us let us do not relive history. Let us accept the responsibility. This is not an emergency supplemental for Kosovo; this is funding our national military strategy and it must be done.

NATIONAL TEACHERS DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure on behalf of my colleagues today to recognize National Teachers Day and National Teacher Appreciation Week. We know the old bumper sticker that reads, "If you can read this, thank a teacher." Well, tonight I would like to thank teachers.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) organized this special order, but was unable to be here tonight because he had to attend a funeral. But on his behalf and my colleagues', I would like to talk a bit about teachers.

According to the National PTA, the origins of National Teachers Day are somewhat unclear but it is known that Arkansas teacher, Mrs. Mattie White Woodridge began corresponding with political and educational leaders around 1944 about the need for a national day honoring teachers.

One of the people Mrs. Woodridge wrote to was Eleanor Roosevelt who persuaded the 81st Congress to proclaim a National Teacher Day in 1953.

In the late 1970s, the National Education Association as well as many of its local affiliates persuaded Congress to create a national day celebrating the contributions of teachers and such a day was established in 1980. In 1985, the NEA and the National PTA established a full week of May as National Teacher Appreciation Week, and to make the Tuesday of that week National Teacher Appreciation Day.

It is only right that we take a moment to honor the dedication, hard work, and importance of teachers in our society. As a teacher myself, I know that teaching is a hard and sometimes unrecognized job. But of all the important jobs in our society, nothing makes more of an impact on our children than a well-trained, caring and

dedicated teacher. No job ultimately is more important to our society.

Each of us has had teachers who have made marks on our lives who have pushed us to achieve more and challenged us to excel. While these teachers may not command the celebrity of a sports star, they continue to work every day often under difficult circumstances to guide our children to a better future.

We here in Congress, on both sides of the aisle, continue to debate ways to improve our public schools and to boost the educational achievement of our young people. Experts have suggested all kinds of ways to strengthen our education system. But as we talk about these programs and policies, we may forget that one of the best ways to improve our education system is to show respect and support for our teachers.

Teachers across our Nation are doing an outstanding job. As I have traveled around my central New Jersey district, I have met hundreds of teachers who are working hard every day to prepare students to succeed in this economy and it is not often easy.

□ 2245

Compared with many professionals, teachers are underpaid and overworked. The Education Testing Service pointed out in a recent report that despite the importance of the work they do, teachers still earn less in median weekly wages than doctors, lawyers, accountants, public relations professionals and even many service workers.

Studies consistently show that teachers earn less than other professionals with similar educational requirements, and that is just not right. As long as this country continues to pay teachers less than it pays others, we will not get all we need. In the next decade we Americans must hire two million new teachers to fill vacancies and to keep up with student school growth, and we need the best people.

Teachers often perform miracles in the classrooms, which too many of us take for granted. We forget many times teachers are called on to undertake other tasks in addition to teaching. Teachers today often have to enforce discipline and guide troubled children to the help they need. Our Nation can improve its education system by showing respect for teachers and by letting them know how much we value their work. All of us should take time to thank our teachers.

Later this week, when I return home to New Jersey, I will visit a teacher at West Windsor Plainsboro School on Friday morning, the first morning I am back, and I will teach a class in physics. But we need to do more than simply reflect on teachers' contributions and drop in occasionally. We need to undertake policies that will make their jobs easier. We need to work together to find ways to support teachers, to help them continue to grow professionally, to help our school districts

hire more qualified teachers, to help our school districts modernize and update their classrooms with technology. That is how we thank our teachers. That is how we show respect for our teachers. That is how we show respect for our children.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of inspecting tornado damage in Oklahoma.

Mr. TIAHRT (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of inspecting tornado damage in Kansas.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and May 5 on account of inspecting tornado damage in Oklahoma.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BAIRD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KUCINICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SANDERS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes each day, today and on May 5th.

Mr. DEMINT, for 5 minutes, on May 5th.

Mr. HILL of Montana, for 5 minutes, on May 5th.

Mr. SCHAFFER, for 5 minutes, on May 5th.

Mr. BATEMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, on May 11th.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, on May 5th.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRADY of Texas, for 5 minutes, on May 5th.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GIBBONS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SAXTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 5, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1822. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Dimethylmorph; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300842; FRL-6075-2] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received April 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1823. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Oxyfluorfen; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300834; FRL-6073-4] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received April 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1824. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-7268] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1825. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1826. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1827. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-7277] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1828. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (RIN: 1840-AC59) received April 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1829. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Authorization to Implement Section 111 and 112 Standards; State of Connecticut [A-1-FRL-6325-3] received April 12, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1830. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Approval of VOC RACT Determinations for Individual Sources [PA129-4083a; FRL-6323-6] received April 12, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1831. A letter from the General Counsel, Information Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Exchange Visitor Program—received April 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1832. A letter from the General Counsel, Information Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Exchange Visitor Program—received April 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1833. A letter from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting notification that funding under title V of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, will exceed \$5 million for the response to the emergency declared on January 15, 1999, as a result of the record/near record snow which severely impacted the State of Indiana from January 1, 1999, through and including January 15, 1999, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1834. A letter from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting notification that funding under title V of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, will exceed \$5 million for the response to the emergency declared on January 8, 1999, as a result of the record/near record snow which severely impacted the State of Illinois from January 1, 1999, through and including January 15, 1999, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1835. A letter from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting notification that funding under title V of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, will exceed \$5 million for the response to the emergency declared on January 27, 1999, as a result of the record/near record snow which severely impacted the State of Michigan from January 2, 1999, through and including January 15, 1999, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1836. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Model 407 Helicopters [Docket No. 99-SW-16-AD; Amendment 39-1111; AD 99-06-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1837. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-163-AD; Amendment 39-11106; AD 99-08-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1838. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service,

Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-326-AD; Amendment 39-11105; AD 99-08-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1839. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-100, -200, and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-04-AD; Amendment 39-11109; AD 99-08-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1840. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA.3160, SA.316B, SA.316C, and SA.319B Helicopters [Docket No. 98-SW-58-AD; Amendment 39-11112; AD 99-08-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1841. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 and C-9 (Military) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-110-AD; Amendment 39-11110; AD 99-08-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1842. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10 and MD-11 Series Airplanes, and KC-10 (Military) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-55-AD; Amendment 39-11072; AD 99-06-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1843. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Allison Engine Company, Inc. AE 3007A and AE 3007C Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 99-NE-01-AD; Amendment 39-11108; AD 99-02-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1844. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting Initial estimate of the applicable percentage increase in hospital inpatient payment rates for fiscal year 2000, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 4002(g)(1)(B) (104 Stat. 1388-36); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1845. A letter from the Chair, Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation, transmitting the FY 1998 Annual Report of the Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation, pursuant to Public Law 102-281, section 429(b) (106 Stat. 145); jointly to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services and Science.

1846. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a listing of two Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation properties covered by the Act as of September 30, 1998; jointly to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services and Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 1999 (Rept. 106-124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 1664. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for military operations, refugee relief, and humanitarian assistance relating to the conflict in Kosovo, and for military operations in Southwest Asia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 158. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 833) to amend title 11 of the United States Code, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-126). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

(The following action occurred on April 30, 1999)

H.R. 434. Referral to the Committees on Ways and Means and Banking and Financial Services extended for a period ending not later than May 21, 1999.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LOFGREN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. EWING, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1658. A bill to provide a more just and uniform procedure for Federal civil forfeitures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself and Mr. HYDE):

H.R. 1659. A bill to reinforce police training and reestablish police and community relations, and to create a commission to study and report on the policies and practices that govern the training, recruitment, and oversight of police officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. STARK, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr.

BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DIXON, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. QUINN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WEYGAND, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1660. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the incentives for the construction and renovation of public schools and to provide tax incentives for corporations to participate in cooperative agreements with public schools in distressed areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. HILLIARD):

H.R. 1661. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act and part 7 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish standards for the health quality improvement of children in managed care plans and other health plans; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 1662. A bill to amend Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for the inclusion of mentoring programs for novice teachers in the professional development activities of local educational agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. STUMP, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. COX, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. LEE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HORN, Mr. POMBO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. CONDIT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. WA-

TERS, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. OSE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BUYER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HANSEN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. REYES, and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 1663. A bill to designate as a national memorial the memorial being built at the Riverside National Cemetery in Riverside, California to honor recipients of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 1664. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for military operations, refugee relief, and humanitarian assistance relating to the conflict in Kosovo, and for military operations in Southwest Asia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BATEMAN:

H.R. 1665. A bill to allow the National Park Service to acquire certain land for addition to the Wilderness Battlefield in Virginia, as previously authorized by law, by purchase or exchange as well as by donation; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BOYD (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MICA, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 1666. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service at 200 East Pinckney Street in Madison, Florida, as the "Captain Colin P. Kelly, Jr. Post Office"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. COOK (for himself and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota):

H.R. 1667. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, relating to vehicle weight limitations; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GANSKE:

H.R. 1668. A bill to authorize the National Park Service to conduct a feasibility study for the preservation of the Loess Hills in western Iowa; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GOSS:

H.R. 1669. A bill to provide that an annual pay adjustment for Members of Congress may not exceed the cost-of-living adjustment in benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for that year; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 1670. A bill to establish a commission to study the culture and glorification of violence in America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOYER:

H.R. 1671. A bill to grant a Federal charter to Korean War Veterans Association, Incorporated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 1672. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require States Medicaid plans to provide for payment for costs

of medical services under individualized education programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act after they exceed \$3,500 in a school year; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut:

H.R. 1673. A bill to provide bonus funds to local educational agencies that adopt a policy to end social promotion; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GARY MILLER of California:

H.R. 1674. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act with respect to civil actions against public waters systems that are in compliance with national drinking water regulations promulgated by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 1675. A bill to provide for the full funding of the Pell Grant Program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1676. A bill to amend part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1965 to prevent motorist stops motivated by race or other bias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. BROWN of California):

