HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, October 13, 1993*

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

As we view our communities and too many areas of our world, we see the pain of conflicts and the anger of people who are too eager for confrontation. Yet, O gracious God, we also see those people who use their abilities and gifts to strive for tolerance and who work for peace. For those who seek to heal the wounds of society, for those who give of their time and resources, for those who contribute with support and a caring spirit, for all those who seek the common good, for those who give blessing with their thoughts and prayers, we offer this word of thanksgiving and praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SAXTON 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 832. An act to designate the plaza to be constructed on the Federal Triangle property in Washington, DC, as the "Woodrow Wilson Plaza";

S. 1507. An act to make technical amendments to the Higher Education Amendments of 1992 and the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; and

S. 1534. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to repeal a requirement that the Under Secretary for Health in the Department of Veterans Affairs be a doctor of medicine.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 101-194, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints Shepard Lee of Maine to the Citizens' Commission on Public Service and Compensation, vice Walter B. Gerken of California.

END THE MISADVENTURE IN SOMALIA

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the adage that a picture is worth a thousand words, let me display for the benefit of my colleagues in the House and in the other body who will vote, I hope, this week on resolutions dealing with how long we should remain in Somalia, pictures taken from this week's Time and Newsweek magazines which show the disgraceful, deplorable, and indecent way our United States troops were treated in Somalia earlier this month.

I hope my colleagues can see this picture. If they have a chance to look at this picture in this issue and also this picture which shows our soldier being dragged through the streets of Mogadishu.

Mr. Speaker, for many months many of my colleagues and I have been saying we should not have been in Somalia beyond last May when the humanitarian phase of our deployment ended successfully.

We say again and I say again today, let us get out of Somalia long before next March, which is when the President wants to bring us out. We have no business there. Our troops today are pinned down to their compound and not patrolling the streets of Mogadishu.

That adventure has turned into a misadventure. It should end immediately.

SLIDING DOWN A DANGEROUS SLOPE

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, recently I talked to the parents of a young man wounded in Somalia. What made a difficult task even more difficult is that I could not even explain why we were involved there.

As I was on the phone trying to explain United States policy in the "new world order," the President was making plans to send our troops into Rwanda and Haiti.

Mr. Speaker, we are now sliding down a very dangerous slope of arbitrating internal conflicts.

As this map illustrates with red marks, there are many dangerous places in the world where U.S. troops could be sent, keeping in line with this very dangerous foreign policy of minding other people's business.

Jeanne Kirkpatrick eloquently details the shortcomings of this deficient policy in an editorial I will submit for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, we must lead the "new world order" with coherent, understandable policy—policy that Americans can understand, accept, and support.

TAXPAYERS AND THE IRS

(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, the Constitution says you are innocent until proven guilty, or at least that is what we learned in our Government classes; but the truth is, when it comes to the Internal Revenue Service, the Constitution has been reworked, reworded, changed, manipulated by a bunch of bureaucrats.

In fact, if you are accused of wrongdoing, under the IRS law you are guilty, Mr. Speaker, and must prove yourself innocent.

Unbelievable. We are going to reinvent Government? We are going to straighten out America? We are going to take our Government back?

Unbelievable. My bill today says that when the IRS points its finger, makes an accusation that a taxpayer is guilty of fraud or wrongdoing, fine; but they have the burden of proof, not the taxpayer.

I am asking Congress to support me. I am asking you to cosponsor this bill.

I will say this, now that the words have become public on these formerly secret petitions, if in 30 days no one deals with this, because they have never dealt with it here, there will be a petition here. I am going to ask you to sign it.

CONTINUE OUR TRANSMISSIONS TO CUBA

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, emboldened by Somalia, the coup regime in Haiti has prevented our military and police trainers from peacefully entering that country engulfed in tragedy.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

I think the President is right in seeking to reimpose the United Nations Security Council embargo against the Haitian regime.

Now, a few miles away from Haiti, the Cuban dictatorship continues to try to prevent our television and radio signals from entering that country to provide news and information to the Cuban people.

Now, there is an entire chorus in the media and a few even in this body who not only are not calling for the same sanctions against Cuba, they are not calling for an international embargo against Castro, no. They are calling for us to throw in the towel, cave in to Castro and unilaterally to kill the transmissions to the Cuban people.

That is another blatant example of the double standard that is applied against the remaining Communist dictatorship in this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to seek an international embargo against Castro like we are seeking against the Haitian dictatorship, and at the very least it is time to stay the course and to continue our transmissions to Cuba.

HUMAN DIGNITY MUST BE OUR GUIDE

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

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Speaker, our Christian teachings instruct us that every human being has dignity. Our dignity is the binding unifying force in our relationships—our families, our friendships, our businesses, our governments. I believe we are very rightly taught to respect an individual's human dignity. There are times when an individual or individuals may behave in a fashion that is not dignified. In addressing these individuals let us move from the premise that we can enforce dignified behavior to the very Christian religious premise that individuals be encouraged to consider, to reflect upon, to contemplate their personal dignity, and to cherish the vision of the strength that flows and will flow in their families, in their communities, in their businesses, and in their governments as their personal dignity is strengthened.

As we embrace this very religious principle in all our thoughts and actions, we as a nation will improve our work in situations of stress with other people in the world, in our communities, and organizations and in our personal relationships. The basis for human progress is human dignity. If we are to progress we must respect human dignity.

CRIME IN AMERICA

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, in the near future we will be debating yet another anticrime bill here in this Chamber. I hope that this Congress will enact a tough bill into law. We came close last year—this year, let's get the job done.

We need to, Mr. Speaker, because violent crime is a booming business across our Nation today—up 500 percent since 1960. That is 5-0-0 percent. Not 5, not 50, but 500 percent—and that is a disgrace.

Every year, some 5 million people are victims of violent crime—a murder every 24 minutes, a rape every 6 minutes, a robbery every 55 seconds, an assault every 33 seconds. Yet, on average, violent offenders serve only 5½ years for murder, 3 years for rape, 2¼ years for robbery, and 1.28 years for assault. That is a disagrace as well.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress, let us pass a tough anticrime bill—and let us get it enacted into law.

Let us do something for the thousands of Americans living in fear across our Nation. Let us get the job done.

□ 1010

THE SUNSHINE FOR LOBBYISTS' ACT OF 1993

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

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support today of H.R. 2834, the Sunshine for Lobbyists' Act of 1993. This legislation is a companion bill to S. 349, introduced by Senator PAUL WELLSTONE and was passed in May of this year. I encourage my colleagues to join me as cosponsors of this bill.

The American people are tired of politics as usual, you know it, and I know it. They sent 110 freshmen to Washington to change the system, to shake it up, to get rid of the old ways. H.R. 2834 is lobbying disclosure legislation that reforms current congressional practices. If we pass this legislation, gifts to Members and their staff with a value of $20 or more, will be public record. An August New York Times editorial praised freshmen Representatives, the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT] for their leadership in this area.

Let us show the American people that they have been heard and pass this legislation before we recess for the year.

BIPARTISAN HEALTH CARE REFORM: HEALTH CARE INFORMATION MODERNIZATION AND SECURITY

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, nearly everyone engaged in the health care debate agrees that we must eliminate administrative waste and the costly burden of paperwork in our health care system, which consumes 10 cents of every dollar we pay for insurance and medical bills.

Relieving that burden is possible through an electronic health care data network. Recently, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] and I introduced H.R. 3137, the Health Care Information Modernization and Security Act.

In addition to simplifying paperwork, our bill creates the information infrastructure critical for comprehensive reform:

It provides consumers with the data they need to compare insurance plans and health services.

It creates the tools that researchers, doctors and hospitals need to reduce unnecessary and costly medical procedures.

And it provides the information needed to expose fraud in the health care system.

I am pleased to work with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] on this bipartisan project. He has shown great leadership on electronic data issues as the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Census.

He agrees that now is the time to modernize our health care system, and we invite our colleagues to join us in this effort.

BIPARTISAN HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. DAVE HOBSON, just made a strong case for why we need to reduce the paperwork burden in our health care system.

To do that, we need an information network that contains timely, accurate, and uniform data. Our bill would do just that.

It would create medical information standards that would apply across the country. With consistent data available, doctors and hospitals would be speaking the same language—using the same vocabulary—and in the same terms of measurement. And Americans would know that their medical records are up-to-date and accurate and confidential.

A good information system means that Americans won't have to fill out piles of forms each time they visit a new doctor or go to the hospital. And doctors won't have to spend valuable time filling out papers, when they could be treating patients.

Easy access to health records that contain accurate and uniform information. That is what Americans want in a

new health care system. That is what they deserve.

CLINTON'S HEALTH PLAN

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, we need real health care reform. However, we must protect the rights of families to choose their health care coverage, and if a member of the family gets sick, families must have the freedom to choose their doctors, hospitals, and methods of treatment. When politicians tell us that only the Government is smart enough to solve our health care problems, average Americans should remember that this is the same Government which cannot balance a budget or manage the huge bureaucracy which already exists.

The Clinton health plan will create 59 new Federal programs or bureaucracies, expand 20 others, and impose 79 brand new Federal mandates. Thousands of new Government bureaucrats will be hired at the expense of billions of taxpayers' dollars.

An editorial from a newspaper in my district simply and succinctly sums up Clinton's plan as "* * * big brother and bigger bureaucracy * * *" and, if this plan passes, Americans are going to get huge doses of both.

CUT SUPER SPENDING, CUT THE SUPER COLLIDER

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

Mr. KREIDLER. Mr. Speaker, in June we voted overwhelmingly to kill the superconducting super collider. But now, the Senate has brought it back to life.

This shows how hard it is to cut Federal spending. Everyone says, "cut spending." But some just cannot say "no."

There are contractors in my district who could benefit from this project. But there are a lot more taxpayers in my district who would have to pay for it.

The test for Federal funding these days has to be strict: The need must be urgent, the results must be demonstrable, and the cost must be reasonable.

The SSC flunks that test. There are cost overruns and sloppy accounting, and the price tag has doubled—to $12 billion.

That is why I will vote against the energy and water appropriation conference report if it contains funding for the SSC, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

We have to draw the line somewhere. Let us draw it here. Let us vote "no" on the energy and water conference report.

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, the declaration of principles, which was signed last month at the White House, goes into effect today. While we all cheered the pact as a blueprint for peace in the Middle East, we must hold our celebration until issues such as Hamas, the militant Palestinian wing; and the continuing Arab boycott of Israel, are fully addressed.

We must work to insure that Hamas does not use the Gaza Strip or Jericho as launching pads for terrorism. And we must continue to press the Arab world to end the economic boycott of Israel, truly an issue that has become lost in the revelry surrounding the peace plan.

As Israel takes risks for peace, the United States-Israeli relationship becomes more important than ever. We must, as Israeli Foreign Minister Peres recently said, remain the real bridge builder of peace in the Middle East. To do anything less abdicates our responsibility to peace initiatives throughout the world.

AIDS TOLL HITS RURAL AMERICA

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I do not want a milestone to go unnoticed. September was a milestone month for Sonoma County, CA. A terrible, sad, and tragic milestone.

Mr. Speaker, last month, Sonoma County public health officials recorded the 1,000th patient to contract AIDS. Sonoma County will be the first-ever rural area in America to be eligible for title 1 funding—disaster relief that has previously been reserved for the AIDS-ravaged urban areas.

One thousand people in Sonoma County alone, Mr. Speaker. How many more individuals must contract AIDS before this Nation forges a comprehensive agenda to fight this dreaded disease?

Mr. Speaker, we must have education, research, and prevention plans, and we must fully fund them. America simply cannot afford to wait any longer.

HEARINGS BUT NO SIGHTINGS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, two Americans just received the Nobel Prize for medicine for discovering the basis of DNA makeup. DNA is impossible to see, so you can imagine how hard it is to find and why you deserve a Nobel Prize for finding it.

This medical discovery clearly qualifies them to undertake another in the impossible-to-see category: the Clinton health care plan.

Weeks ago the President made a speech on this floor about the plan. Congress has even had hearings, but as yet there have been no sightings.

It is no wonder a recent Washington Post poll found an astounding 79 percent of all Americans do not think the President has a complete plan, while only 17 percent think he does. And 30 percent say they know nothing at all about the plan.

Maybe if the medical Nobel Prize winners can find the Clinton health care plan, they will call on the two American Nobel Prize winners in economics to tell us how much it will cost.

□ 1020

NAFTA: THE BETTER CHOICE

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, some folks out there in the debate on NAFTA are saying "Not this NAFTA." The implication is, let us get a better NAFTA. But I am afraid the reality is it is this NAFTA, or none at all. We simply should not kid ourselves about the likelihood of getting back to the negotiating table. The Mexican and Canadian Governments simply are not in the position to pull it off. So the choice before us really is between the status quo, which is clearly unacceptable, or positive change for all three countries, especially Mexico.

If Congress defeats NAFTA, the toxic discharges along our border are not going to go away; enforcement of Mexican labor laws is not going to get better; loss of American jobs will not turn around; and we will not be able to do very much about it.

But if NAFTA and its accompanying side agreements are approved, including major new provisions for worker retraining and border cleanup, we will have some important new tools to leverage real reform and to improve the job situation here at home.

NAFTA is not perfect, but it is a lot better than the drift of the status quo. The choice is simple: We can tread water and hope things will get better, or we can seize this opportunity and pass NAFTA.

PRESIDENT CLINTON NEEDS A NEW PLAN FOR SOMALIA

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has been roundly criticized for not having a coherent plan in Somalia.

His plan of the day, introduced in a meeting with a number of congressional leaders last week, was summarily rejected.

A congressional briefing, led by Secretaries Aspin and Christopher, left Members shaking their heads.

Mr. Speaker, if the President is interested in some advice, I have some for him: Secure American military personnel in Somalia. And bring our troops home. Now.

Our troops went to Somalia to provide humanitarian assistance—to see to it that the hungry were fed. We have accomplished that mission.

Now, it is time to bring our men and women home.

SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER CAN WAIT

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, by a vote of 280 to 150, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly supported the elimination of funding for the superconducting super collider. Despite this Chamber's clear assertion to have these funds removed, all nine House conferees named to the Energy and Water Appropriations conference committee are supporters of the SSC program.

The conferees should remember why funds for the SSC were eliminated, and they should acquiesce to the vast majority of this Chamber by ensuring that the SSC funds are not included in the conference bill.

The original price tag for this taxpayer funded project was $4.4 billion. The latest estimate, after severe cost overruns, is over $11 billion. I hope that some day our Nation will be able to afford a project of this magnitude. However, as a question of Federal spending priorities, most of us believe that the SSC can wait.

Mr. Speaker, we need to focus on eliminating our deficit, educating our children, developing our infrastructure, and creating high-wage, full-time jobs for all Americans. I urge the conferees to help make this possible, by adhering to the mandate voted on by the House of Representatives. Let us eliminate funding for the superconducting super collider.

THE CLINTON HEALTH CARE PLAN: "SIMPLICITY" DEFINED

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration still has no health care bill, but a 239-page draft claims the bill will reduce paperwork and regulation and consumers will experience a streamlined and simpler system.

As with the budget earlier this year, there is a disparity between what the administration claims and what it does. A close look at the draft reveals that the plan would create 59 new Federal programs or bureaucracies, expand 20 others, impose 79 new Federal mandates, and make major changes in the Tax Code.

The Clinton plan is a bureaucratic nightmare. The Federal Government will mandate, regulate, legislate, promulgate, and, yes, suffocate the U.S. health care industry.

All these agencies and programs will govern every aspect of your family's health care. From the President, to the 9-member National Health Board, to the 50 State governments, to regional health alliances, to accountable-to-the-Government health plans, to insurers, to doctors, to hospitals, and, finally, to you.

The Clinton plan is trickle-down health care.

PUERTO RICO STATEHOOD BY 1996

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

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, next month, on November 14, my constituents on the island of Puerto Rico will have the opportunity to begin the process that will put an end to a territorial status that has kept us as disenfranchised American citizens and prevented us from achieving political and economic equality with our fellow citizens in the 50 States of the Union.

We have waited a long time for this moment. Puerto Rico has been a U.S. colony longer than any other previous American territory, but until now we have not sought a mandate for statehood. When we get that mandate on November 14, we will have met all the requirements for statehood that each of the other territories had to meet in order to be admitted as States.

I am confident that the people of Puerto Rico are now ready to take the initiative, and deliver a historic mandate for statehood. It will then be time for us in Congress to define the terms of admission, and pass an enabling act for Puerto Rico's admission as a State.

Mr. Speaker, I will seek your support and the support of my colleagues to get an admission act passed into law by 1996.

ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown has been accused of taking a $700,000 bribe and possibly having gotten the commitment for hundreds of millions of dollars more from the Government of Vietnam in exchange for using his influence to remove the embargo against that country and lower the trade barriers that we have been putting on them.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary has come before our committees in Congress and said that this is a total falsehood. He said he had nothing to do with negotiations to normalize relations with Vietnam.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I found out last night that there was a National Security Council meeting in June, and that I believe there is a real possibility that the Secretary may have misled the Congress, been involved in a falsehood, and may have done the things that he has been alleged to do.

Tonight in a special order at the conclusion of business, I will be going into details of that National Security Council meeting and bringing the country up to date, and I hope my colleagues will pay attention. This is very, very serious. There is a big cloud hanging over the Clinton administration. It needs to be removed. We are going to take the first step tonight.

SOMALIAN INTERNATIONAL OUTRAGE NOT A QUESTION OF POLITICS

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, like all Americans, I grieve with the families of the American soldiers killed in Somalia. The images of mistreatment of our peacekeepers, participating in a humanitarian mission, stir my anger and the anger of every American. Last week I joined the call to set a date for an American withdrawal. I was pleased that the President did set a date certain in his address to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is now vital that we resist the temptation to make this international outrage a question of politics. The President has committed to us a withdrawal from Somalia.

The need to protect our soldiers now on the ground as well as the significant success we have had in saving millions of people from starvation justify the course of action the President has ordered.

Were we to follow a more hasty course of action, American peacekeepers, soldiers, and relief workers across the world would be viewed as targets of opportunity by outlaw regimes.

Our primary concern must be the safety of our troops. But we must also

not lose sight of the potential backslide to starvation that a quick reaction poses.

The President's plan is a measured, considered course of action that does both.

□ 1030

FOREIGN POLICY ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the President was apparently stung very deeply by the criticism during the campaign that he knew little about foreign affairs. Now he seems to be trying desperately to prove that he is a world leader.

The only problem is that we cannot afford this very expensive on-the-job training. We have already spent over $3 billion in U.N. missions that our people did not want.

The President wanted to commit us in a big way militarily in Bosnia. But the overwhelming majority of the American people were against it, because their common sense told them such a mission would be an utter failure.

