

the structures that constrain African Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I and the other members here today understand, like Douglass, the necessity of government backed decisions to help encourage the will of America to respond positively to the structures that constrain African American. This resolution does just that. I agree Congress must recognize the historical significance of the Supreme Court's unanimous decision in *Brown versus Board of Education*. This is why I have joined in signing this important resolution and urge all members to do the same.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of this resolution to commemorate the historic decision of *Brown versus Board of Education*. This landmark court decision ended years of the separate but unequal education of African American students in the United States. It also played a role in instigating the larger Civil Rights Movement. This decision is a prime example of how one person who sees an injustice can use our legal system to make that situation more tolerable.

Oliver Brown was distressed that his young daughter had to walk across town and over dangerous railroad tracks to attend school when a perfectly adequate school sat just blocks from their home. Rather than accepting the status quo Oliver Brown took matters in his own hands and sued the school system that refused to let his daughter attend the neighborhood school because she was black.

Mr. Brown is an example to all parents and citizens in the United States. When injustices occur it often is our response to accept it and move on. Progress has never occurred using that philosophy. I ask our parents to become involved in their children's education. If you see problems with your schools or problems with the police in your town or neighborhood—speak out against these injustices.

While the laws that created segregation and discrimination have been lifted, these terrible acts still occur. We must make our voices be heard and let the United States government know that we will not tolerate de facto segregation and discrimination anywhere in this nation, not in our schools, not in our government, not in our workplace and not on our highways or in our police stations.

We must take the commemoration of this landmark legal decision which sparked the beginning of the end of legal separate but equal laws and use it to end the segregation and discrimination that still exists in our country today.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 176

Whereas in 1951 Linda Brown was a third-grader and an African-American who was forced to endure hardships such as walking a mile through a railroad switchyard to get to her black elementary school, even though a white elementary school was only 7 blocks away;

Whereas the Reverend Oliver Brown, Linda Brown's father, was turned away when he

tried to register his daughter at the nearby white school, simply because the little girl was black;

Whereas Thurgood Marshall, special counsel for the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and a protégé of Howard University Law Professor Charles Houston, successfully argued that the "separate but equal" doctrine, established by the Supreme Court in its *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision in 1896, was unconstitutional;

Whereas Chief Justice Earl Warren read aloud, from the Court's unanimous decision: "We come then to the question presented: Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other 'tangible' factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does. . . . We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment";

Whereas the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision struck a pivotal blow against Jim Crow laws, as well as the dark forces of racism and segregation; and

Whereas the interaction of students of all races promotes better understanding and the acceptance of racial differences: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the historical significance of the Supreme Court's unanimous decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*;

(2) heralds this watershed in our shared history as a significant advancement of the most basic American principles of freedom, justice, and equality under the law; and

(3) repudiates racial segregation as antithetical to the noble ideals upon which this great Nation was founded, and reaffirms the fundamental belief that we are all "one Nation under God, indivisible."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 176 and House Resolution 161.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 987

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed from H.R. 987 as an original cosponsor.

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

There was no objection.

□ 2100

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

AVIATION BILATERAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a piece of legislation entitled the Aviation Bilateral Accountability Act.

The Aviation Bilateral Accountability Act is a bill that will require congressional review of all U.S. bilateral aviation agreements. International aviation is governed by a series of bilateral civil aviation agreements between nations. This means that if an air carrier from the United States wants to fly into or out of another country, the United States Government must first negotiate with the government of that foreign country to determine the terms under which the carriers from both countries will operate.

U.S. bilateral aviation agreements are executive agreements. They are negotiated and signed by representatives from the Department of State and from the Department of Transportation. In fact, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and Transportation Secretary Rodney Slater recently joined representatives from the People's Republic of China in signing a new U.S.-China civil aviation agreement.

The new agreement will govern aviation policy between the United States and China for the next 3 years. Unfortunately, like all bilateral aviation agreements, Congress did not play any official role in the review or the approval of this new agreement.

As ranking member of the House Subcommittee on Aviation, I strongly believe that Congress deserves to play a role in reviewing and approving bilateral aviation agreements. As Members of Congress, we represent the business person, the leisure traveler, the consumer, and the flying public in general. We should have the right to make sure that bilateral aviation agreements are negotiated to give U.S. consumers the most access to international aviation markets at the best prices possible.

For example, the new U.S.-China civil aviation agreement increases U.S. access to China by doubling the number of scheduled flights and designating one additional U.S. carrier. However, many industry observers believe that U.S. negotiators should not have settled for anything less than access for

two additional U.S. carriers through this very large Chinese market.

Therefore, I am introducing the Aviation Bilateral Accountability Act, a bill to require congressional review of all U.S. aviation bilateral agreements. International aviation, which is based on bilateral aviation agreements, has a tremendous impact on the U.S. economy and U.S. citizens. Congress should not be excluded from agreements of such magnitude.

Under the Aviation Bilateral Accountability Act, the executive branch must submit each new and updated bilateral aviation agreement to Congress. Then a Member of Congress must introduce a disapproval resolution within 20 days after receiving the agreement. If a disapproval resolution is not introduced within 20 days, the bilateral agreement is automatically approved and can be implemented.