H.R. 1677. A bill to restrict the sale of cigarettes in packages of less than 15 cigarettes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 1678. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Transportation to initiate investigations of unfair methods of competition by major air carriers against new entrant air carriers; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

H.R. 1679. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide assistance and slots with respect to air carrier service between high density airports and certain small and nonhub airports that have unreasonably high airfares, to improve jet aircraft service to markets that have unreasonably high airfares, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 1680. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Forest Service property in Kern County, California, in exchange for county lands suitable for inclusion in Sequoia National Forest; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 1681. A bill to concentrate Federal resources aimed at the prosecution of drug offenses on those offenses that are major; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WILSON (for herself, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. FORD, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 1682. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a permanent tax incentive for research and development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRYANT (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

H.J. Res. 50. A joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Chickasaw Trail Economic Development Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHENOWETH (for herself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr.

GRAHAM, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. METCALF, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon):

H. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution recognizing the public need for reconciliation and healing, urging the United States to unite in seeking God, and recommending that the Nation's leaders call for days of prayer; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that State earnings limitations on retired law enforcement officers be lifted to enhance school safety; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Mr.

PITTS, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. METCALF, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MOORE, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. KLINK, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. HORN, Mr. FROST, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BLUNT, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H. Res. 157. A resolution Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in support of America's teachers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts introduced a bill (H.R. 1683) for the relief of Paul Green; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 8: Mr. MICA.
 H.R. 36: Mr. HOLT, Mr. DIXON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PALLONE, and Mrs. CLAYTON.
 H.R. 44: Mr. BISHOP and Mr. BAKER.
 H.R. 49: Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H.R. 65: Mr. BAKER and Mr. BERRY.
 H.R. 111: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 116: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. MURTHA.
 H.R. 142: Mr. WELDON of Florida.
 H.R. 165: Mr. EHLERS.
 H.R. 215: Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 274: Mr. COOK, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HOYER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms.

KAPTUR, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 303: Mr. BAKER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 315: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 325: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MASCARA, Ms. RIVERS, and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 348: Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 357: Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 382: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. SANDLIN, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 383: Ms. CARSON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 390: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 405: Mr. NADLER and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 415: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 425: Mr. MINGE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 430: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 455: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 457: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 486: Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 488: Mr. BONIOR and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 492: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 516: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 518: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 527: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 531: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 537: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 541: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 558: Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 595: Ms. KAPTUR and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 597: Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. HORN.

H.R. 673: Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 700: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 725: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 731: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 750: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 775: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky and Mr. EWING.

H.R. 776: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WISE, Mr. RAHALL, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 783: Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 784: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 827: Mr. FROST, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BERRY, and Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 850: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. HOFFFEL.

H.R. 875: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 894: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 902: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. STARK, Mr. HOFFFEL, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 906: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 914: Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 961: Mr. WU and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 976: Ms. WATERS, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. BALDACCIO, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 987: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MICA, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.

H.R. 996: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 997: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. PITTS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COOK, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1003: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1032: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WAMP, and Peterson of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1044: Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1049: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1062: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SABO, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1082: Mr. BENTSEN and Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 1083: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. NUSSLE, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 1084: Mr. GARY MILLER of California and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 1102: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. METCALF, Ms. DUNN, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 1108: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1111: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1130: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 1130: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 1168: Mr. COBLE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1173: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1188: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 1219: Mr. HILL of Montana.

H.R. 1236: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 1256: Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 1272: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ISTOOK, and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 1283: Mr. STUMP, Mr. BALLERNGER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. DOOLEY of California.

H.R. 1289: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1298: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1299: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 1300: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FORD, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1301: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. EWING, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.

H.R. 1317: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 1322: Mr. GOODLING and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 1326: Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. FROST, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 1344: Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 1349: Mr. GOODE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. NEY, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1350: Mr. SABO, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 1354: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. THUNE.

H.R. 1355: Mr. LARSON and Mr. SAWYER.

H.R. 1357: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1361: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1370: Mr. BARR of Georgia and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1371: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1405: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FROST, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1456: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 1476: Mr. FARR of California and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 1485: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1525: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1536: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 1538: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. PICKERING, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 1545: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BERMAN, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1592: Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. HERGER, Ms. DANNER, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 1606: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 1622: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STARK, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1648: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. FALCOMA.

H.R. 1650: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 1657: Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. ARMEY.

H.J. Res. 21: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. TANNER.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. BONIOR.

H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FROST, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. REYES, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 74: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CONYERS, and Mrs. CAPPAS.

H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Con. Res. 84: Mr. FORBES and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H. Con. Res. 88: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. BACHUS.

H. Res. 41: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H. Res. 89: Mr. WATT of North Carolina and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H. Res. 146: Ms. RIVERS, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. ALLEN.

H. Res. 156: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LEE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FORD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. DIXON, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CARSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. WATERS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. FALCOMA, and Mr. SCOTT.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 732: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1598: Mrs. EMERSON.