Now the President is sending thousands of additional troops into Somalia and Haiti. There is no threat to our national security in either of those countries.

We should not continue to let a wasteful and corrupt United Nations commit us to all sorts of expensive adventures around the world. We have neither the financial resources nor the manpower to solve every world problem.

We simply cannot afford to continue to spend additional billions so that our President can prove that he knows something about foreign policy.

LOST MANUFACTURING JOBS

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, recent newspaper articles tell us what every American in his guts knows to be true, that we are continuing to lose our decent-paying manufacturing jobs, the jobs that pay $10, $15, $20 an hour, and are replacing them with low-wage, part-time, temporary, service industry jobs for 5 bucks an hour.

It is happening in my State. It is happening all over the country.

An AP report indicates that the manufacturing sector in the United States has lost 260,000 jobs since February, and we are now down to the lowest level since 1965.

Let us be very clear. If this trend continues, if the GE's, the GM's, the Digital's, the AT&T's continue to downsize, continue to move for cheap labor to Mexico, Singapore, Thailand, that in 20 years the United States will become a Third World economy with a vast majority of our workers earning subsistence wages.

It is clear that we not only have to defeat NAFTA to stop this trend but we need an entirely new economic policy which reindustrializes America, which rebuilds our manufacturing base, and which stops the hemorrhaging of decent-paying jobs.

We need immediately a real jobs program which rebuilds our infrastructure, builds affordable housing. To start that process, I intend to fight for that.

COMMERCE SECRETARY RON BROWN

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I might add, if the Socialist policies of my colleague who preceded me are followed, we are going to need a much bigger jobs program, because there will be a lot more people unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], in providing the American people a corruption update, which we will hear later on this evening.

Recently, Secretary of Commerce Brown testified before my subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and he denied the allegations that he negotiated a $700,000 bribe to ease the embargo on Communist Vietnam.

He also testified that he did not participate in any way in the administration's decision to lift the embargo on Vietnam or to ease the embargo on Vietnam, which was a major economic decision.

The question I have to ask is: Why did he not participate, as Secretary of Commerce, on this incredibly important economic decision?

Listen, either he is clean and he should have participated in that decision on lifting the embargo, or he is dirty, and he should not be the Secretary of Commerce.

This deserves an investigation. We are not going to let it fade from memory like we did the White House Travelgate scandal.

Let us keep this before the attention of the American people, have the questions answered, and have a legitimate investigation.

A NEW DRUG MENACE IN NORTHERN MICHIGAN

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I want to highlight to my colleagues a column by Anderson and Binstein in last Sunday's Washington Post regarding a new drug menace that is running rampant in northern Michigan. The drug is methcathinone, nicknamed "cat." Its effects are devastating.

Cat is easy to make. Cat produces a high more powerful than cocaine, and its ingredients—battery acid, drain cleaner, epsom salts, and ephedrine—are for the most part legal.

The drug is spreading rapidly from Michigan's upper peninsula, across this Nation. Cat laboratories have been seized as far away as Indianapolis and Seattle. Each "cat" lab seizure has a tie back to northern Michigan. While this drug is still regional, if not stopped it promises to plague this Nation.

The key to stopping the spread of this powerful drug is to place controls on the amount of ephedrine—sold as diet pills and as pep pills—which can be obtained over the counter, and through the mail. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 3216, which would tighten controls on ephedrine. These new controls are strongly supported by the Drug Enforcement Agency and law enforcement officials in Michigan.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation so we can stop "cat" before it becomes a national drug epidemic.

WHAT HAPPENED IN SOMALIA AND WHY

(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, for the time being, American troops in Somalia are not being ambushed. Still risking their lives to feed a country, our troops in Mogadishu remain wary—constantly aware that a sniper may find a clear shot, that a mortar round may suddenly descend, or that a rocket-propelled grenade may be fired their way.

However, on October 3, 17 of our sons died and 77 were wounded in a furious firefight that found our troops outmanned and outgunned. When the bodies of these fallen soldiers were brought back to America—to Dover, DE, there was no ceremony, and our President was not there. As a Vietnam-era veteran, it reminds me of transgressions our Nation pledged not to repeat from Vietnam.

Amid all this, I read about Defense Secretary Aspin denying requests from our field commanders in Somalia for more and better equipment. I see feverish diplomatic efforts under way to placate the leader of those Somalis who killed and wounded our soldiers and

who continue to hold injured helicopter pilot Michael Durant as a prisoner. Meanwhile, like millions of other Americans, I watch the chaos in Haiti as we begin another dangerous, ill-conceived mission that is not vital to our national security.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened in Somalia? The families of the dead and wounded—and the American people—deserve straight answers. I urge the Armed Services and the Foreign Affairs Committees to immediately begin formal hearings to get at the root of this tragedy. We should not wait 5 more months while more American lives are lost.

WILL WE BECOME AN ISLAND?

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I came this morning to speak about health care, but I find, after listening, that something is much more urgent.

We have heard about the bridging, bridges by sending money to Israel, working on peace around the world, talking about isolationism, protectionism, NAFTA and health care reform.

Yet, I have heard speeches about cutting off our research, ignoring that we need to continue to learn, ignoring that we need to create jobs and that we must look out for the welfare of our children and the future of this Nation.

I have heard Members saying, cut, cut, cut, cut, cut all of the research, cut the state-of-the-art research, cut the super collider.

Yes, we can cut the super collider. Yes, we will save millions today. But what will we do to our tomorrow?

We will shut off breakthroughs in health care. We will shut off opportunities to create jobs. We will shut off this Nation from the rest of the world. And while we talk about being global, we will be isolated here on an island. And we will be so protectionist, when we do vote down NAFTA, that we will not have relationships with any other nation in the world.

We will simply be here as an island.

MORE THOUGHTS ON FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, almost 25 years ago, in a place called Woodstock, a singer named Country Joe McDonald sang a song:

> Come on all you big strong men. Uncle Sam needs your help again. Got himself in a terrible jam, way down yonder in Vietnam. So put down your books, pick up your gun, we are going to have a whole lot of fun.

The song epitomized the divisiveness and the bitterness surrounding that unpopular war, and the theme of it was that we got ourselves in a terrible jam because of inept foreign policy.

Indeed, even the chorus said, "One, two, three, what are we fighting for?"

Mr. Speaker, these words revisit us today. In my district, 1,200 young men and women had gone to Somalia.

□ 1040

I support them 100 percent, but what I do not support is the net foreign policy. We need to know what are we doing in Somalia; why are we involved in their civil war; when will we be home?

The President, Mr. Aspin, and Mr. Christopher need to answer these questions and they need to do it now. Otherwise, Country Joe's words still haunt us: "What are we fighting for?"

CONGRESSIONAL ROLE IN A NEW WAR ON POVERTY

(Ms. WATERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss poverty in America. According to last week's census data, poverty is on the rise for the third straight year.

More people live in poverty than at any time since 1970—38.6 million Americans are poor—14.5 percent of the population. That number has risen 5.4 million since 1989.

People are not poor because they are lazy—40.3 percent of all poor adults worked at some time last year—9.2 percent of those worked full-time.

Poverty among children is 21.6 percent. Over 14.5 million children are condemned to poverty in the richest country in the world. This is a national disgrace.

In minority communities, the problem is dramatic. Nearly 30 percent of Latinos and one-third of all African-Americans live in poverty.

A weak recovery, persistent unemployment, and low wages continue to impede our progress.

We in this Congress must lead. We need an urban agenda and a rural renaissance. We need a new war on poverty. We cannot sit by while our children are condemned to a life without opportunity. It is time to end the hopelessness.

CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE ITS MEDICINE AND CLEAN UP ITS ACT

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

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, when Members of Congress talk about health care, perhaps we need to focus on a body that is racked with illness, but no one seems to be interested in working on the cure. The body is Congress. The illness is scandal and impropriety.

The questions raised by the House post office scandal continue to attack this body, but few are willing to take the medicine of truth or responsibility. Perhaps we cannot see the illness, but it is here.

Mistrust is like a virus. It grows among the public body until it can overwhelm us. The only cure is for Congress to take its medicine and clean up its act. The cure is House Resolution 238, calling upon our Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to actively investigate the House post office scandal.

We must face this head-on, Mr. Speaker. Allegations of embezzlement by Members of Congress, embezzlement from the taxpayer, left unresolved, will rock and cripple this institution. The shot may hurt, but the disease is far worse. Congress heal thyself.

CALLING FOR STRONG ACTION IN HAITI

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

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, the way our diplomatic corps was treated in Haiti is a disrespect to our country. The organized thugs and murderers in the Haitian police and military are ruling the country through violence, threats, and killings.

Observer after observer from the United States, the United Nations, the Organization of American States, and in short, everyone who goes to Haiti and sees firsthand what is happening there, say the Governor's Island Accords are meaningless to the lawless little dictators who are calling the shots in Haiti.

Mr. President, let us face it, words are not working. President Aristide cannot continue to run his government out of Washington, DC. Let us impose a complete embargo against Haiti that will not hurt the poorest of the people, but will hurt the rich who have made this country fall to its knees.

Mr. Speaker, Haiti is only 800 miles off our coast. It has a major impact on the fragile developing democracies in the Caribbean. There are large Haitian-American communities here in the United States, in my district, and there is a possibility of a new influx of Haitians to come to our shores.

We must straighten out the mess in Haiti. We cannot continue to have the small dictators ruin this country.

CONGRESS MUST DO SOME IN-HOUSE CLEANING

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, what I would like to address is the issue of the Congress and how it must do some in-house cleaning. First I came here and thought I would need a broom. Then I thought perhaps I needed a shovel. Now I think we need a backhoe.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal investigation of the House post office scandal continues to unearth questions about how the House has operated for years. First we learned that employees of the House post office were dealing drugs and selling cash. Next came the allegations linking several Congressmen to illegal cash-for-stamp deals with the House post office. Sentencing for the former House Postmaster for that charge is imminent. Now we learn of "special arrangements" for payroll counselors on the Hill, apparently through the House Finance Office.

Congress loses credibility by standing back and looking the other way, as if pretending will make it all disappear. It will not disappear. We must do in-house cleaning. I support House Resolution 238, to force the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to investigate the House post office scandal, because Congress should clean up its own house.

ADVISING THE ADMINISTRATION TO DEVELOP A CLEAR FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, America is a friend of freedom everywhere, but a guarantor of only its own. It has been nearly two centuries since John Adams established that basic dictum of American foreign policy.

Generations have come and gone. They have interpreted it to send America to defend Europe and defeat Japan, but confusion now and division with regard to American forces in Somalia and Haiti reminds us that now, approaching the millennium, this Nation is essentially without a guiding principle, a basic foundation for American foreign policy.

It is time for this administration, for the post-cold-war period, to find what our interests might be, where they might take us, and what essential principles will guide the United States before we take the lives of our citizens or use the good name of our country to defend or defeat those abroad.

URGING ADOPTION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 238

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, it was unconscionable that the House of Representatives operated its House bank and its House post office in a manner completely inconsistent with good business practices. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] has pending before the House a resolution that directs a full investigation by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of the House post office. Now that the former House Postmaster has pleaded guilty to conspiracy and embezzlement charges, and now that six other employees of the House post office and one former congressional aide have pleaded guilty to charges related to conduct in the post office, it is vital that we adopt the Istook resolution.

Lastly, yesterday's Washington Times mentioned files missing in the House probe which may relate to ghost employees. This item as well should be incorporated into the investigation. I urge support of the Istook resolution.

□ 1050

SIMPLICITY DEFINED

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

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, here it is. Simplicity defined. The new Clinton health care bureaucracy in a nutshell.

This diagram shows you how the system is supposed to flow.

If it all looks a little confusing, don't worry. It will get worse if the Democrat administration ever releases their Government health system scheme.

If this is what the President means by simplicity, I shudder to think what he means by cost savings, security, responsibility, and choice.

No doubt, by cost savings he means mandatory payroll taxes on all business to pay for the plan. By security, he means increasing the security of the Government over the individual and his/her current health plan.

By responsibility the President wants to make the Government responsible for every person's health care. And by choice, well, you can choose to do it the Government's way, or you can choose to go to jail.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the President promise before, and now with this chart we know that when the President says something, we have to look for the deeper meaning.

SOMALIA

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the situation in Somalia, I share the outrage of the American people over the violence directed at members of the United States Military. Clearly, our troops must conclude their mission and come home as soon as possible. Before American troops are sent abroad, clear goals must be defined. The President has now done that. It is time for us to now rally around President Clinton's Somalia policy. Foreign policy should be bipartisan.

First, we must secure the release of the American hostage, Chief Warrant Officer Michael Durant. Second, the President is trying to get the various Somalia factions together using the carrot and the stick approach with General Aideed. If he is intransigent, we must punish Aideed and the thugs who want to plunge Somalia back into chaos. Third, we must make sure we have the resources needed to carry out an orderly withdrawal from Somalia, which I believe can be done by the March 31 deadline, or sooner. We do not want to see any more unnecessary casualties resulting from a shortage of resources. Fourth, the President is right to try to get the surrounding African nations to engage in nation building in Somalia, as we withdraw our troops. We must not allow our resolve to be deterred by thugs attacking our troops because we have soldiers stationed around the world, and it would become open season on Americans everywhere if we allow that.

TRIBUTE TO THE GREEN BAY PACKERS, CELEBRATING 75 YEARS AS NFL FRANCHISE

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, let this Congress pay tribute to the most accomplished and successful franchise in the history of the National Football League: the Green Bay Packers.

On Sunday, our Packers added another milestone to their already proud tradition of accomplishment—the cherished green and gold won their 500th victory.

This milestone came at a fitting time. The Packers are celebrating their 75th year as an NFL franchise and they have planned an entire season's worth of festivities to commemorate this important achievement.

From Curly Lambeau to the Vince Lombardi era to the new Packer heroes of today coached by Mike Holmgren, the Packers have set a winning tradition. They have claimed a league-high 11 championships, including two Super Bowl wins.

This is a great accomplishment for Green Bay, truly a city of champions. The people of northeast Wisconsin who have cheered for and supported this franchise through thick and thin they are the real heroes in this football success story.

Without the support and dedication of Wisconsinites, the Green Bay Packers could not have accomplished their milestone.

LET US PUT THE SUNSHINE ON LOBBYING IN WASHINGTON

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

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, the 1992 elections were about change—fundamental change in the way our Government operates. One of the most important changes we can make is to enact H.R. 2834, the Sunshine for Lobbyists Act of 1993, and thereby open up the lobbying process to the voters and taxpayers of our Nation.

As we all know, when Congress is in session, Washington is awash in catered receptions, lunches, and dinners for Members of Congress and their staffs which are paid for by lobbyists or by clients of lobbyists.

I think that the average voter would be shocked to learn that the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 does not require that any of this wining and dining be disclosed. That is why it is essential that we enact H.R. 2834 so that: Any gift to a Member or staffer worth more than $20 must be disclosed; any collection of under $20 gifts which aggregate to more than $50 from a single source must be disclosed; and, lobbyists will have to file semi-annual public reports with the Attorney General detailing expenses for receptions, special events honoring Members, privately financed retreats, gifts to Members and staffs, local or long distance transportation, and political fundraising activities.

Until these disclosures are required, the public will be deprived of essential information about efforts by special interests to influence the governmental process. As Justice Louis Brandeis once said: "Sunshine is the best disinfectant." So let's pass H.R. 2834 and put the sunshine on lobbying in Washington.

YOU REAP WHAT YOU SOW

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the events unfolding in Haiti bear out the ancient truth that you reap what you sow. The Clinton administration is reaping in Haiti and Somalia what it sowed by eschewing experienced advice and by failing to utilize appropriate intelligence mechanisms that have been previously available. President Clinton and his advisers did not do their homework well. The Clinton administration needs to understand that the solution to Haiti lies with the Haitians in Haiti. It should not involve sending U.S. troops, especially inadequately armed troops, into the middle of a brutal ongoing civil war. A claim is made that we must not break an agreement that was made at Governors Island. That agreement, I would point out, was contingent on a stable climate in Haiti which by design does not exist and never did.

At least this time the lesson comes home not in loss of life, but so far only in loss of face. I hope this time the President will face up to this reality of what is working in Haiti, workable solutions others have presented. Meanwhile the Secretary of State's scare tactics and public statements about waves of new immigration threatening the United States unless we send troops belittles all Americans and ignores the successful efforts to contain illegally immigration problems in the Florida Straits.

DEMOCRACY IN HAITI

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my personal outrage over the recent events in Haiti. Killers and gangsters have blocked the way for democracy in Haiti by reneging on the Governor's Island accord signed by constitutionally elected President Aristide who was elected by 70 percent of the Haitian people and overthrown by a violent coup.

The United States must make it very clear that the latest violence will not be tolerated. We hold the coup leaders, General Cedras and Police Chief Francois, responsible for the safety of the people of Haiti. The killings, beatings, kidnappings, and intimidation must stop immediately. The United States must not cave into the demands of people who have no regard for right or wrong, much less promoting democracy in Haiti. The coup leaders must step down by October 15 as required by the U.N. accord. This plan has been worked on for 2 years by the international community to provide a peaceful solution to this crisis.

If Americans are the champions of democracy, we must begin at home. I believe that Haiti, which is in our back yard and just across the water from my home State of Florida, is where we must stand firm for democracy. If we don't have a United States interest in Haiti, where is our interest—in oil rich countries far away? President Aristide has fulfilled every requirement of the U.N. agreement and he must be returned this month. President Aristide's return must not be blocked by a group of killers—less than 50 people—trying to bluff the United States and the world community by flexing their muscles before they give up power.

SPENDING WELFARE DOLLARS FOR THEIR INTENDED PURPOSE

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

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, welfare payments are taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Speaker, we have the right to know that every dollar is spent for the purpose intended. The mere thought that some people would be cashing welfare checks and spending some of those dollars on the purchase of illegal drugs cannot be deemed acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, taking the currency out of the hands of welfare recipients and replacing it with a more accountable automated debit system would greatly reduce the prospect of taxpayer dollars going to drug dealers. Illegal drug transactions and the related crime activities need dollars to sustain themselves. By using modern technology, a savings and a more efficient system can be realized, while leaving out the cash-driven drug dealers.

Let us make sure that those drug dollars are not coming from you, the taxpayer.

□ 1100

NAFTA: WE MUST GET HEALED FIRST BEFORE WE DOCTOR THE REST OF THE WORLD

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

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, the jobless rate is 6.7 percent. Worst of all, manufacturing jobs are down, the lowest since the mid-1960's. More people are working, making minimum wage or low wages, unable to be able to house, clothe, and feed their families.

Now we are going to consider the North American Free Trade Agreement which would make it easier for companies in the United States to move south of the border, to build the Mexican economy. Well, what about the economy of America? What about the economy of middle America? What about the economy of States like Ohio? What about the economy of towns like Steubenville, Zanesville, Martins Ferry, and Woodsfield and Yorksville and Dover? And I could go on. They have lost industries, which have gone out of the country. We must get healed first before we start doctoring the rest of the world. Think about it.