However, if a disapproval resolution is introduced, Congress then has 90 days to review the bilateral agreement and enact a disapproval resolution if necessary. If a disapproval resolution is not enacted by the end of the 90-day period, the bilateral agreement is then automatically approved and can and will be implemented.

As elected representatives of the people, we owe it to the American consumer to look out for his or her best interest. My legislation will help Members of Congress better represent the flying public by giving Congress a vital role in the review and approval of U.S. bilateral agreements.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to thank the 13 Members who have joined me as original cosponsors of this important legislation, including the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JOHN DUNCAN, JR.) Chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation.

I urge all Members of the House to join us in cosponsoring the Aviation Bilateral Accountability Act.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATE SPENDING LEVELS SET BY INTERIM ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the aggregate spending levels set by the interim allocations and aggregates for fiscal year 1999 printed in the RECORD on February 3, 1999, pursuant to H. Res. 5. H.R. 1141, the conference report to accompany the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act for fiscal year 1999, adjusts the allocation for the House

Committee on Appropriations to reflect \$12,782,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$3,582,000,000 in additional outlays for designated emergency spending. In addition, the Committee on Appropriations will receive \$25,000,000 less in budget authority and \$2,000,000 less in outlays for funds previously appropriated for arrearages that were rescinded by the conference report for H.R. 1141. Overall, the allocation to the Appropriations Committee will increase to \$585,555,000,000 in budget authority and \$580,059,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999.

I also submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an adjusted fiscal year 2000 allocations to the House Committee on Appropriations to reflect \$1,881,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$1,806,000,000 in additional outlays for designated emergency spending. In addition, the outlay effect of the fiscal year 1999 budget authority of H.R. 1141 will result in additional outlays of \$5,452,000,000 for fiscal year 2000. The rescission of funds previously appropriated for arrearages will result in \$2,000,000 less in outlays for fiscal year 2000. Overall, the allocation to the Appropriations Committee will increase to \$538,152,000,000 in budget authority and \$578,201,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2000.

The House Committee on Appropriations submitted the report for H.R. 1141, the conference report to accompany the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act for fiscal year 1999, which includes \$12,757,000,000 in budget authority and \$3,580,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 designated defense and non-defense emergency spending. H.R. 1141 includes \$1,881,000,000 in budget authority and \$7,256,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2000 designated emergency spending.

These adjustments shall apply while the legislation is under consideration and shall take effect upon final enactment of the legislation. Questions may be directed to Art Sauer or Jim Bates at x6-7270.

#### HOW LONG MUST BOMBINGS IN YUGOSLAVIA CONTINUE?

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, how long must the bombings in Yugoslavia continue? NATO has been bombing now for over 54 days. For what purpose? Why?

The President, Vice President, and Secretary of State's stated policy was to stop the ethnic cleansing of Kosovo Albanians. They said they must act to forestall a new round of ethnic cleansing by Mr. Milosevic. That was the reason the bombings started. But the policy has failed. The bombings have not worked.

Today there are nearly 800,000 refugees in Macedonia, another 500,000 internally displaced within Kosovo, thousands have been murdered, Macedonia has been destabilized, and our foreign

relations with Russia and China are severely strained.

Furthermore, in today's Washington Post it was written that in Latin America, Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and other regions with little direct interest in the conflict, opposition to the bombings is surfacing in statements by elected officials, in newspaper editorials of the opinion polls, and by public protest.

From a policy point, it is difficult to imagine how the situation could be much worse than it is today. Clinton administration spokesmen and women have criticized Milosevic forces for killing innocent civilians, and rightfully so, because Serb forces have killed innocent civilians. However, our bombings have killed and may be killing innocent civilians in Yugoslavia today.

Mr. Milosevic's forces have destroyed much of the infrastructure in Kosovo. That is true. However, our bombings are destroying the infrastructure in Yugoslavia today. So today we have death, refugees, displaced persons, pain and suffering among the Kosovo Albanians, but we also have death, refugees, displaced persons, and pain and suffering among the Serbs of Yugoslavia today.

As Mr. Michael Dobbs wrote in Sunday's Washington Post, this administration's oversimplistic comparison between Kosovo and Bosnia and Mr. Milosevic and Hitler has helped transform what would otherwise have been a Balkan crisis into a global crisis, the ramifications of which are being felt not only in Yugoslavia, not only in Kosovo, but throughout the entire world.

I would say to the President, what does he want? The Yugoslav Government said today it is open to peace proposals by the G-8 foreign ministers for ending the crisis over Kosovo. How many more bombs must be dropped and how many more deaths must be brought before we admit this policy has not worked?

I would say to the President, stop the bombings, give negotiations an opportunity to work. How long must the bombings in Yugoslavia continue?

#### NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION WEEK

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, May 16 to 21 is National Transportation Week. During National Transportation Week, I will honor the many accomplishments of the Department of Transportation and our dedicated