SOMALIA, HAITI: MR. SPEAKER, IT IS TIME TO COME HOME

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, Haiti, Somalia, Karabak, Oszetzia: the names keep rolling across our tongues as we discuss what we should do about our Peace Corps with Uzis. But the price in blood to some American families is absolutely heartbreaking.

Mr. Speaker, this is from the Washington Times, last Friday: "Twenty-nine Americans dead in Somalia, only four of them under the successful operation of Restore Hope." And there are five names that are not on this page because last week they were listed as missing. I knew they were not.

One name I still cannot give to you, although his sacred remains, sacred to his family, were dumped at a U.N. building, treated in this horrible manner in Somalia. But four of them I can talk about: Tommy Field, age 25, from Lisbon, ME; Gary Gordon, age 33, from Lincoln, ME; Randall Shughart, age 35, from Monrovia, CA; and Raymond A. Frank, age 45, from Nevada, OH. Two of them are senior sergeant Rangers who rappelled down to save the men at the Durant crash site. They were all taken alive, all tortured, beaten to death, and their bodies desecrated in the streets of Somalia.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to come home.

FUNDING UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, later today we may be voting on unemployment compensation extension. Aside from the issue itself, where we may be divided, the funding mechanism for the proposed bill is chaotic at this juncture and quixotic at its best.

When the Committee on Rules met last week to consider it, everyone knew that what they had before them could not be enacted, putting more burden on the States, some kind of Rube Goldberg mechanism for funding the unemployment compensation. I proposed, and will propose again in the Rules battle, that we ought to take the funding for unemployment compensation out of the new spending that is already in the new tax bill that has been passed by the Congress. Some $28 billion of new spending has already been authorized by the Congress in the Clinton administration tax bill. We ought to take first monies out of that $28 billion to fund the unemployment compensation of today. In that manner, it will be funded and the taxpayers of our country, who have been treated to this new tax bill, new spending bill, will get something for their money.

I will propose and ask for your support during the Rules battle.

THE LESSON OF RUSSIA: NO MORE DEFENSE CUTS

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

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the White House has burned—and the only good news associated with that statement is that our White House is not the one that burned.

Unfortunately, for the people of Russia, their White House—their parliament—was in flames.

It is a tragedy that is continuing to unfold as Russians vainly try to hold on to their democracy.

In 1917, the Bolsheviks co-opted another revolution. Most people forget that the Russians—led by the Mensheviks—toppled the czar in March of 1917 and established a democracy. In October of that year, the Communists seized control.

Now, in another October, 76 years later, Bolshevik hardliners tried again to steal the fruits of a democratic revolution.

And, throughout the former Soviet Union, the governments of the new republics are being forced to fight both ethnic violence and the assault of disenfranchised government bureaucrats.

The United States cannot assume that all of these violent outbreaks will be won by the forces of democracy. We must be prepared for any eventuality. Several republics have nuclear weapons, and fundamentalist Islamic regimes are interested in those weapons.

Before the United States totally demobilizes, we must evaluate the way the world will be—and not the way we wish it would be.

HOUSE BANK SCANDAL DESERVES MORE ATTENTION

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a number of people come to the floor today and call for reforms of various kinds in the way this Congress or lobbyists do business. I think one of the things we ought to begin to focus on is where we have problems right now that deserve to be corrected.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] has been attempting to focus this House on problems that continue to flow from the House bank scandal of some months ago. And I think the gentleman from Oklahoma deserves to be heard far more than what Congress has allowed so far.

The reason for this is because we were told throughout the evolving House bank scandal that there may have been a mess there but at least there was no criminal activity. Most recently now we have found out that felonies were committed in the course of the conduct of the House bank. The gentleman from Oklahoma wants us to investigate this matter further. He wants the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to look into it further and he wants this House to be aware of what really took place in the House bank.

He deserves credit for continuing to focus on this issue. I hope at some point that the House leadership and the House itself will help the gentleman from Oklahoma get to the bottom of what is a mess that the American people have every reason to be concerned about.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2446, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2446) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TUCKER). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read. (For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 7, 1993, at page H7627.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report and the amendments in disagreement on the bill H.R. 2446, and that I may include extraneous and tabular material.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the conference report we present to the House today for military construction, family housing and base closure contains agreements on about 350 line items. The conference agreement recommends a total appropriation of $10.1 billion. The recommendation is $729 million under the President's request and $209 million under the House passed level. It is over the 1993 appropriated level, but one should review that with caution. The reason I say that is because, last year, we were forced under a veto threat to reduce military construction by over 40 percent with the understanding that, in 1994, we would return to a more appropriate level. When you compare our recommendation with the fiscal year 1992 level, you will find that we are under the 1992 level for military construction and family housing by $421 million. However, base closure funding, in contrast to military construction, has increased by $1.9 billion when compared to the 1992 level.

I should also note that the base closure recommendation in this conference report is $2.8 billion which represents 27 percent of the Military Construction bill. Shown below are the conference agreements compared with the 1992 and 1993 funding levels.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONFERENCE AGREEMENT—COMPARISONS WITH FISCAL YEAR 1992 AND 1993 FUNDING LEVELS

(Dollars in millions)

	Fiscal year 1992	Fiscal year 1993	Conference agreement fiscal year 1994	Conference comparison with	
				Fiscal year 1992	Fiscal year 1993
Military construction	$3,934	$2,361	$3,741	−$193	+$1,380
NATO	225	60	140	−85	+80
Family housing	3,645	3,941	3,501	−144	−440
Base closure	759	2,034	2,683	+1,924	+649
Total	8,563	8,396	10,065	+1,502	+1,669

QUALITY OF LIFE

The conference report before you provides for quality of life of our military. Our service men and women need to have better living and working conditions. For example, we still have troops living in antiquated World War II barracks. For that reason, we are supporting a major Department initiative to upgrade and replace antiquated barracks. This bill also includes funds to repair and replace housing that is substandard and dangerous to the health of families because of the presence of asbestos and lead based paint.

INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Members should realize that the military construction bill is an investment bill that has significant payback in economic terms and provides for offsets and payback in other parts of the Defense budget.

BILL FEATURES

Let me just go over some of the special features of the conference report.

The conference report provides about $500 million for new barracks and modernization of existing barracks.

It provides about $300 million for environmental compliance type projects.

It provides $562 million for environmental cleanup at base closure sites which is essential to expediting cleanup and disposal of property to local interests.

It provides about $100 million for child development centers.

It reduces the President's request for NATO funding by $100 million.

It provides $50 million as an ongoing effort to reduce energy costs that has significant payback.

The conferees have agreed to consider reprogramming of any authorized project not funded including projects such as a modified record fire range at Camp Gruber, OK.

Mr. Chairman, these are just some of the items in this bill.

AUTHORIZATION

Regarding authorization, let me say that we have had an excellent relationship with the Armed Services Committee over the years in coordinating and reflecting their priorities. This year is no exception.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Before I conclude my remarks, I want to express my appreciation to all the members of the subcommittee, and especially our ranking minority member, the gentlelady from Nevada, Mrs. VUCANOVICH. It is a pleasure to work with the gentlelady. This is why we are presenting, to you, a bipartisan conference report and a good agreement given the budget constraints that we have to work with. I also want to thank Chairman NATCHER for this leadership in helping bring this conference report to the floor.

Again, Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate why this is a responsible agreement. The conference agreement is:

(1) Under the President's request by $729 million.

(2) Under the House passed level by $209 million.

(3) Under the 1992 level for Military Construction and Family Housing by $421 million.

(4) Provides for $2.7 billion in base closure funding for all three rounds of base closure.

□ 1110

It is a good agreement, considering that we had to resolve over 350 items in disagreement, and I ask the House to support this conference report.

I would be remiss if I did not thank the staff for their excellent work on both sides, the minority and the majority, for the great staff work that they did in helping us bring this conference report to fruition.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert at this point in the RECORD a comparative statement of budget authority contained in the bill, as well as a detailed table of rescissions and general reductions.

FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPRIOPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2446)

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Military construction, Army	425,270,000	776,642,000	837,644,000	723,505,000	906,676,000	+481,406,000
Rescission				-13,900,000	-13,900,000	-13,900,000
Total, Military construction, Army (net)	425,270,000	776,642,000	837,644,000	709,605,000	892,776,000	+467,506,000
Military construction, Navy	371,887,000	655,123,000	575,971,000	580,033,000	681,373,000	+309,486,000
Rescission				-68,952,000	-122,627,000	-122,627,000
Total, Military construction, Navy (net)	371,887,000	655,123,000	575,971,000	511,081,000	558,746,000	+186,859,000
Military construction, Air Force	717,280,000	906,378,000	913,297,000	963,726,000	1,021,567,000	+304,287,000
Rescission				-16,710,000	-30,095,000	-30,095,000
Total, Military construction, Air Force (net)	717,280,000	906,378,000	913,297,000	947,016,000	991,472,000	+274,192,000
Military construction, Defense-wide	262,116,000	1,077,718,000	618,770,000	524,165,000	562,008,000	+299,892,000
Rescission				-15,500,000	-15,500,000	-15,500,000
Total, Military construction, Defense agencies (net)	262,116,000	1,077,718,000	618,770,000	508,665,000	546,508,000	+284,392,000
Total, Active components	1,776,553,000	3,415,861,000	2,945,682,000	2,676,367,000	2,989,502,000	+1,212,949,000
Military construction, Army National Guard	209,639,000	50,865,000	203,980,000	291,250,000	302,719,000	+93,080,000
Military construction, Air National Guard	287,559,000	142,353,000	161,761,000	254,923,000	247,491,000	-40,068,000
Military construction, Army Reserve	42,150,000	82,233,000	87,825,000	124,794,000	102,040,000	+59,890,000
Military construction, Naval Reserve	15,400,000	20,591,000	28,647,000	25,013,000	25,029,000	+9,629,000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve	29,900,000	55,727,000	66,136,000	68,427,000	74,486,000	+44,586,000
Total, Reserve components	584,648,000	351,769,000	548,349,000	764,407,000	751,765,000	+167,117,000
Total, Military construction	2,361,201,000	3,767,630,000	3,494,031,000	3,440,774,000	3,741,267,000	+1,380,066,000
Appropriations	(2,361,201,000)	(3,767,630,000)	(3,494,031,000)	(3,555,836,000)	(3,923,389,000)	(+1,562,188,000)
Rescissions				(-115,062,000)	(-182,122,000)	(-182,122,000)
North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure	60,000,000	240,000,000	140,000,000		140,000,000	+80,000,000
Outside the United States - Special account				300,000,000		
Family housing, Army:						
Appropriation	1,523,819,000	1,343,886,000	1,286,707,000	1,353,986,000	1,298,486,000	-225,333,000
Portion applied to debt reduction	-127,000	-412,000	-412,000	-412,000	-412,000	-285,000
Total	1,523,692,000	1,343,474,000	1,286,295,000	1,353,574,000	1,298,074,000	-225,618,000
Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps	1,044,025,000	1,208,824,000	1,149,721,000	1,189,793,000	1,142,263,000	+98,238,000
Rescission				-25,018,000	-40,371,000	-40,371,000
Total, Family housing, Navy (net)	1,044,025,000	1,208,824,000	1,149,721,000	1,164,775,000	1,101,892,000	+57,867,000
Family housing, Air Force	1,211,727,000	1,027,147,000	998,044,000	1,048,947,000	977,947,000	-233,780,000
Rescission				-55,102,000	-55,102,000	-55,102,000
Total, Family housing, Air Force (net)	1,211,727,000	1,027,147,000	998,044,000	993,845,000	922,845,000	-288,882,000
Family housing, Defense-wide	28,400,000	27,496,000	25,870,000	27,496,000	26,496,000	-1,904,000
Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense	266,000,000	151,400,000	151,400,000	151,400,000	151,400,000	-114,600,000
Rescission	-133,000,000					+133,000,000
Total, Family housing	3,940,844,000	3,758,341,000	3,611,330,000	3,691,090,000	3,500,707,000	-440,137,000
Appropriations	(4,073,971,000)	(3,758,753,000)	(3,611,742,000)	(3,771,622,000)	(3,596,592,000)	(-477,379,000)
Rescissions				(-80,120,000)	(-95,473,000)	(-95,473,000)
Applied to debt reduction	(-127,000)	(-412,000)	(-412,000)	(-412,000)	(-412,000)	(-285,000)
Base realignment and closure accounts:						
Part I	415,700,000	27,870,000	27,870,000	12,830,000	12,830,000	-402,870,000
Part II	1,618,600,000	1,800,500,000	1,800,500,000	1,526,310,000	1,526,310,000	-92,290,000
Part III		1,200,000,000	1,200,000,000	1,197,000,000	1,144,000,000	+1,144,000,000
Total, Base realignment and closure accounts	2,034,300,000	3,028,370,000	3,028,370,000	2,736,140,000	2,683,140,000	+648,840,000
Reduction of Appropriation				-414,527,000		
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority	8,396,345,000	10,794,341,000	10,273,731,000	9,753,477,000	10,065,114,000	+1,668,769,000
Appropriations	(8,529,472,000)	(10,794,753,000)	(10,274,143,000)	(9,949,071,000)	(10,343,121,000)	(+1,813,649,000)
Applied to debt reduction	(-127,000)	(-412,000)	(-412,000)	(-412,000)	(-412,000)	(-285,000)
Rescissions				(-195,182,000)	(-277,595,000)	(-277,595,000)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION RESCISSIONS AND GENERAL REDUCTIONS FISCAL YEAR 1994 CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

Service, fiscal year, and location/project	Amount
ARMY	
Fiscal year 1992 rescission, Public Law 102–136:	
New York: Seneca Army Depot: Fire station	$1,150
Virginia: Vint Hill Farms Station: Barracks with dining facility	1,700
Virginia: Vint Hill Farms Station: General purpose warehouse	1,850
Total	4,700
Fiscal year 1993 rescission, Public Law 102–380:	
Utah: Tooele Army Depot: Hazardous material storage facility	9,200
Army subtotal:	13,900
NAVY	
Fiscal year 1990 rescission, Public Law 101–148:	
New York: Staten Island NS: Child care center	2,987
New York: Staten Island NS: Land acquisition	1,675
South Carolina: Charleston NB: Access roads	3,000
Total: No longer required due to BRC III	7,662
Fiscal year 1991 rescission, Public Law 101–519:	
Alaska: Amchitka FSSC: Electronic Installation	5,656
California: Point Mugu PMTC: Security improvements	2,070
Florida: Key West NAS: EOD mobile unit facility	3,010
Virginia: Oceana NAS: Weapons systems trainer building addition	3,670
Total: No longer required due to force structure or mission change	14,406
Fiscal year 1992 rescission, Public Law 102–136:	
California: Vallejo Mare Island NSY: Computer operations center	9,000
South Carolina: Charleston FMWTC: Fire fighting trainer facility	14,620
Subtotal: No longer required due to BRC III	23,620
Alaska: Adak NSGA: Classic wizard facility addition	3,600
Alaska: Adak NSGA: Bachelor enlisted quarters	9,100
California: Concord NWC: Missile test cell	1,250
District of Columbia: Washington NAVDIST: Hazardous waste storage facility	2,050
Florida: Orlando NTC: Barracks	7,980
Georgia: Kings Bay NSB: Trident training complex addition	9,200
Maryland: Annapolis NRTF: Antenna modifications	2,400
Virginia: Norfolk NS: Fire alarm system improvements	340
Washington: Whidbey Island NAS: Flight area control and surveillance facility	3,349
Subtotal: No longer required due to force structure or mission change	39,269
Fiscal year 1992 subtotal	62,889
Fiscal year 1993 rescission, Public Law 102–380:	
California: Mare Island NSY: Hazardous material storage facility	8,000
California: Miramar NAS: Fixed point aircraft utility support system	9,700
Florida: Cecil Field NAS: Jet engine test cell	5,850
Tennessee: Memphis NAS: Fire fighting training mock-up	3,300
Tennessee: Memphis NAS: Aircraft fire and rescue training facility	9,060
Tennessee: Memphis NAS: Fire and crash rescue station	1,750
Total: No longer required due to BRC III	37,660
Navy subtotal:	122,627
AIR FORCE	
Fiscal year 1990 rescission, Public Law 101–148:	
Florida: Homestead AFB: Add to transient dormitory	1,950
Florida: Homestead AFB: Alter dormitories	5,395
Ohio: Newark AFB: Child care center	970
Total	8,315
Fiscal year 1991 rescission, Public Law 101–519:	
Florida: Homestead AFB: Alter dormitories	5,500
California: March AFB: Troop subsistence warehouse	1,050
Total	6,550
Fiscal year 1992 rescission, Public Law 102–136:	
Florida: Homestead AFB: Alter dormitories	4,900
New York: Plattsburgh AFB: Jet fuel storage	880
New York: Plattsburgh AFB: Electrical distribution system	7,200
Total	12,980
Fiscal year 1993 rescission, Public Law 102–380:	
California: March AFB: Underground fuel storage tanks	2,250
Air Force subtotal:	30,095

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION RESCISSIONS AND GENERAL REDUCTIONS FISCAL YEAR 1994 CONFERENCE AGREEMENT—Continued

Service, fiscal year, and location/project	Amount
DEFENSE-WIDE	
Fiscal year 1992 rescission, Public Law 102–136:	
Florida: Homestead AFB: Hospital (phase I)	10,000
Ohio: Dayton Defense Electronics Supply Center: Fire and security station	2,000
Texas: Dallas NAS: Medical/dental clinic replacement	3,500
Total	15,500
AIR NATIONAL GUARD	
General reduction:	
Fiscal year 1990: Texas: Dallas NAS: Add/alter dining/medical training facility	540
Fiscal year 1993: Illinois: O'Hare IAP: Repair aircraft ramp	5,200
Total	5,740
NAVY RESERVE	
General reduction:	
Fiscal year 1990: California: Bakersfield NMCRC: Land acquisition	1,000
Fiscal year 1991: Texas: Dallas NAS: Ground support equipment shop	1,640
Fiscal year 1993: Illinois: Glenview NAS: Fuel farm modifications	6,500
Total	9,140
AIR FORCE RESERVE	
General reduction:	
Fiscal year 1991: Illinois: O'Hare IAP: Security police operations facility	1,080
Fiscal year 1993: Illinois: O'Hare IAP: Aerospace ground equipment shop/storage	1,700
Total	2,780
FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY	
Fiscal year 1990 rescission, Public Law 101–148: California: El Toro MCAS (200 units)	14,100
Fiscal year 1991 rescission, Public Law 101–519: California: Long Beach NS (300 units)	25,018
Fiscal year 1993 rescission, Public Law 102–380: California: El Toro MCAS: Improve 67 units	1,253
FH,N subtotal	40,371
FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE	
Fiscal year 1992 rescission, Public Law 102–136: Florida: Homestead AFB: Improve 90 units	6,400
Fiscal year 1993 rescission, Public Law 102–380:	
Michigan: K.I. Sawyer AFB: Improve 134 units	10,351
California: March AFB: Replace 320 units	38,351
Total	48,702
FH,AF subtotal	55,102
FH subtotal	95,473
Grand total:	
Rescissions	277,595
General reductions	17,660
Total	295,255

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

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted today to bring to the floor, along with my chairman and friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], the conference report making appropriations for military construction for fiscal year 1994.

I would like to thank the chairman and the members of the subcommittee for their hard work. In addition, I want to commend the staff for their hours of toil and trouble.

I support this conference report. Although the measure is not all things to all Members, I believe we have arrived at an equitable compromise.

Mr. HEFNER has outlined the highlights of the bill so I won't be repetitive. I would simply point out again that the bill totals $10.1 billion for fiscal year 1994, is under the President's request by $729 million, is $209 million less than appropriated by the House, and is below the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation.

While the bill shows a significant increase over fiscal year 1993 funding, this is due to base closure expenses—which account for 30 percent of the bill—and making up for a DOD-initiated construction pause in fiscal year 1993.

The military construction bill constitutes about 3 percent of DOD's total budget. The majority of the other 97 percent is provided through the annual Defense authorization and appropriations bills. I believe it is important to note that our subcommittee has worked closely with the Armed Services Committee in order to move the bill forward.

Military construction is an investment program that has significant payback in economic terms, in better living and working conditions, and in environmental restoration.

This bill helps meet that goal. I hope that my colleagues will support this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, before reserving the balance of my time, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman regarding a project not funded in the military construction appropriations conference report.

The conferees decided not to fund the Air National Guard project at Pease Air Force Base for the upgrade of the Kc-135 hydrant refueling system. Is it correct that this action was based on questions about the scope of the project?

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, that is correct.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. If the scope questions are resolved, would the committee reconsider this project—either for funding under base realignment and closure, or as a new start reprogramming, or as an item in the fiscal year 1995 budget?

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, when the scope has been resolved and when the cost has been re-estimated, we would certainly reconsider the project.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY].

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker I would like to thank the efforts of subcommittee chairman HEFNER, my special friend BARBARA VUCANOVICH, ranking minority member, and the Military Construction Committee staff on both sides of the aisle.

I ask the Members to support the military construction conference report.

The committee worked hard to fund the administration's requests. However, the downsizing of the military

and other domestic needs have forced a cut in this year's funding.

This cut in funding concerns me. MilCon has been referred to as the quality of life appropriation for the services. As such, I feel it needs a higher priority than it received this year.

All of us remember the state of our military in 1980, when many of our troops needed food stamps to feed their families. That is unacceptable.

We ask our Armed Forces to stand in harm's way to protect us and our homes. We must ensure that our troops are housed and properly supplied. This year's conference report does the best we can within the fiscal constraints the 602(b) allocations permit.

The committee reviewed administration and Member requests. The committee balanced the equities of each proposal while all the time focusing on one central mandate—quality of life.

The numbers drive this bill. However, there are some important measures for the quality of life of the troops.

For instance, the committee funded a day care center for the children of the troops serving at Edgewood aresenal.

The Army slated this project to be completed with minor construction funds. However, there is a statutory limit of $1.5 million for those items. The Edgewood day care center's projected cost is $1.4 million. If the bids come in for over $1.5 million—minor construction funds cannot be used.

As a result, the day care center might not be built—even though one is desperately needed.

Currently, the child care center is housed in a World War II era stable. I would like to quote DOD's own description:

> Buildings "consist of three separate WWII wood buildings contaminated with friable asbestos and lead paint. The buildings have structural problems. . . . Facilities are presently required to use bottled water for drinking due to the condition of the pipes. The present capacity of 125 does not meet the current need of 363 children."

This need has existed for years, and the Army has not been able to budget for an adequate child care center.

The executive branch cannot know the needs in every congressional district. That is why we are here.

We are not rubber stamps. That is why my constituents have sent me here. It is my duty to raise this and other issues that affect the soldiers who are stationed in my district and my military personnel stationed elsewhere.

I urge support of the conference report.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into a colloquy regarding Senate report language dealing with closure of Naval Air Station Agana. As you know, the President and the Congress have approved the Base Realignment and Closure Commission recommendation to close Naval Air Station Agana. However, the Senate report language requires the local communities in Guam to submit a local financing plan to the Secretary of the Navy for his consideration and approval. Would the gentleman agree that this Senate report language runs counter to existing base closure law and does not have the force of law to override existing statute.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct in that the report language runs counter to existing law. As the gentleman knows, I have written a letter to the Secretary of the Navy, on behalf of the gentleman from Guam, in articulating our position.

I can assure the gentleman that we will go to whatever length it takes to see that this is obeyed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his support and his patience and understanding.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the chairman has said it all. It is the best agreement that we can get under the circumstances. I urge a favorable vote on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in support of the fiscal year 1994 military construction appropriations conference report. I want to congratulate the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. HEFNER, the gentlewoman from Nevada, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. SASSER, and the gentleman from Washington, Mr. GORTON, and the professional and associate staff for putting together a military construction bill that is $729 million less than President Clinton's $10.8 billion request. I, for one, am proud of all the men and women who serve their country, and believe their responsibility and dedication deserves the best we can offer them. I urge a favorable vote.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I support the fiscal year 1994 military construction appropriations conference report. The bill contains much needed funding for Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, which is in my district.

Earlier this year, southern California was hit with torrential floods. The floods caused millions of dollars in damage including severe damage to Camp Pendleton. I visited Pendleton shortly after most of the floods receded. I was surprised at the extent of damage I saw.

Bridges and major portions of the roadway literally disappeared. Water wells were completely washed away. Helicopters, which at one point were submerged under 15 feet of water, were still buried in mud up to their cockpit. Cars and trucks were overturned and small office buildings and trailers were swept a quarter of a mile away.

Funds included in this conference report will go a long way toward repairing a portion of the damage done to the base.

I would like to thank Chairman HEFNER and Congresswoman VUCANOVICH for their help to fund these sorely needed repairs.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2446, the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

In particular, I want to thank Chairman BILL HEFNER, the ranking minority member BARBARA VUCANOVICH and the members of the subcommittee for their attention to the housing needs of enlisted personnel in our Armed Forces.

As my colleagues with military bases in their districts know, base housing for enlisted personnel is one area of the Defense budget where indiscriminate cuts can undermine the quality of life and morale of the youngest members of the military services.

At Dover Air Force Base in Delaware, most of the dormitories date from the 1950's. They are not in good repair and must be replaced. Despite the draw-down in the Armed Forces, Dover Air Force Base will continue to be a key part of the air mobility command. I want to thank Chairman HEFNER and members of the committee for restoring full funding for a dormitory project at Dover. While it is a relatively small sum of $4.4 million, failure to provide these funds would have resulted in the loss of rooms for at least 50 enlisted personnel and additional costs to complete the new dormitory at a later date.

As a result of the committee's action, 175 young men and women at Dover Air Force Base will have quality living space.

Again, I thank Chairman HEFNER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH and the subcommittee staff for their consideration of the well-being and morale of the most junior members of the Air Force. I urge passage of the conference report.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, in the twinkling of an eye the House will approve the conference report accompanying H.R. 2446, the Military Construction Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1994.

On the surface, the conference committee's recommendations appear to be fiscally responsible, for they provide $10,065,114,000 of new (obligational) budget authority, which is $729,277,000 below the Administration's request of $10,794,341,000, and $208,617,000 below the House-approved level of $10,273,731,000.

Unfortunately, the devil is in the details, and a detailed examination of the conference report paints another picture. First, the conference committee's recommendations total $311,637,000, or nearly 3.2 percent above the Senate-approved level of $9,753,477,000. Second, and even more objectionable, is the fact that the conference committee's recommendations include 22 unauthorized earmarks totaling $66,022,000 in 7 Military Construction appropriations accounts: one totaling

$1,450,000 in the "Military Construction, Army" account; 4 totaling $6,550,000 in the "Military Construction, Navy" account; 3 totaling $7,050,000 in the "Military Construction, Air Force" account; 8 totaling $13,272,000 in the "Military Construction, Army National Guard" account; 4 totaling $26,250,000 in the "Military Construction, Air National Guard" account; one totaling $8,700,000 in the "Military Construction, Naval Reserve" account; and one totaling $2,750,000 in the " Military Construction, Air Force Reserve" account. Five of these earmarks totaling $10,958,000 also had not been appropriated by either the House or Senate during their consideration of H.R. 2446.

The conference committee recommended the largest add-on to the Army National Guard account. The conference committee's recommended level of $302,719,000 is an increase of $251,854,000, or more than 495 percent, above the administration request of $50,865,000. This recommendation is also $73,268,000, or nearly 32 percent, above the House Armed Services Committee's recommendation of $229,023,000, and $25,668,000, or nearly 9.3 percent above the Senate Armed Services Committee's recommendation of $277,541,000. As noted above, the conference committee recommended 8 unauthorized earmarks in this account totaling $13,272,000 including three earmarks totaling $2,458,000 for three armories in Tennessee which had received no prior appropriations.

I decline to oppose this conference report on the House floor today because the rules of the House precluded a meaningful challenge. I do plan to work with our colleagues on the Senate side to address this serious issue.

A list of these unauthorized earmarks follows:

Military Construction, Army: 1 Line Item Totaling $1,450,000.

1. Edgewood Arsenal (Maryland): $1,450,000 for Child Development Center. Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by House only.

Military Construction, Navy: 5 Line Items Totaling $11,550,000.

1. Camp Pendelton Marine Corps Base (California): $750,000 for Emergency Off-Base Water Supply Main. Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by House only.

2. Camp Pendelton Marine Corps Base (California): $1,000,000 for Flood Protection-Sewage Treatment Plant. Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by House only.

3. Camp Pendelton Marine Corps Base (California): $1,800,000 for Relocate Water Wells. Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by House only.

4. Camp Pendelton Marine Corps Base (California): $3,000,000 for Replace Drainage Structures. Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by House only.

Military Construction, Air Force: 3 Line Items Totaling $7,050,000.

1. Tydall Air Force Base (Florida): $3,200,000 for Add to Base Supplies and Equipment Warehouse. Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by House only.

2. Tydall Air Force Base (Florida): $2,400,000 for Security Police Operations. Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by House only.

3. Fort George Meade (Maryland): $1,450,000 for Add to Operations Facility. Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by House only.

Military Construction, Army National Guard: 8 Line Items Totaling $13,272,000.

1. Fort Irwin (California): $1,265,000 for Maintenance Pad Covers. Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by House only.

2. Molokai (Hawaii): $1,050,000 for Armory. Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by Senate only.

3. Oahu (Hawaii): $4,300,000 for Armory. Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by Senate only.

4. Poplar Bluff (Missouri): $2,842,000 for Armory and Organizational Maintenance Shop. Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by Senate only.

5. Camden (Tennessee): $714,000 for Armory Addition. Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

6. Milan (Tennessee): $1,357,000 for Armory. Not authorized by House or Senate; $1,352,000 appropriated by House only.

7. Tiptonville (Tennessee): $1,157,000 for Armory. Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

8. Waverly (Tennessee): $587,000 for Armory Addition. Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

Military Construction, Air National Guard: 4 Line Items Totaling $26,250,000.

1. Robins Air Force Base (Georgia): $5,750,000 for Support and Hydrant System. Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

2. NAS Barking Sands (Hawaii): $8,500,000 for Forward Air Control Point Facility. Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by Senate only.

3. Hickman Air Force Base, Hawaii: $9,700,000 for Consolidated Support Facility. Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by Senate only.

4. Capital Map (Springfield, Illinois): $2,300,000 for Upgrade Runway.

Military Construction, Naval Reserve: 1 Line Item Totaling $8,700,000.

1. Naval Support Activity, New Orleans (Louisiana): $8,700,000 for Marine Corps Reserve Force Headquarters. Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by House only.

Military Construction, Air Force Reserve: 1 Line Item Totaling $2,750,000.

1. Homestead Air Force Base (Florida): $2,750,000 for Medical Training Facility. Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member would like to express his sincere gratitude to the chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], and the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], for supporting important and much-needed modernization for the Nebraska Air National Guard in the fiscal year 1994 Military Construction Appropriations Conference Report. The Nebraska Air Guard is in the midst of a transition from RF–4C reconnaissance aircraft to KC–135R tankers. The Nebraska Air Guard has enthusiastically embraced this new mission, and the conversion is well underway. However, a number of infrastructure alterations are necessary to support the conversion.

Of particular concern is the old maintenance hangar and repair facility. The hangar in question is almost 40 years old and is showing its age. Moreover, it is filled with old asbestos insulation, which carries with it obvious health risks. While it may have been adequate to maintain small fighter-type aircraft such as the RF–4C, it is completely unsuitable for the much larger KC–135R tankers. Construction of the new maintenance hangar is absolutely essential if the Air Guard is to support its new mission.

Mr. Speaker, this Member is particularly appreciative of the fact that the Military Construction Subcommittee was able to find the funds required to support the hangar renovation, and that these funds were retained in conference. In doing so, they have made an important, positive contribution to the readiness of our Air National Guard.

□ 1120

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motions as printed in the joint statement of managers be considered as read when offered.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the previous order of the House, the motions printed in the joint statement are considered as read.

The Clerk will designate the first amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 2, line 9, strike out "$837,644,000" and insert "$723,505,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$906,676,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 17, after "therefor" insert ": *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Army" under Public Law 102-136, $4,700,000 is hereby rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Army" under Public Law 102-380, $9,200,000 is hereby rescinded".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 2, line 25, strike out "$575,971,000" and insert "$580,033,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$681,373,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 3, line 7, after "therefor" insert ": *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Navy" under Public Law 101-148, $7,662,000 is hereby rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Navy" under Public Law 102-136, $23,630,000 is hereby rescinded: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Navy" under Public Law 102-380, $37,660,000 is hereby rescinded".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert ": *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Navy" under Public Law 101-148, $7,662,000 is hereby rescinded: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Navy" under Public Law 101-519, $14,406,000 is hereby rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Navy" under Public Law 102-136, $62,899,000 is hereby rescinded: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Navy" under Public Law 102-380, $37,660,000 is hereby rescinded".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 3, line 12, strike out "$913,297,000" and insert "$963,726,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$1,021,567,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 3, line 20, after "therefor" insert ": *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Air Force" under Public Law 102-136, $14,480,000 is hereby rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Air Force" under Public Law 102-380, $2,230,000 is hereby rescinded".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert ": *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Air Force" under Public Law 101-148, $8,315,000 is hereby rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Air Force" under Public Law 101-519, $6,550,000 is hereby rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Air Force" under Public Law 102-136, $12,980,000 is hereby rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Air Force" under Public Law 102-380, $2,250,000 is hereby rescinded".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 4, line 12, strike out "$42,405,000" and insert "$37,405,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$44,405,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 4, line 17, after "therefor" insert ": *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Defense Agencies" under Public Law 102-136, $15,500,000 is hereby rescinded".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 4, line 24, strike out "$203,980,000" and insert "*291,250,000*".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and concur therein

with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$302,719,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 6, line 6, strike out "$66,136,000" and insert "*$68,427,000*".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$74,486,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: Page 7, line 1, strike out "$218,785,000" and insert "$228,385,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$228,885,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 7, line 11, strike out "$367,769,000" and insert "$354,738,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$370,208,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 7, line 13, strike out "$781,952,000" and insert $835,055,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$772,055,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 7, line 14, strike out "$1,149,721,000" and insert $1,189,793,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$1,142,263,000.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 7, line 14, after "$1,149,721,000" insert ": *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated for "Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps" under Public Law 101-148, $25,018,000 is hereby rescinded".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert ": *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps" under Public Law 101-148, $14,100,000 is hereby rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps" under Public Law 101-519, $28,018,000 is hereby rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps" under Public Law 102-380, $1,253,000 is hereby rescinded".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 7, line 22, strike out "$192,197,000" and insert "$195,035,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$187,035,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 7, line 24, strike out "$805,847,000" and insert $853,912,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$790,912,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 29: Page 7, line 24, strike out "$998,044,000" and insert "$1,048,947,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$977,947,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 7, line 24, after "$998,044,000" insert ": *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated for "Family Housing, Air Force" under Public Law 102-136, $6,400,000 is hereby rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Family Housing, Air Force" under Public Law 102-380, $48,702,000 is hereby rescinded".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 8, line 15, after "$151,400,000" insert", to remain available until expended".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 38: Page 9, line 19, strike out "$1,200,000,000" and insert "$1,197,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$1,144,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 16, strike out lines 6 to 25.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 122. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army shall transfer, no later than September 30, 1994, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, to the Architect of the Capitol, a portion of the real property, including improvements thereon, consiting of not more than 100 acres located at Fort George G. Meade in Anne Arundel County, Maryland, as determined under subsection (c).

(b) The Architect of the Capitol shall, upon completion of the survey performed pursuant to subsection (c) and the transfer effected pursuant to subsection (a), utilize the transferred property to provide facilities to accommodate the varied long term storage and service needs of the Library of Congress and other Legislative Branch agencies.

(c) The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be transferred under this section shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Architect of the Capitol and the Secretary of the Army, and in consultation with officials of Anne Arundel County, Maryland.

(d) Any real property and improvements thereon transferred pursuant to this section shall be under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, subject to the rules and regulations providing for the use of such property as may be approved by the House Office Building Commission and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration: *Provided*, That any existing improvements made available by the Architect to the Librarian of Congress, under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, or hereafter erected upon such real property pursuant to law for the purposes of providing for the long term storage and service needs of the Library of Congress shall be subject to the provisions of sections 136, 141 and 167 to 167j of Title 2, United States Code.

(e) Portions of the real property and any improvements thereon transferred pursuant to this section that are not determined to be immediately required for storage or service needs by the Architect are authorized to be leased temporarily to the Secretary of the Army: *Provided*, That nominal lease payments made by the Secretary of the Army shall be credited to the appropriation "Architect of the Capital, Library Buildings and Grounds, Structural and Mechanical Care, No Year".

(f) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the last amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 17, strike out lines 6 to 9.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 124. None of the funds appropriated in this Act or any other Act may be used for the purposes of establishing any criminal detention or rehabilitation facility or program at Fort George Meade, Maryland.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which the various motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

AVIATION INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). Pursuant to House Resolution 269 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2739.

□ 1130

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2739) to amend the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. HEFNER, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, October 7, 1993, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] had been disposed of and title II was open for amendment at any point.

Pursuant to the order of the Committee of Thursday, October 7, 1993, debate on the remainder of the bill and any amendments thereto will be limited to 1 hour and 15 minutes, 1 hour allocated to the amendment, if offered, by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], and 15 minutes for any remaining debate or amendments.

Are there further amendments to title II?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title III of the bill be open for amendment and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows:

TITLE III

Title III—Federal Aviation Administration Research, Engineering, and Development Authorization Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. AVIATION RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 506(b)(2) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2205(b)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting the following:

"(A) for fiscal year 1994—

"(i) $13,498,000 solely for management and analysis projects and activities;

"(ii) $76,939,000 solely for capacity and air traffic management technology projects and activities;

"(iii) $35,675,000 solely for communications, navigation, and surveillance projects and activities;

"(iv) $1,908,000 solely for weather projects and activities;

"(v) $7,509,000 solely for airport technology projects and activities;

"(vi) $40,175,000 solely for aircraft safety technology projects and activities;

"(vii) $35,430,000 solely for system security technology projects and activities;

"(viii) $27,756,000 solely for human factors and aviation medicine projects and activities;

"(ix) $5,385,000 for environment and energy projects and activities; and

"(x) $5,725,000 for innovative/cooperative research projects and activities, of which $1,000,000 shall be available for the establishment of a new Aviation Center of Excellence;

"(B) for fiscal year 1995—

"(i) $14,847,000 solely for management and analysis projects and activities;

"(ii) $84,000,000 solely for capacity and air traffic management technology projects and activities;

"(iii) $39,242,000 solely for communications, navigation, and surveillance projects and activities;

"(iv) $2,098,000 solely for weather projects and activities;

"(v) $8,260,000 solely for airport technology projects and activities;

"(vi) $44,192,000 solely for aircraft safety technology projects and activities;

"(vii) $39,523,000 solely for system security technology projects and activities;

"(viii) $31,716,000 solely for human factors and aviation medicine projects and activities;

"(ix) $5,923,000 for environment and energy projects and activities; and

"(x) $5,199,000 for innovative/cooperative research projects and activities; and

"(C) for fiscal year 1996—

"(i) $16,332,000 solely for management and analysis projects and activities;

"(ii) $92,402,000 solely for capacity and air traffic management technology projects and activities;

"(iii) $43,167,000 solely for communications, navigation, and surveillance projects and activities;

"(iv) $2,307,000 solely for weather projects and activities;

"(v) $9,086,000 solely for airport technology projects and activities;

"(vi) $48,611,000 solely for aircraft safety technology projects and activities;

"(vii) $43,475,000 solely for system security technology projects and activities;

"(viii) $34,887,000 solely for human factors and aviation medicine projects and activities;

"(ix) $6,515,000 environment and energy projects and activities; and

"(x) $5,718,000 for innovative/cooperative research projects and activities.

Not less than 15 percent of the amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph shall be for long-term research projects, and not less than 3 percent of the amount appropriated under this paragraph shall be available to the Administrator for making grants under section 312(g) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.".

SEC. 3. JOINT AVIATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator and the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies shall jointly establish a program to conduct research on aviation technologies that enhance United States competitiveness. The program shall include—

(1) next-generation satellite communications, including global positioning satellites;

(2) advances airport and airplane security;

(3) environmentally compatible technologies, including technologies that limit or reduce noise and air pollution;

(4) advanced aviation safety programs; and

(5) technologies and procedures to enhance and improve airport and airway capacity.

(b) PROCEDURES FOR CONTRACTS AND GRANTS.—The Administrator and the heads of the other appropriate Federal agencies shall administer contracts and grants entered into under the program established under subsection (a) in accordance with procedures developed jointly by the Administrator and the heads of the other appropriate Federal agencies. The procedures should include an integrated acquisition policy for contract and grant requirements and for technical data rights that are not an impediment to joint programs among the Federal Aviation Administration, the other Federal agencies involved, and industry.

(c) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—The program established under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) selected programs that jointly enhance public and private aviation technology development;

(2) an opportunity for private contractors to be involved in such technology research and development; and

(3) the transfer of Government-developed technologies to the private sector to promote economic strength and competitiveness.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Of amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996 under section 506(b)(2) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2205(b)(2)), as amended by section 2 of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996, respectively, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 4. AIRCRAFT CABIN AIR QUALITY RESEARCH PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration (in this Act referred to as the "Administrator") and the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies shall establish a research program to determine—

(1) what, if any, aircraft cabin air conditions, including pressure altitude systems, on flights within the United States are harmful to the health of airline passengers and crew, as indicated by physical symptoms such as headaches, nausea, fatigue, and lightheadedness; and

(2) the risk of airline passengers and crew contracting infectious diseases during flight.

(b) CONTRACT WITH INDEPENDENT RESEARCH ORGANIZATION.—In carrying out the research program established under subsection (a), the Administrator and the heads of the other appropriate Federal agencies shall contract with an independent research organization to carry out any studies necessary to meet the goals of the program set forth in subsection (c).

(c) GOALS.—The goals of the research program established under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) to determine what, if any, cabin air conditions currently exist on domestic aircraft used for flights within the United States that could be harmful to the health of airline passengers and crew, as indicated by physical symptoms such as headaches, nausea, fatigue, and lightheadedness, and including the risk of infection by bacteria and viruses;

(2) to determine to what extent, changes in, cabin air pressure, temperature, rate of cabin air circulation, the quantity of fresh air per occupant, and humidity on current domestic aircraft would reduce or eliminate the risk of illness or discomfort to airline passengers and crew; and

(3) to establish a long-term research program to examine potential health problems to airline passengers and crew that may arise in an airplane passengers and crew that may arise in an airplane cabin on a flight within the United States because of cabin air quality as a result of the conditions and changes described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(d) PARTICIPATION.—In carrying out the research program established under subsection (a), the Administrator shall encourage participation in the program by representatives of aircraft manufacturers, air carriers, aviation employee organizations, airline passengers, and academia.

(e) REPORT.—(1) Within six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Congress a plan for implementation of the research program established under subsection (a).

(2) The Administrator shall annually submit to the Congress a report on the progress made during the year for which the report is submitted toward meeting the goals set forth in subsection (c).

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Of amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996 under section 506(b)(2) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2205(b)(2)), as amended by section 2 of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996, respectively, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 5. LIMITATION ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Nothwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no funds are authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year after fiscal year 1996 for carrying out the programs for which funds are authorized by this Act, or by the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 6. USE OF DOMESTIC PRODUCTS.

(a) PROHIBITION AGAINST FRAUDULENT USE OF "MADE IN AMERICA" LABELS.—(1) A person shall not intentionally affix a label bearing the inscription of "Made in America", or any inscription with that meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States, if that product is not a domestic product.

(2) A person who violates paragraph (1) shall not be eligible for any contract for a procurement carried out with amounts authorized under this Act, including any subcontract under such a contract pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures in subpart 9.4 of chapter 1 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor procedures thereto.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the head of each office within the Federal Aviation Administration that conducts procurements shall ensure that such procurements are conducted in compliance with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a through 10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

(2) This subsection shall apply only to procurements made for which—

(A) amounts are authorized by this Act to be made available; and

(B) solicitations for bids are issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) The Secretary, before January 1, 1995, shall report to the Congress on procurements covered under this subsection of products that are not domestic products.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section, the term "domestic product" means a product—

(1) that is manufactured or produced in the United States; and

(2) at least 50 percent of the cost of the articles, materials, or supplies of which are mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States.

SEC. 7. PURCHASE OF AMERICAN MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that any recipient of a grant under this Act, or under any amendment made by this Act, should purchase, when available and cost-effective, American made equipment and products when expending grant monies.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In allocating grants under this Act, or under any amendment made by this Act, the Secretary shall provide to each recipient a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLEIN

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLEIN: Strike out section 301 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 301. AVIATION RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 506(b)(2) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2205(b)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting the following:

"(A) for fiscal year 1994—

"(i) $11,297,000 solely for management and analysis projects and activities;

"(ii) $76,939,000 solely for capacity and air traffic management technology projects and activities;

"(iii) $35,675,000 solely for communications, navigation, and surveillance projects and activities;

"(iv) $1,908,000 solely for weather projects and activities;

"(v) $7,509,000 solely for airport technology projects and activities;

"(vi) $40,175,000 solely for aircraft safety technology projects and activities;

"(vii) $35,430,000 solely for system security technology projects and activities;

"(viii) $27,756,000 solely for human factors and aviation medicine projects and activities;

"(ix) $7,586,000 for environment and energy projects and activities; and

"(x) $5,725,000 for innovative/cooperative research projects and activities, of which $1,000,000 shall be available for the establishment of a new Aviation Center of Excellence;

"(B) for fiscal year 1995—

"(i) $12,646,000 solely for management and analysis projects and activities;

"(ii) $84,000,000 solely for capacity and air traffic management technology projects and activities;

"(iii) $39,242,000 solely for communications, navigation, and surveillance projects and activities;

"(iv) $2,098,000 solely for weather projects and activities;

"(v) $8,260,000 solely for airport technology projects and activities;

"(vi) $44,192,000 solely for aircraft safety technology projects and activities;

"(vii) $39,523,000 solely for system security technology projects and activities;

"(viii) $31,716,000 solely for human factors and aviation medicine projects and activities;

"(ix) $8,124,000 for environment and energy projects and activities; and

"(x) $5,199,000 for innovative/cooperative research projects and activities; and

"(C) for fiscal year 1996—

"(i) $14,131,000 solely for management and analysis projects and activities;

"(ii) $92,402,000 solely for capacity and air traffic management technology projects and activities;

"(iii) $43,167,000 solely for communications, navigation, and surveillance projects and activities;

"(iv) $2,307,000 solely for weather projects and activities;

"(v) $9,086,000 solely for airport technology projects and activities;

"(vi) $48,611,000 solely for aircraft safety technology projects and activities;

"(vii) $43,475,000 solely for system security technology projects and activities;

"(viii) $34,887,000 solely for human factors and aviation medicine projects and activities;

"(ix) $8,716,000 for environment and energy projects and activities; and

"(x) $5,718,000 for innovative/cooperative research projects and activities.

"Not less than 15 percent of the amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph shall be for long-term research projects, and not less than 3 percent of the amount appropriated under this paragraph shall be available to the Administrator for making grants under section 312(g) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.".

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, today I offer an amendment to H.R. 2739 that will improve both the competitiveness of our domestic aircraft industry and the quality of life for the millions of Americans who live near airports. My amendment will transfer money from FAA's administrative functions to aircraft noise reduction research. This money is not going to a new program, but one that has been reviewed extensively by Congress and has received consistent support.

Aircraft noise is a problem that is twofold. As anyone who lives near an airport will tell you, it is not a pleasant situation. Many families are disrupted by the constant roar overhead of planes taking off and landing. Any action that can be taken to minimize this intrusion is welcome news to those New Jerseyites, such as Doug Hill of Montclair and Jerry Baron of South Orange, who know the flight paths around Newark Airport all too well.

Noise reduction is also of major concern to industry, as it is vital that our planes are made quieter in order to conform to international noise standards. If current trends continue, American-made planes will soon be unable to land in European airports. Fully funded noise reduction research has been endorsed by both AOPA and GAMA.

Two years ago, in 1991, the Aircraft Noise Abatement Working Group of the FAA Research and Development Advisory Group urged the development of a nationwide policy to develop improved engine and airframe noise reduction technology. They recommended three areas for research:

First, jet engine core noise analysis.

Second, antinoise analysis.

Third, high-lift technology.

Acting on this information, and at the urging of the aircraft industry and those who live in the vicinity of any major airport, Congress approved substantive research efforts in this area. In Public Law 102-581, the House directed FAA to conduct research to minimize the noise of both new and existing aircraft. Unfortunately, the fiscal year 1994 administration request of $4,361,000 represents an 8-percent reduction from fiscal year 1993 appropriations.

This amendment reprograms roughly $2.2 million, the amount that FAA management was increased in fiscal year 1994 for the R&D management and systems analysis accounts, to the environment and energy projects and activities accounts. Simply, we are putting money that Congress asked for back into noise reduction R&D by taking from administrative increases. This done not only for this year, but for fiscal years 1995 and 1996.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment which is both bipartisan and revenue neutral.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, although this matter is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Space, Science, and Technology, we have reviewed the amendment and discussed it with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KLEIN] and with the chairman of the full committee, and are fully in support of the reprogramming in order to get more funding into studies and research on noise abatement. It is a sound amendment, it will focus the funds appropriately, and, for our part, we support the amendment.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] for his support.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KLEIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLF

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLF: Pages 16 through 22, strike section 207 of the bill.

Redesignate subsequent sections of title II of the bill accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the Committee of Thursday, October 7, 1993, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, there is a provision in H.R. 2739 which represents an assault on the 1986 legislation which transferred control of Washington National and Washington Dulles International airports from the FAA to a local airports authority. I am referring to the provision mandating collective bargaining for employees at these two airports, and I am offering an amendment to delete this section from the bill.

It is important to emphasize that this is not a vote on whether or not you support collective bargaining. In the bill report's bipartisan additional views, the committee members state:

Our objection is not to the NLRA and its collective bargaining provisions. In many cases, collective bargaining is desirable and appropriate. The issue is not whether one supports collective bargaining, but whether is should be imposed on public airports by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I agree. A bipartisan group on the committee also went on to say:

The imposition of the NLRA and its collective bargaining provisions in this case is unprecedented. While other airports may have adopted collective bargaining provisions on their own initiative, none have been required to do so by the Federal Government. Indeed, we are not aware of any case where the NLRA has been imposed on any agency of a state government or one of its subdivisions.

Mr. Chairman, it closes by stating:

Doing so here would seem to override the longstanding definition of covered employees in section 22 of the act, which specifically excludes the States.

Mr. Chairman, what the issue is here is that this position represents a dictated approach by the Congress in to these two State and locally operated airports concerning how to bargain with their employees. The Federal Government does not tell a single other airport in the country how to do this. Why Dulles and why National? Many airports do collectively bargain with their employees for wages, but this has been adopted by the local officials who run those airports, and not imposed by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, citing this unprecedented Federal intrusion into State and local matters, the Airports Council International, which represents all airports, passed a resolution this morning in opposition to this measure. Let me just read to Members what the resolution said this morning.

□ 1140

They said:

Whereas, the U.S. House of Representatives is considering a measure that would impose labor provisions on certain non-Federal airports; and, whereas, labor policy at airports is determined by the law of the State and local entities that operate the airports and the measure in the U.S. House of Representatives being considered is without precedent.

Basically, what they said, the resolution that we are dealing with today is without precedent. It has never been done before.

Then they go on:

Now therefore be it resolved that the Airports Council International-North America opposes the imposition of labor provisions by the Federal Government on airports operated by States or local entities.

Any Member of this body who has an airport in his or her congressional district should be on guard, because the next step would be that they could then apply this legislation and language in airports in Buffalo, Toledo, Akron, Tupelo, Wake Forest, any area of the country.

It is important to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority does have a labor code which includes an impartial arbitration board selected by labor organization representatives and Airports Authority officials. Neither the board of directors nor the general manager of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority has received notice from authority employees that they are dissatisfied with the labor code.

I would like to say, however, that if the Fire Fighters Association, and that is who we are dealing with basically here, which is advocating this provision, has a grievance, I for one would be glad to sit down with them to work it out. But it is inappropriate, again, for the Congress, with a heavy hand, to come in and dictate to these airports in a way that would not be done any other place.

Congress stated, in section 6009 of the 1986 transfer legislation, that these two Washington area airports would be treated like any other airport nationwide, not subject to a Federal law simply because the Federal Government once controlled them. The collective bargaining mandate included in H.R. 2739, therefore, abrogates the transfer legislation. And it is important to remember that these provisions impose restrictions that did not even govern airport employees before the transfer, when they worked for the Federal Aviation Administration.

The Metropolitan Washington Area Airports Authority is a political subdivision created by the Commonwealth of Virginia and the District of Columbia. These collective bargaining provisions also represent a unilateral change in the National Labor Relations Act, which specifically excludes State employees.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, this is being done without a single hearing on the part of the Committee on Education and Labor. Here we are, dramatically changing labor law, dramatically. Yet, the Committee on Education and Labor never held one hearing.

In the additional views it is stated:

We are not aware of any case where the NLRA has been imposed on any agency of a State government or one of its subdivisions.

Carrying out this law, we could then say that it might be imposed to all of the transit agencies around the country or all the State and local governments.

This congressional micromanagement also amounts to one more unfunded mandate. Now, if I had a dollar for every speech that was given by Members on both sides about unfunded mandates, I would have quite a bit of money. Yet, here we have an unfunded mandate coming which will drive up costs at these two local regional airports.

These higher costs will be borne by the airline industry, which has lost more than $10 billion in the last 3 years. Ultimately, the costs will fall on the shoulders of the travelers not only from this region, not only from Virginia, but also from around the country.

I would urge the support of every Member for this amendment, which would prevent an unprecedented intrusion by the Federal Government into this matter.

In closing, I will say that this is not, Mr. Chairman, an issue with regard to collective bargaining. This is an issue

with regard to States' rights. This is an issue with regard to whether the heavy-handed Congress can come in and mandate these things.

As we said earlier, the Airports Council International just today, in looking at this, was so offended by it that they passed a resolution saying that they oppose the imposition of the labor provisions by the Federal Government on airports operated by State or local entities; that is, National and Dulles Airports.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFNER). The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] has used 9 minutes of his time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF]. Prior to 1986, employees at Dulles and National Airports were Federal employees and subject to the statutory protection afforded such workers.

In 1986, the Congress acted to transfer responsibility for Dulles and National to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority. The Washington Airports Authority is an administrative body appointed by officials of the District of Columbia and the State of Virginia. It exercises sole and unilateral authority over the determination of wages for employees of the two airports.

Private sector employees have a right to bargain wages directly with their employer. Public sector workers can directly lobby the institutions that establish their wages, their State legislatures, and local municipal councils. The employees of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority have the misfortune of being neither fish nor fowl and effectively have no ability to exercise any voice in the determination of their wages.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], contends that no real problem exists. If these workers desire to have a voice in the determination of their wages, all they must do is lobby the legislature of two different jurisdictions in hopes that a third independent entity just might take a hint. We, in this body, are all professional legislators and can readily understand just how hollow a right that is.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] also argues that we have never imposed such authority on any other airport. No other airport authority that I am aware of was created by the Federal Government. Finally, and most importantly, the gentleman neglects the fact that it is Federal law that has left these workers without any effective voice in the determination of their wages. Having created this anomaly, it is certainly within the purview of the Congress to correct it.

The solution imposed by the legislation before us is neither unprecedented nor unworkable. This legislation does not afford these employees the right to strike. It simply affords them the ability to exercise a voice in the determination of their wages. Every American deserves that right. I urge the defeat of the Wolf amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER].

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

I would say to my good friend who just spoke that this authority is no different than many other authorities across the United States. Perhaps the best example is the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, which has multiple jurisdictions. And while this authority, indeed, is composed of both Washington, DC, and the State of Virginia, this is not unusual. All across America, we find multiple jurisdictions. Therefore, there is no difference between this authority, and it should not be treated any differently.

In fact, no other airport in America has the heavy hand of the Federal Government dictating to it what its labor policy should be. This is not an issue of collective bargaining. Rather, it is an issue of whether the Federal Government is going to say that these airports must be treated differently than every other airport in America.

□ 1150

The Airport Authority is a State agency, formed by a compact between the District of Columbia and Virginia, and should be treated like any other State agency. Indeed, if there are changes in the labor requirements necessary, then it is up to the commonwealth of Virginia and to the District of Columbia to make those changes. There is no reason why the employees in the Washington area should be treated differently from employees in other congressional districts across the United States.

The firefighters who are pushing for this change have actually done quite well under the current labor code. since the airports were transferred from Federal to local control in 1987, firefighters' salaries have increased from $20,000 to $33,000, and the weekly duty hours have decreased from 72 to 56 hours.

Amendments to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Act, especially ones that are dealing with collective bargaining, are beyond the scope of the legislation that is before us today and should not be included in this bill.

It is important to emphasize that the Washington Airport Authority opposes this provision, and as my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], has just said this morning, the Airports Council International, which represents all of the airports across America, has also come out in opposition to the language which is included in the bill.

For those reasons, and particularly for the very important reason that no other airport in America is treated this way, with the heavy hand of the Federal Government dictating to it, for all of these reasons I strongly urge support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF]. This is the one area in this bill where there is a disagreement between the majority and the minority. I think in all other respects we are totally in agreement that this is a fine piece of legislation.

We do disagree in this area, because of what has been stated before. That is, what we are going to be imposing on the two airports is a condition that we do not impose on any other airport in the United States. It has to be stressed again and again that this is not an issue having to do with collective bargaining. It is an issue having to do with whether airports have the right to control their own destiny, whether they have the right to determine what kind of labor arrangements they are going to have.

Section 207 in this bill stipulating that employees of Washington National and Dulles Airports shall be covered by the NLRA and its collective-bargaining provisions establishes, therefore, I think a dangerous new precedent that should not be included in this legislation. It is Congress taking onto itself to dictate to a non-Federal and it has to be stressed this is a non-Federal, regional airport authority, how it shall conduct its relationship with labor.

The Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority is a State agency formed by a compact between Virginia and the District of Columbia. National and Dulles Airports do sit on land, and we admit that, that is owned by the Federal Government and leased to the Authority. That is the sole basis for even suggesting this legislation. There is no further association. The land may be owned by the Federal Government, but it is leased to the Authority formed by Virginia and the District of Columbia.

The Metropolitan Washington Airports Act of 1986, when this council was established, in conveying the airports from the Federal Government to the new authority, was very explicit in its desire to grant the airport the same

autonomy generally enjoyed by other regionally owned airports around the country. Again, we would be making an exception in this case, treating these two airports differently than we treat all other airports in the country.

I want to point the attention of the Members to section 6009(b) of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Act, which states, in part, "The Metropolitan Washington airports and the Airports Authority shall not be subject to the requirements of any law solely by reason of the retention by the United States of fee simple title to such airports * * *."

Mr. Chairman, I would submit that section 207 of the bill therefore violates this provision of the law.

If we begin to intrude upon the affairs of this particular regional authority, where do we draw the line? Next time we may well be mandating similar changes for airports in your district, in my district. The provision, I think, is setting an extremely dangerous precedent, Mr. Chairman, and I would urge all Members to oppose it, and vote for this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, this is Pennsylvania's day. Two of three Members from Pennsylvania have spoken, and all three have great ties to Penn State, where I went to school, so this is a Penn State effort.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I should start by saying I would imagine our committee should have jurisdiction over this issue, and should have had hearings and debate and discussion, et cetera. We have had none.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Wolf amendment to H.R. 2739, the Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act of 1993. As the gentleman from Virginia explained, this amendment would strike from the bill a provision which would extend coverage of the National Labor Relations Act [NLRA] to employees of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, with certain exceptions including a prohibition on the right to strike. Extending the NLRA to public sector employment would override the longstanding definition of covered employer contained in section 2(2) of the act which explicitly excludes the United States, as well as the States and any political subdivision thereof.

Proponents of the provision have explained that it is necessary to correct an inequity that may have resulted with respect to the employees of National and Dulles Airports when responsibility for the airports was transferred from the Federal Government to the airports authority. However, the collective-bargaining rights that would be extended to such employees under the National Labor Relations Act are far more extensive than those they enjoyed as Federal employees. It is my understanding that airport employees were not permitted to collectively bargain over wages and economic issues as Federal employees, although they would be so permitted under this legislation.

Whatever you believe about the merits of extending the National Labor Relations Act in this manner, it certainly could have a profound impact on labor-management relations in public sector employment. The analogy to the extension of the NLRA to employees of the United States Postal Service is not appropriate as it is federally subsidized corporation, something the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority expressly is not. I support the Wolf amendment because I feel that such a major change in the scope of the National Labor Relations Act, no matter that such a change was accomplished indirectly, warrants more careful consideration.

Mr. Chairman, for the RECORD. I include a letter I sent to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor on this subject:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC, July 28, 1993.

Hon. JAMES L. OBERSTAR,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Aviation, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC

DEAR JIM: I would like to bring to your attention two labor provisions in the draft FAA airport program reauthorization bill which, I understand, is to be marked up tomorrow by the Subcommittee on Aviation. As these provisions constitute significant, questionable changes in the scope of the National Labor Relations Act and the Davis-Bacon Act which have not been considered by the Education and Labor Committee, I urge that you move to have the provisions deleted from the legislation.

One provision would expressly extend the National Labor Relations Act, for the time, to certain state employees. While the Act is not directly amended, the draft legislation reaches the same result by simply stating that the Act shall apply to "labor-management relations between the Airports Authority an labor organization representing bargaining units at the Metropolitan Washington Airports," overriding the longstanding definition of covered employers at section 2(2) of the Act which specifically excludes the states. While I realize that proponents of this change believe that Authority employees should be extended the same rights as those afforded private sector employees, a change in existing law which extends the reach of the National Labor Relations Act to the public, state sector—effectively displacing state law—is one that needs careful examination. While here limited to one group of state employees, the effect of such a precedent is potentially enormous.

I am also deeply concerned with the provision requiring the payment of prevailing wages as determined by the Secretary of Labor under the Davis-Bacon Act to laborers and mechanics working on any construction projects at Washington Metropolitan airports. What is particularly disturbing is the attempt to apply the wage protections of the Davis-Bacon Act to any and all construction laborers and mechanics at the airports, regardless of whether or not the project involves federal funds. This extension is contrary to the Act's basic precept that it is federally funded construction that triggers Davis-Bacon coverage.

The Davis-Bacon Act has been shown to reduce jobs and increase unemployment, with an especially harmful effect on minorities, women, and the very group it was intended to help—small, local contractors. Such expansion of the Act can serve only to inflate construction costs and to add to the numerous administrative problems already associated with the law.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. Should you have any questions, please call me (225-5836) or have a member of your staff call Randy Johnson (225-7101).

Sincerely,

BILL GOODLING,
Ranking Republican.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker referred on behalf of the Committee on Education and Labor to the jurisdictional issue. I just want to report to the Committee a letter that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation received from the gentleman from Michigan, WILLIAM D. FORD, chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, on August 9, in which he writes:

Dear Mr. Chairman: On August 5, 1993, the Committee on Public Works and Transportation marked up H.R. 2739, the Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act of 1993. This bill contains a provision which falls within the rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Then it goes on specifically to define the language in our bill, and concluded:

Our staff have reviewed the language in question and have determined that the proposed provision extending collective bargaining rights needs no revision. Accordingly, we see no need to seek a sequential referral of the legislation. Our agreement to forgo consideration of the legislation should not be construed as a waiver of this Committee's jurisdiction as established by House Rule X.

I would appreciate it if you would include a copy of this letter in the Committee's report accompanying the bill.

With kind regards, Sincerely, William D. Ford, Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I serve on the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and I respectfully disagree with some of my colleagues on this issue. This is a rather unique situation. It is not a precedent for Federal law generally, but here are two airports in which the Federal Government has more involvement than with, really, any other airport in the United States.

□ 1200

And we get down to the simple issue of fairness, particularly should a Federal airport be in a right-to-work State, of whether the employees within that airport complex have a right to

negotiate on working conditions and wages. There is no right to strike. The Federal interest for the free flow of interstate commerce and transportation is thoroughly protected.

This is simply giving them the opportunity to negotiate, as exists at most other airports in the United States. Therefore, I would oppose the amendment of my good friend from Virginia, whose expertise on the Civil War I greatly admire. But in this case, I think we need a different standard than we have now in the law.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in 1986 the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, at the request of the administration at that time, and the States affected by the proposed legislation to modify the way in which National Airport and Dulles Airport were operated, reported legislation to transfer National and Dulles Airports from the authority of the Federal Government specifically the Federal Aviation Administration that administered those two airports, to a newly created regional airport authority which would operate those airports in lieu of the Federal Government through the Federal Aviation Administration. And the objective at the time was to free those two airports from the annual appropriation process and provide latitude for the two airports to proceed through the bonding process, as the U.S Postal Service did, more expeditiously in enhancing capacity at both airports, improving the terminal capability, and doing all of the other things that are necessary to make airports operate efficiently and with a dedicated revenue stream, and the ability to count upon the money being available when needed for airport projects.

In adopting that legislation, or transfer legislation as it was called at the time, Congress provided that employees at the airport would continue to have the same rights that they had as Federal employees, to wit: the right to bargain collectively on matters other than wages with a prohibition on strikes. In the aftermath of enactment of that legislation, as it turned out, the employees of the authority were prohibited from doing what they have done previously; that is, to come and lobby Congress for improvements in wages and benefits. Bereft of that right, they continued to muddle along with the authority, and have felt that that arrangement is not satisfactory.

In fact, we have found in the course of our inquiry into this matter that the employees are in a worse position than they were prior to the creation of the authority, and that certainly the time has come to correct that inequity. The legislation is very clearly intended to give National Airport and Dulles Airport employees the same rights as they had as Federal employees. They ought to be able to lobby the Congress. They ought to be able to negotiate with the authority, as do employees at 35 of the top 45 airports in this country. At those airports employees have the right to bargain collectively over wages. Most, if not all of those airport authorities are administered by elected governments, and where the collective bargaining process does not work well, they can go to their State legislatures, as Federal employees could go to the Congress, and say, "We insist upon, or we plead with you for, equity." And the Congress could respond, and similarly the State legislatures could respond.

But now they have no State legislature to appeal to. Granted, the authority could give them authority to bargain collectively. It has not done so.

This chairman thinks very strongly that there ought to be collective bargaining available for these public employees. They should not be second-class citizens. They should not be in a different position than employees of other airport authorities who can go to their State legislatures, who can lobby for improvements in their working conditions and in their wages, or attempt to succeed in improving their economic condition. But they cannot do that here at this authority.

This legislation does not give them the right to strike. It does not enhance their position over what it was previously. It puts them in the same position they would have been had this transfer not taken place.

This legislation will not affect air service. There are not going to be strikes. And conversely, there will not be lockouts. The authority cannot do that either.

If a dispute cannot be resolved in the collective bargaining process, there is a provision in here for mandatory arbitration, fair, reasonable, decent, the same conditions that exist for employees of the U.S. Postal Service. If it is good enough for 650,000 U.S. Postal Service employees, it ought to be good enough for the handful of employees at National and Dulles Airports.

This is worker equity. It is not as much as I would like to provide. I would like to go much further. But I think that our commitment was only at the time of creating the authority to put employees in the same position under the authority as they would have been had the Federal Government continued to operate those airports through the Federal Aviation Administration.

I urge support of the provision in the bill which is simply worker equity, the right to bargain collectively with your employer for conditions of work and wages and benefits. And I urge defeat of the ill-considered Wolf amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume and I rise in support of the amendment that the gentleman just called ill-considered.

Mr. Chairman, before I close let me just comment on a number of the statements that have been made.

First, this is an involvement in this airport in a way that the act that passed in 1986 said was not to take place. In fact, I see the former Speaker of the House, Mr. Wright, on the floor, and he was very instrumental in that legislation at that time, and these airports were to be treated totally like any other airport.

Second, I would like to correct a statement by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. Under the law before the airports were transferred, the employees were Federal employees and did not have the right to bargain collectively. And they have actually gained greater rights to bargain collectively under the airport authority than they had when they were Federal employees.

Third, take BWI. BWI has the right to collective bargaining and the employees at the Washington airports, both National and Dulles, have better benefits. Their pay is up and the hours are down. Also, 60 percent of the employees in the Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority have never worked for the airport authority. They have never worked for the FAA. The other 40 percent had the choice of transferring in 1986, and this provision imposes rights that they did not have under the FAA.

Also, my good friend from California, Mr. HORN, who I have the greatest respect for, talked about all of the airports have this right. The Atlanta Hartsfield does not have the right, Dallas/Fort Worth does not have the right, Houston International does not have the right, Lambert St. Louis does not have the right, and in Baltimore/Washington International Airport, and you can go on and on.

One other thing, the members of the airport authority sent a letter to the Members of Congress where they said:

> As the House considers H.R. 2739, the Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act, I urge all Members of Congress to support the amendment offered by Congressman Wolf to strike the NLRA provision.
>
> If the Wolf amendment does not pass, the Congress will take the unprecedented action of applying the National Labor Relations Act to a State agency, the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority.

□ 1210

I would also say there is no record of the employees going or petitioning the District of Columbia or petitioning the State of Virginia for any right to collective bargaining.

They go on to say:

> The Airports Authority is an interstate compact agency created by the Commonwealth of Virginia and the District of Columbia to operate Washington National and Washington Dulles International Airport. As an interstate compact, its legal status is

that of a State agency. The Airports Authority is not a Federal agency, and its labor policy is not the responsibility of the Congress.

Now, for those who are listening, this is like coming in and mandating something to a local airport in your congressional district. It is not their responsibility.

Now, if the Congress gets involved in this, then there is no telling where Congress will go.

They go on to say:

As a non-Federal public agency, the Airports Authority's labor policy should be determined by the jurisdictions that created it: Virginia and the District of Columbia. Regardless of labor policy for public employees in their home States, Members should not support the committee bill, which sets a precedent for Federal intervention. The NRA does not apply to any State and local agencies; it should not be extended to the Airports Authority. Your support for the Wolf amendment is a vote against Federal intrusion into State and local Government matters.

Also, as I said earlier, the Airports Council International today is looking at this onerous provision in this bill and passed a resolution where they said:

Whereas the United States House of Representatives is considering a measure that would impose labor provisions on certain non-Federal airports, and whereas labor policy at airports is determined by the law of the State and local entities that operate the airports and the measure in the U.S. House of Representatives is considered without precedent, the ACCI opposes the imposition of labor provisions by the Federal Government on airports operated by State and local entities.

In closing, this is not a collective bargaining issue.

My dad was a policeman in the city of Philadelphia, was one of the people involved in the beginning of the Fraternal Order of Police. I understand and would be sympathetic if this were a collective bargaining issue; it is not a collective bargaining issue.

This is purely an issue of the heavy hand of the Congress dictating to the State of Virginia and the District of Columbia how it will operate. I have also said earlier, if the fire fighters have a particular grievance, my door is open to them. I would be glad to meet with them to see what could be done. But in the process, we do not want to go back to the days in the past, when many Members were not here, where the Congress considered that they would own and operate these airports. I think you have to take your hat off to the people who operate the airports authority in a bipartisan manner. They have done an excellent job in operating both National and Dulles Airports. We do not want to come back to the time when the Congress micromanages these airports.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman mentioned his Philadelphia roots. I just wanted to point out that both Philadelphia and Pittsburgh International Airports have collective bargaining for their employees.

Mr. WOLF. That is correct, and that is the very point that I said.

Reclaiming my time, the chairman is exactly right. I say if locally they made the decision in the City of Brotherly Love, in the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, where I was raised and graduated from Penn State and love very deeply, they made that decision and I honor that. I think it is appropriate there. What I am saying is the Congress in this case should not come in and mandate something for the Commonwealth of Virginia or for the District of Columbia. I think it is a position of local control.

When we had this great battle on these airports, for new Members, this was a disgrace the way the airports were operated. They were falling down, there was no allocation for their operation. In 1981 Dulles had 2.1 million passengers. It was ridiculed, considered to be a white elephant, if you will, a joke. Now it has 11½, almost 12 million passengers. There is a consistent, organized policy. The airports authority, under the leadership of Jim Wilding and Ron Linton, whom I will tell my colleagues were selected by the Governor of Virginia, a Democrat, the Governor of Maryland, who is a Democrat, and the mayor of the District of Columbia, who is a Democrat. They have selected the people who are running these airports. They selected the airports authority.

I will say and stipulate that they have done a good job. So this, I think, is a question of home rule, allowing these localities to make the decisions.

So I strongly urge again, it is not a collective bargaining issue and it ought not to be made into one. It is an issue of whether or not the localities and the airports authority that was given this authority have the ability to operate them. I may say again to the fire fighters, "Come by and see me, and we will be glad to deal and try to help them on the issue. But let us not upset this very important precedent here." These airports have been operated well.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 259, not voting 12.

[Roll No. 490]

AYES—167

Allard	Goss	Parker
Archer	Grams	Paxon
Armey	Grandy	Petri
Bachus (AL)	Greenwood	Pickett
Baker (CA)	Gunderson	Pombo
Baker (LA)	Hall (TX)	Porter
Ballenger	Hancock	Portman
Barrett (NE)	Hansen	Pryce (OH)
Bartlett	Hastert	Quillen
Barton	Hefley	Ramstad
Bateman	Herger	Regula
Bentley	Hobson	Ridge
Bereuter	Hoekstra	Roberts
Bilirakis	Hoke	Rogers
Bliley	Houghton	Rohrabacher
Blute	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Hutchinson	Roth
Bonilla	Hyde	Roukema
Bunning	Inglis	Rowland
Burton	Inhofe	Royce
Buyer	Istook	Saxton
Callahan	Johnson (CT)	Schaefer
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Schiff
Camp	Kasich	Sensenbrenner
Canady	Kim	Shaw
Castle	King	Shuster
Clinger	Kingston	Sisisky
Coble	Klug	Skeen
Collins (GA)	Knollenberg	Smith (MI)
Combest	Kolbe	Smith (OR)
Condit	Kyl	Smith (TX)
Cox	Lazio	Snowe
Crane	Leach	Solomon
Crapo	Levy	Spence
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Deal	Lewis (FL)	Stenholm
DeLay	Lightfoot	Stump
Doolittle	Linder	Sundquist
Dornan	Livingston	Talent
Dreier	Machtley	Tanner
Dunn	Manzullo	Tauzin
Emerson	McCollum	Taylor (MS)
Everett	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
Ewing	McHugh	Thomas (CA)
Fawell	McInnis	Thomas (WY)
Fields (TX)	McMillan	Torkildsen
Fish	Meyers	Upton
Fowler	Mica	Valentine
Franks (CT)	Miller (FL)	Vucanovich
Gallegly	Molinari	Walker
Gallo	Montgomery	Walsh
Gilchrest	Moorhead	Wolf
Gillmor	Myers	Young (FL)
Gingrich	Nussle	Zeliff
Goodlatte	Oxley	Zimmer
Goodling	Packard	

NOES—259

Abercrombie	Cardin	Duncan
Andrews (ME)	Carr	Durbin
Andrews (NJ)	Chapman	Edwards (CA)
Andrews (TX)	Clay	Edwards (TX)
Applegate	Clayton	Engel
Bacchus (FL)	Clement	English (AZ)
Baesler	Clyburn	English (OK)
Barca	Coleman	Evans
Barcia	Collins (IL)	Farr
Barlow	Collins (MI)	Fazio
Barrett (WI)	Conyers	Fields (LA)
Becerra	Cooper	Filner
Beilenson	Coppersmith	Fingerhut
Berman	Costello	Flake
Bevill	Coyne	Foglietta
Bilbray	Cramer	Ford (MI)
Bishop	Danner	Ford (TN)
Blackwell	Darden	Frank (MA)
Boehlert	de la Garza	Franks (NJ)
Bonior	de Lugo (VI)	Frost
Borski	DeFazio	Furse
Brewster	DeLauro	Gejdenson
Brooks	Dellums	Gekas
Browder	Derrick	Gephardt
Brown (CA)	Deutsch	Geren
Brown (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Gibbons
Brown (OH)	Dicks	Gilman
Bryant	Dingell	Glickman
Byrne	Dixon	Gonzalez
Cantwell	Dooley	Gordon

Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Ackerman
Boucher
Dickey
Eshoo
Faleomavaega (AS)
Horn
Hutto
McDade
McKeon
Michel
Murtha
Torres

□ 1255

Messrs. DERRICK, BLACKWELL, KLECZKA, LAUGHLIN, ROSE, WELDON, and RAVENEL changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. PAXON changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I observe there are no further amendments that the committee is aware of. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania know of any amendments on his side?

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I also have no amendments that we are aware of on this side.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I would simply close by summarizing that this bill authorizes $28 billion for the programs of the Federal Aviation Administration over the next 3 years, provides stability of funding, a dedicated revenue stream, continuity of the programs of the FAA, focused on safety, improving the operations and efficiency of the air traffic control system of our airports in this country to accommodate what is anticipated to be a 60-percent increase in aviation traffic over the balance of this decade.

I urge support of the bill.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, aircraft noise is a serious problem. It is an invisible pollutant that causes stress, hearing loss, and impaired health. The residents of my district, and the districts of many of my colleagues, have experienced the harm of adverse effects resulting from aircraft noise firsthand, as they have had to endure constant, daily, and nightly overflights of their homes and their neighborhoods.

In testimony before the Science Committee's Technology, Environment, and Aviation Subcommittee, we have heard from witnesses supporting the need for greater technological efforts to reduce aircraft noise.

To address this concern, in the Aviation Safety and Capacity Interim Amendments Act of 1992—Public Law 102–581—the House directed the Federal Aviation Administration to conduct more research on aircraft noise abatement for existing aircraft, and for new aircraft.

Yet, the President's budget for fiscal year 1994 requested only $4.361 million for research and development in efforts such as airport noise abatement. This figure represents an 8-percent reduction below the fiscal year 1993 appropriation level.

Mr. Chairman, clearly, this funding level does not reflect the will of this House. The amendment, which I am offering with my colleague from New Jersey, seeks to rectify this problem.

To achieve the goal of increased aircraft noise abatement research and development, this amendment seeks to reprogram $2.201 million of the account for environment and energy projects. By doing so, we would allow for increased aircraft noise abatement research.

To offset this increase, the activities and projects budget account for management and analysis would be reduced by the same $2.201 million. Despite this reprogramming, the management account would still receive an increase of 9.7 percent to $11.297 million for fiscal year 1994.

Consequently, this reprogramming of funds would not result in a need for any additional new spending. This amendment would also have the same reprogramming effect for fiscal years 1995 and 1996.

Mr. Chairman, the airline industry supports adding more research for aircraft noise. Not only will quieter aircraft meet standards within the United States and provide our constituents with quieter airspace, it will also make our aircraft more competitive in international markets.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Klein/Morella amendment—for our constituents discomforted by aircraft noise and for our international competitiveness.

□ 1300

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHARP). There being no further amendments to title II or title III, the Clerk will designate title IV.

The text of title IV is as follows:

TITLE IV—EXTENSION OF AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY

SEC. 401. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

Paragraph (1) of section 9502(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to expenditures from Airport and Airway Trust Fund) is amended—

(1) by striking "October 1, 1995" and inserting "October 1, 1996", and

(2) by striking "(as such Acts were in effect on the date of the enactment of the Airport and Airway Safety, Capacity, Noise Improvement, and Intermodal Transportation Act of 1992)" and inserting "or the Airport and Airway Safety, Capacity, Noise Improvement, and Intermodal Transportation Act of 1992, or the Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act of 1993 (as such Acts are in effect on the date of the enactment of the Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act of 1993)".

Mr. RAHALL, Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2739, the Aviation Infrastructure Investment Act.

This bill, briefly defined, authorizes a continuation of funding for the development of our Nation's aviation system. With respect to our Nation's declining investment in its infrastructure overall, aviation has suffered along with the rest.

Yet we know from the report by the President's Commission which studied the airline industry and general aviation needs as well, that improvement in the capacity of our airports and air traffic control system is essential to reducing costly flight delays and to enabling the system to handle the increased demands which will be placed upon it as the economy recovers and expands. The FAA expects airline passenger enplanements to increase by 60 percent in the next 10 years.

The recent financial problems of the industry has not lessened the need for development of our aviation infrastructure—for indeed it is the inadequacies of our airports and air traffic control system which are partially responsible for airline losses, since the inadequacies have created unnecessary added expenses for the airlines. If airports are not permitted to grow along with the estimated increase in air traffic, then we will have exacerbated the problem—draining the airlines, the consumers, and the entire economy.

There is much to praise in the aviation infrastructure investment bill, and I know that the

debate today will bring out all the improvements and modestly increased funding recommendations for airports improvement and certainly the enhancement of air traffic control features.

Being from a small, rural State, I wanted to focus on the protection of small community airline passengers.

This bill provides that in establishing levels of basic essential air service and selecting a carrier to provide the service, the Secretary shall not give consideration to whether the slots at a high density airport are available for providing such service. If basic essential air service is to be provided to and from a high density airport, the Secretary shall ensure that a sufficient number of slots are available to allow such service to be provided. If necessary the Secretary must take action to transfer such slots or otherwise make them available. If a carrier providing essential air services to a small community terminates such service, they may not retain EAS slots at high density airports; we have closed that loophole in current law.

Essential air service funding was eliminated in the House version of fiscal year 1994 transportation appropriations, but it is my expectation that these funds will be at least partially restored by the Senate. I hope and expect that House conferees will recede to the Senate funding level for EAS in fiscal year 1994; these funds are vital to small community airports in my district.

The bill, overall, increases funding for aviation, but does so modestly and in keeping with budgetary constraints. It authorizes the release of $6.5 billion through fiscal year 1996 from the airport and airway trust fund for AIP grants, which finance airport capacity development, safety and security, and noise abatement. In fiscal year 1994, that would amount to $2.1 billion, for AIP, and $2.2 billion in fiscal years 1995 and 1996. The bill's fiscal year 1994 authorization is $300 million more than appropriated in fiscal year 1993.

I am pleased with the bill, and I commend our very able subcommittee chairman, JIM OBERSTAR, for his excellent guidance of this bill through subcommittee and the full Public Works and Transportation Committee, and for bringing it to the floor in a timely manner. Thanks and appreciation go also to chairman of the full committee, NORM MINETA, and to the ranking Republicans, BUD SHUSTER and BILL CLINGER.

Having recently rejoined the Aviation Subcommittee, I am pleased to be a part of today's debate on aviation infrastructure needs, for I have an intense understanding of the importance of airport improvement and enhancement of services necessary to keep West Virginia in the mainstream of economic recovery and economic development opportunities.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, no further amendment is in order.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MAZZOLI] having assumed the chair, Mr. SHARP, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2739) to amend the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 269, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Lightfoot amendment, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: At the end of title II of the bill add the following:

SEC. 212. CHILD RESTRAINT SYSTEMS ON COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 601 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. App. 1421) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) CHILD RESTRAINT SYSTEMS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall issue regulations requiring an air carrier to provide a child safety restraint system approved by the Secretary on any aircraft operated by such air carrier in providing interstate air transportation, intrastate transportation, or overseas air transportation. Such regulations shall establish age or weight limits for children who may use such systems.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents contained in the first section of such Act is amended by inserting at the end of the matter relating to section 601 the following new item:

"(g) Child restraint systems.".

Mr. LINDER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the grounds that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 5(b)(2) of rule XV, the Chair may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for any recorded vote that may be ordered on the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 375, nays 49, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 491]

YEAS—375

Abercrombie	Duncan	Johnson (CT)
Andrews (ME)	Durbin	Johnson (GA)
Andrews (NJ)	Edwards (CA)	Johnson (SD)
Andrews (TX)	Edwards (TX)	Johnson, E.B.
Applegate	Emerson	Johnson, Sam
Archer	Engel	Johnston
Bacchus (FL)	English (AZ)	Kaptur
Bachus (AL)	English (OK)	Kasich
Baesler	Eshoo	Kennedy
Baker (CA)	Evans	Kennelly
Barca	Everett	Kildee
Barcia	Ewing	Kim
Barlow	Farr	King
Barrett (NE)	Fawell	Kleczka
Barrett (WI)	Fazio	Klein
Barton	Fields (LA)	Klink
Bateman	Fields (TX)	Klug
Becerra	Filner	Kolbe
Beilenson	Fingerhut	Kopetski
Bentley	Fish	Kyl
Bereuter	Flake	LaFalce
Berman	Foglietta	Lambert
Bevill	Ford (MI)	Lancaster
Bilbray	Ford (TN)	Lantos
Bilirakis	Fowler	LaRocco
Bishop	Frank (MA)	Laughlin
Blackwell	Franks (CT)	Lazio
Blute	Franks (NJ)	Leach
Boehlert	Frost	Lehman
Bonior	Furse	Levin
Borski	Gallegly	Levy
Brewster	Gallo	Lewis (CA)
Brooks	Gejdenson	Lewis (FL)
Browder	Gekas	Lewis (GA)
Brown (CA)	Geren	Lipinski
Brown (FL)	Gibbons	Livingston
Brown (OH)	Gilchrest	Lloyd
Bryant	Gillmor	Long
Bunning	Gilman	Lowey
Buyer	Gingrich	Machtley
Byrne	Glickman	Maloney
Calvert	Gonzalez	Mann
Camp	Goodlatte	Manton
Canady	Gordon	Manzullo
Cantwell	Goss	Margolies-Mezvinsky
Cardin	Grams	Markey
Carr	Grandy	Martinez
Castle	Green	Mazzoli
Chapman	Greenwood	McCandless
Clay	Gunderson	McCloskey
Clayton	Gutierrez	McCollum
Clement	Hall (OH)	McCrery
Clinger	Hall (TX)	McCurdy
Clyburn	Hamburg	McDermott
Coleman	Hamilton	McHale
Collins (GA)	Hansen	McHugh
Collins (IL)	Harman	McInnis
Collins (MI)	Hastert	McKeon
Combest	Hastings	McKinney
Conyers	Hayes	McMillan
Cooper	Hefner	McNulty
Coppersmith	Herger	Meehan
Costello	Hilliard	Meek
Coyne	Hinchey	Menendez
Cramer	Hoagland	Meyers
Crane	Hobson	Mfume
Cunningham	Hochbrueckner	Miller (CA)
Danner	Hoke	Miller (FL)
Darden	Holden	Mineta
de la Garza	Horn	Minge
Deal	Houghton	Mink
DeLauro	Hoyer	Moakley
Dellums	Huffington	Molinari
Derrick	Hughes	Mollohan
Deutsch	Hutchinson	Montgomery
Diaz-Balart	Hyde	Moorhead
Dicks	Inhofe	Moran
Dingell	Inslee	Morella
Dixon	Istook	Murphy
Dooley	Jacobs	Nadler
Dreier	Jefferson	

Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—49

Allard
Armey
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Bartlett
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Burton
Callahan
Coble
Condit
Cox
Crapo
DeFazio
DeLay
Doolittle
Dornan
Dunn
Goodling
Hancock
Hefley
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Kanjorski
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kreidler
Lightfoot
Linder
Mica
Michel
Myers
Nussle
Parker
Penny
Pombo
Ramstad
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sarpalius
Smith (MI)
Stenholm
Stump
Taylor (NC)
Upton
Walker

NOT VOTING—9

Ackerman
Boucher
Dickey
Gephardt
Hutto
Matsui
McDade
Murtha
Torres

□ 1327

Mr. KANJORSKI and Mr. BOEHNER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay".

Mr. HUTCHINSON and Mr. BEREUTER changed their vote from "nay" to yea."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, because of a malfunction of my beeper I was unable to be here to record my votes on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], rollcall No. 490, and on the separate vote in the House on the so-called Lightfoot amendment, rollcall No. 491.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 384, nays 42, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 492]

YEAS—384

Abercrombie
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dreier
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—42

Allard
Ballenger
Bentley
Bonilla
Burton
Carr
Coble
Combest
Crapo
Doolittle
Dornan
Duncan
Fawell
Goodlatte
Goodling
Grams
Hancock
Hefley
Hunter
Johnson, Sam
Knollenberg
McInnis
Mica
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Quillen
Roberts
Roth
Royce
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Solomon
Stump
Sundquist
Walker
Wolf
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—7

Ackerman
Boucher
Hutto
Lewis (GA)
McDade
Murtha
Rangel

□ 1344

Mr. SMITH of Michigan changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM changed his vote from "nay" to "yea." So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

SUNDRY DEFERRALS OF BUDGET AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report eight deferrals of budget authority, totaling $1.2 billion.

These deferrals affect International Security Assistance programs as well as programs of the Agency for International Development and the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Health and Human Services, and State. The details of these deferrals are contained in the attached report.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 13, 1993.*

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 274 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 274

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1804) to improve learning and teaching by providing a national framework for education reform; to promote the research, consensus building, and systemic changes needed to ensure equitable educational opportunities and high levels of educational achievement for all American students; to provide a framework for reauthorization of all Federal education programs; to promote the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skill standards and certifications; and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the amendments made in order by this resolution and shall not exceed eighty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 3210. The amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 2 of this resolution. Except as specified in section 2, each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment (except that pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate may be offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor), and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor or a designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution or germane modifications thereof. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read except that modifications shall be reported. Amendments en bloc shall be debatable for twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against amendments en bloc are waived. The original proponent of an amendment included in amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

□ 1350

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 274 provides for consideration of H.R. 1804, the President's Goals 2000: Educate America Act. The rule provides for 1 hour and 20 minutes of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Education and Labor Committee.

The rule makes in order as original text an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 3210. The substitute shall be considered as read. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the report to accompany the rule and amendments en bloc described in section 2 of the rule. The amendments shall be considered in the order and manner specified in the report, with debate time also specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The report specifies that the amendments are to be considered as read and are not subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or the Committee of the Whole. In addition, the amendments are not subject to amendment, except that the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Education and Labor Committee may offer pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate.

Further, section 2 of the rule provides that the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee or a designee may offer at any time amendments en bloc consisting of the text of the amendments printed in the report, or germane modifications thereof. The chairman's amendments en bloc will be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. The amendments en block will be considered as read except that the modifications will be reported.

The amendments en bloc are not subject to amendment nor to a demand for a division of the question. All points of order are waived against the amendments en bloc. The original proponents of the amendments included in the chairman's en bloc may insert statements in the RECORD at the appropriate place. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, today's world is much different than it was 50 years ago. Advances in technology have changed the entire nature of our work force. No longer is it enough to equip our children with basic skills. We must also

provide our children with the skills to compete in today's global economy. H.R. 1804 seeks to accomplish this goal through the improvement of education for all children.

H.R. 1804 is a means for the Federal Government to give a major boost to school reform in the United States. The legislation would implement the President's education reform proposals called Goals 2000: Educate America Act.

Under the bill $393 million in grants would be awarded to the States as an incentive to improve their elementary and secondary schools. Each State could apply for these funds through the development of State plans which set standards for education. The bill would require States to establish standards of content—or what children should know in English, math or other subjects at certain points in their education. Local school districts would also be eligible for subgrants from the State to develop and implement comprehensive reform at the local school district level as well.

The bill further establishes a National Education Goals Panel charged with building a national consensus for education improvement and reporting on the Nation's progress in meeting the national education goals. Never before has our Nation had standards for what students should know. These standards will enable America to set voluntary goals for which all students can strive.

The bill also establishes a National Education Standards and Improvement Council. This Council would develop criteria for certifying voluntary national content, student performance, and opportunity-to-learn standards, as well as standards developed and voluntarily submitted by the States. These national standards would become available for use by States as guides or models in developing or modifying their academic standards.

The bill further establishes a 28-member National Skill Standards Board intended to serve as a catalyst in stimulating the development of a voluntary system of skill standards. The Board will encourage and facilitate the establishment of voluntary business-labor-education partnerships to develop skill standards systems. The bill further provides that the skill standards meet or exceed the highest standards used in other countries.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1804 is a departure from the way the Federal Government has previously dealt with education. Not only does the bill call for voluntary national standards, but it calls for the relaxing of regulations and emphasizes academic achievement instead. The bill supports creativity to develop new and innovative approaches to educating our Nation's children.

Further H.R. 1804 stresses improvement for all children. Unlike existing Federal programs which target special groups of children, this legislation seeks broad-based improvement of education for all children.

Mr. Speaker, for our Nation to remain a world leader, we must rise to the challenge and prepare our children for what lies ahead. Only through changes in our present education system can we hope to compete in tomorrow's fast-paced and competitive global economy. H.R. 1804 is a step toward preparing for that future.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 274 is a fair rule that will expedite consideration of the President's education reform bill. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] has ably explained the provisions of the rule. But I rise in strong opposition to the rule. I do not think this is the type of bill, in its present form, that we should pass. Bringing the Federal Government into our schoolrooms really is not what we need in America today. We must watch this legislation closely, because that is where it is headed.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one who can question my support of education. I remember years ago in the Committee on Rules there was a measure, which had been lying without any support for a number of months to create a Cabinet-level position for the Department of Education. It was JIM QUILLEN's vote that sent the measure to the floor. Our late friend, Congressman Mo Udall, attested to that fact in a letter back to my district, that had it not been for my vote, the measure would never have reached the floor.

But I believe that we must watch our course closely today and see that the Federal Government does not get too far into our classrooms in the private and public school systems of this Nation. I think this bill leads to that end.

Mr. Speaker, we know that education is so important in America today. We have children starting now in kindergarten, going all the way up the ladder into high school, and then into college or the university. Some pass with great flying colors. They get high degrees, but they are not taught the realities of life and what it takes to exist in an ever-changing world.

When I graduated from high school, no one ever dreamed that we would have men in space. No one ever dreamed of the progress that has been made.

□ 1400

And no one now will know the progress that might be made in the next 50 years. So the classroom education is most important. We have good schools, and we have bad schools. But there is one thing that we have got to watch.

This Nation of ours and the people of this Nation look to the Federal Government for the cures of all evils. But the classrooms in our public school system and in the private sector must retain their stability without governmental control.

I urge my colleagues in this body to vote down this rule, not only for that reason but because there were amendments not made in order. The chairman of the Rules Committee said that Members who wished to offer amendments to this bill were required to submit those amendments to the Rules Committee prior to its hearing on this bill. Only 15 amendments were submitted and 10 have been made in order. Motions were offered to make this an open rule and also to make other amendments in order. All motions were defeated in the Rules Committee on party line votes.

We must be forever watchful to ensure that the Federal Government does not end up dictating what is to be taught in our schools.

I urge the defeat of this rule.

ROLLCALL VOTES IN THE RULES COMMITTEE ON MOTIONS TO RULE ON H.R. 1804, GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1993

1. Open Rule—This substitute rule provides for one-hour of general debate on the bill, Goals 2000: Educate America Act, followed by an open amendment process under the five-minute rule. It also makes in order an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the bill H.R. 3210 as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

Failed: 4–5. Yeas: Solomon; Quillen; Dreier; Goss. Nays: Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Gordon, Slaughter. Not voting: Moakley, Bonior, Hall, Wheat.

2. Dornan (CA) #8—Prohibits federally-funded schools from promoting, condoning, or encouraging either directly or indirectly, homosexuality, bisexuality, or transsexuality.

Failed: 4–5. Yeas: Solomon; Quillen; Dreier; Goss. Nays: Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting: Moakley, Bonior, Hall, Wheat.

3. Hutchinson (AR) #11—Requires written parental consent for the involvement of students in psychological testing or school-based clinics, and protects the privacy rights of students regarding their academic and personal school records.

Failed: 4–6. Yeas: Solomon; Quillen; Dreier, Goss. Nays; Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon, Slaughter. Not Voting. Moakley, Hall, Wheat.

4. Adoption of Rule—Adopted 6–4. Yeas: Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon, Slaughter. Nays: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, Goss. Not Voting: Moakley, Hall, Wheat.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES 95TH–103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted [1]	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent [3]
95th (1977–78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979–80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981–82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983–84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985–86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987–88)	123	66	54	57	46

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES 95TH–103D CONG.—Continued

Congress (years)	Total rules granted [1]	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent [3]
101st (1989–90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991–92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993–94)	38	10	26	28	74

[1] Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

[2] Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

[3] Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rule, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Sources "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th–102d Cong.; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103d Cong., through Oct. 13, 1993.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103d Cong.

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58, Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D–5; R–25)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 246–176. A: 259–164. (Feb. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 59, Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: National Voter Registration Act	19 (D–1; R–18)	1 (D–0; R–1)	PQ: 248–171. A: 249–170. (Feb. 4, 1993).
H. Res. 103, Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D–2; R–5)	0 (D–0; R–0)	PQ: 243–172. A: 237–178. (Feb. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 106, Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D–1; R–8)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 248–166. A: 249–163. (Mar. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 119, Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (d–4; R–9)	8 (D–3; R–5)	PQ: 247–170. A: 248–170. (Mar. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 132, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental Appropriations	37 (D–8; R–29)	1(not submitted) (D–1; R–0)	A: 240–185. (Mar. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 133, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D–2; R–12)	4 (1-D not submitted) (D–2; R–2)	PQ: 250–172. A: 251–172. (Mar. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 138, Mar. 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 670: Family planning amendments	20 (D–8; R–12)	9 (D–4; R–5)	PQ: 252–164. A: 247–169. (Mar. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 147, Mar. 31, 1993	C	H.R. 1430: Increase Public debt limit	6 (D–1; R–5)	0 (D–0; R–0)	PQ: 244–168. A: 242–170. (Apr. 1, 1993).
H. Res. 149 Apr. 1, 1993	MC	H.R. 1578: Expedited Rescission Act of 1993	8 (D–1; R–7)	3 (D–1; R–2)	A: 212–208. (Apr. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 164, May 4, 1993	O	H.R. 820: Nate Competitiveness Act	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (May 5, 1993).
H. Res. 171, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 873: Gallatin Range Act of 1993	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (May 20, 1993).
H. Res. 172, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 1159: Passenger Vessel Safety Act	NA	NA	A: 308–0 (May 24, 1993).
H. Res. 173 May 18, 1993	MC	S.J. Res. 45: United States forces in Somalia	6 (D–1; R–5)	6 (D–1; R–5)	A: Voice Vote (May 20, 1993)
H. Res. 183, May 25, 1993	O	H.R. 2244: 2d supplemental appropriations	NA	NA	A: 251–174. (May 26, 1993).
H. Res. 186, May 27, 1993	MC	H.R. 2264: Omnibus budget reconciliation	51 (D–19; R–32)	8 (D–7; R–1)	PQ: 252–178. A: 236–194 (May 27, 1993).
H. Res. 192, June 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 2348: Legislative branch appropriations	50 (D–6; R–44)	6 (D–3; R–3)	PQ: 240–177. A: 226–185. (June 10, 1993).
H. Res. 193, June 10, 1993	O	H.R. 2200: NASA authorization	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 14, 1993).
H. Res. 195, June 14, 1993	MC	H.R. 5: Striker replacement	7 (D–4; R–3)	2 (D–1; R–1)	A: 244–176.. (June 15, 1993).
H. Res. 197, June 15, 1993	MO	H.R. 2333: State Department. H.R. 2404: Foreign aid	53 (D–20; R–33)	27 (D–12; R–15)	A: 294–129. (June 16, 1993).
H. Res. 199, June 16, 1993	C	H.R. 1876: Ext. of "Fast Track"	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 22, 1993).
H. Res. 200, June 16, 1993	MC	H.R. 2295: Foreign operations appropriations	33 (D–11; R–22)	5 (D–1; R–4)	A: 263–160. (June 17, 1993).
H. Res. 201, June 17, 1993	O	H.R. 2403: Treasury-postal appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 17, 1993).
H. Res. 203, June 22, 1993	MO	H.R. 2445: Energy and Water appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 23, 1993).
H. Res. 206, June 23, 1993	O	H.R. 2150: Coast Guard authorization	NA	NA	A: 401–0. (July 30, 1993).
H. Res. 217, July 14, 1993	MO	H.R. 2010: National Service Trust Act	NA	NA	A: 261–164. (July 21, 1993).
H. Res. 218, July 20, 1993	O	H.R. 2530: BLM authorization, fiscal year 1994–95	NA	NA	
H. Res. 220, July 21, 1993	MC	H.R. 2667: Disaster assistance supplemental	14 (D–8; R–6)	2 (D–2; R–0)	PQ: 245–178. F: 205–216. (July 22, 1993).
H. Res. 226, July 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 2667: Disaster assistance supplemental	15 (D–8; R–7)	2 (D–2; R–0)	A: 224–205. (July 27, 1993).
H. Res. 229, July 28, 1993	MO	H.R. 2330: Intelligence Authority Act, fiscal year 1994	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (Aug. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 230, July 28, 1993	O	H.R. 1964: Maritime Administration authority	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (July 29, 1993).
H. Res. 246, Aug. 6, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National Defense authority	149 (D–109; R–40)		A: 246–172. (Sept. 8, 1993).
H. Res. 248, Sept. 9, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National Defense authorization			PQ: 237–169. A: 234–169. (Sept. 13, 1993).
H. Res. 254, Sept. 22, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National Defense authorization		91 (D–67; R–24)	A: 241–182. (Sept. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 250, Sept. 13, 1993	MC	H.R. 1340: RTC Completion Act	12 (D–3; R–9)	1 (D–1; R–0)	A: 213–191–1. (Sept. 14, 1993).
H. Res. 262, Sept. 28, 1993	O	H.R. 1845: National Biological Survey Act	NA	NA	A: 238–188 (10/06/93).
H. Res. 264, Sept. 28, 1993	MC	H.R. 2351: Arts, humanities, museums	7 (D–0; R–7)	3 (D–0; R–3)	
H. Res. 265, Sept. 29, 1993	MC	H.R. 3167: Unemployment compensation amendments	3 (D–1; R–2)	2 (D–1; R–1)	
H. Res. 269, Oct. 6, 1993	MO	H.R. 2739: Aviation infrastructure investment	N/A	N/A	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 7, 1993).
H. Res. 274, Oct. 12, 1993	MC	H.R. 1804: Goals 2000 Educate America Act	15 (D–7; R–7; I–1)	10 (D–7; R–3)	

Note.—Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ: Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, may I just say that I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee, that we accepted the good Republican amendments. That we did. There were 15 amendments that were submitted; 10 of those amendments were made in order. Two of them we considered duplicative, and three were not made in order.

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

This rule is carefully constructed to bring before the Members a broad range of issues concerning H.R. 1804, Goals 2000: The Educate America Act.

Goals 2000: The Educate America Act is the first effort that seeks to use limited Federal funds as an incentive for public schools to undertake system reform to benefit all children.

Goals 2000 accomplishes its objectives through several steps.

At the national level, it authorizes a process for overseeing the development of voluntary national education standards which describe what students should know and be able to do.

Voluntary national opportunity-to-learn standards which describe the factors which must be in place in order for a student to have a reasonable chance to learn the material in the content standards would also be developed.

At the State and local level, the bill authorizes grants to assist State and local school districts in carrying out their own reform activities.

In addition, the bill authorizes grants to State and local education agencies to help them develop and evaluate new forms of assessments tied to State content standards.

Ten of the fifteen amendments filed with the Rules Committee are made in order by this rule.

Of the remainder, four raise issues that are either addressed by or similar to amendments that are made in order.

The single amendment that is not made in order would have violated the long-term principle of non-Federal interference in the decisions of local boards of education.

The rule, however, does provide adequate time for debate so Members can be heard on matters of importance to them.

Goals 2000 is the first step in a two-part process to provide Federal support for State and local school reform activities.

I urge the adoption of the rule so that we can proceed to consider this important issue.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

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

Mr. Speaker, I will be offering for discussion an amendment on the Goals 2000 bill. My amendment would prohibit funding under title III of the bill for any local educational agency that serves over 250,000 students. In effect, the amendment would exclude the Nation's very largest school districts from receiving any portion of the $393 million authorized for State and local reform grants under this legislation.

Obviously, the purpose of this amendment would be to encourage large, bureaucratic school districts to dissolve into smaller, more manageable, and more readily accountable school districts.

As early as 1984, Secretary of Education Terrence Bell told Congress that parent involvement and individual school autonomy are critical factors in determining the success of students and schools.

School districts which serve hundreds of thousands of students simply cannot permit or encourage parental involvement and school autonomy in the way that smaller districts can. In large school districts, the sheer magnitude of bureaucracy can frustrate parent influence and dramatically inhibit individual school autonomy which is necessary to successfully promote student achievement.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member in this body, including those who represent congressional districts within these monolithic school districts, who does not agree with that, even if they will not say so publicly.

In our Nation's largest districts, school boards often serve as political fiefdoms that jealously guard jurisdiction and dispense political patronage rather than promoting educational success and facilitating student achievement.

Only by providing parents a real voice in the management of their children's schools can these districts begin to improve educational achievement.

Dramatic structural reforms are needed to improve student performance in this country. But before we grant more funding for extremely large school systems that are structurally incapable of improving parental involvement and school autonomy, we ought to insist they make reasonable structural reforms that are prerequisites to improved student achievement.

My amendment addresses one impediment to reform at a very small number of school districts. Of the 15,350 public school districts in our country, 4 have student enrollments of over 250,000. Yet these four school districts by themselves educate 5 percent—1 of every 20—of all students nationwide. They tend to be symbolic of the failures of an educational system too heavily overburdened with bureaucracy and entrenched interests.

The amendment would simply encourage these school districts to subdivide into smaller districts of more manageable size to be eligible to receive funding under title III of the act.

Obviously, the funding in this measure is not sufficient to move these districts to reforms that have not yet been accomplished locally or through their State governments. Obviously, also, the school reauthorization legislation scheduled for next year, which contains almost all Federal educational programs, is a more appropriate and timely venue to raise this issue. I assume the Rules Committee will be willing to allow a similar amendment when that legislation is made in order.

I thank the Rules Committee for making my amendment in order on this legislation.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I think most Members realize that last year on the International Achievement Test, the American 13-year-olds shaped up at the bottom of the ladder. In fact, in math they were operating at a 55 percentile level on the International Test, whereby Taiwan, for example, and Korea were operating at a 37 percentile.

We are down at the bottom at math and science. 13 out of 15 in math, 14 out of 15 in science. And I do not think we are really taking issue as we should around here.

Second of all, we have an awful lot of young people that are not getting a decent education for a whole lot of reasons other than just education. I am proud to support the bill. I am proud to support this rule, and I am glad to see that my amendment was incorporated in, because there is money in the bill and, hopefully, those individuals will buy American-made products.

I want to speak about one issue briefly. Private school/public school. Most Americans say, look, I pay my taxes for public schools. Why can I not get a little bit of a break for private school?

I think Congress better quit hanging behind the closet on this. The truth of the matter is, the day that Congress allows the finance opportunity for individuals who send their kids to private schools that will open the door to a two-track education system. It will kill public schools.

□ 1410

I would disagree with any measure in any education bill, no matter how good it sounds, I think it is disastrous for our country. It will have haves and have nots where we do not need them.

If we are going to have people that are employable, people who can get a job, people who can help America grow, we are going to have to have quality education. We are sure as hell not going to have people have an option not to vote for a tax levy if they are getting all they want for that private school. I think that is an issue that must be dealt with here.

I commend the chairman for his outstanding work, and I appreciate the time to speak on the rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will pay particular attention to what I am about to read. This is a true story from a teacher:

"Teddy's letter came today, and now that I've read it, I will place it in my cedar chest with the other things that are important in my life.

"I wanted you to be the first to know." I smiled as I read the words he had written and my heart swelled with a pride that I had no right to feel. I have not seen Teddy Stallard since he was a student in my 5th grade class, 15 years ago. It was early in my career, and I had only been teaching for two years. . . . Teachers (although everyone knows differently) are not supposed to have favorites in a class, but most especially are they not to show dislike for a child, any child . . . but Teddy was most assuredly one I disliked.

"He was dirty. Not just occasionally, but all the time. His hair hung low over his ears, and he actually had to hold it out of his eyes as he wrote his papers in class. (And this was before it was fashionable to do so!) Too, he had a peculiar odor about him which I open never identify . . .

"By the end of the first week I knew he was hopelessly behind the others. Not only was he behind; he was just plain slow! I began to withdraw from him immediately.

"Ashamed as I am to admit it, I took perverse pleasure in using my red pen; and each time I came to Teddy's papers, the cross marks (and they were many) were always a little larger and a little redder than necessary.

"He knew I didn't like him, but he didn't know why. Nor did I know—then or now—why I felt such an intense dislike for him. All I know is that he was a little boy no one cared about, and I made no effort in his behalf.

"As the Christmas holidays approached, I knew that Teddy would never catch up in time to be promoted to the sixth grade level. He would be a repeater. To justify myself, I went to his cumulative folder from time to time. He had very low grades for the first four years, but not grade failure. How he had made it, I didn't know. I closed my mind to the personal remarks.

"First grade: Teddy shows promise by work and attitude, but has poor home situation. Second grade: Teddy could do better. Mother terminally ill. He receives little help at home. Third grade: Teddy is a pleasant boy. Helpful, but too serious. Slow learner. Mother passed away end of the year. Fourth grade: Very slow, but well behaved. Father shows no interest.

"Well, they passed him four times, but he will certainly repeat fifth grade! Do him good! I said to myself. And then, the last day before the holiday arrived. Our little tree on the reading table sported paper and popcorn chains. Many gifts were heaped underneath, waiting for the big moment . . .

"His gift wasn't the last one I picked up; in fact it was in the middle of the pile. Its wrapping was a brown paper bag, and he had colored Christmas trees and red bells all over it. It was stuck together with masking tape.

"'For Miss Thompson—From Teddy' it read. As I removed the last bit of masking tape, two items fell to my desk: a gaudy rhinestone bracelet with several stones missing and a bottle of dime-store cologne—half empty.

"I could hear the snickers and whispers, and I wasn't sure I could look at Teddy. 'Isn't it lovely?' I asked, placing the bracelet on my wrist, 'Teddy, would you help me fasten it?' He smiled shyly as he fixed the clasp, and I held up my wrist for all of them to admire. There were a few oohs and ahhs, but as I dabbed the cologne behind my ears, all the little girls lined up for a dab behind their ears.

"I continued to open the gifts until I reached the bottom of the pile. We ate our refreshments, and the bell rang. The children filed out with shouts of 'See you next year!' and 'Merry Christmas!' but Teddy waited at his desk. When they had all left, he walked toward me, clutching his gift and book to his chest.

"'You smell just like Mom,' he said softly. 'Her bracelet looks real pretty on you, too. I'm glad you liked it.'

"He left quickly. I locked the door, sat down at my desk, and wept, resolving to make up to Teddy what I had deliberately deprived him of—a teacher who cared.

"I stayed every afternoon with Teddy from the end of the Christmas holidays until the last day of school. Sometimes we worked together. Sometimes he worked alone while I drew up lesson plans or graded papers. Slowly but surely he caught up with the rest of the class. Gradually there was a definite upward curve in his grades.

"He did not have to repeat the fifth grade. In fact, his final averages were among the highest in the class, and although I knew he would be moving out of the state when school was out, I was not worried for him. Teddy had reached a level that would stand him in good stead the following year, no matter where he went. He had enjoyed a measure of success, and as we were taught in our teacher training course, "Success builds success."

"I did not hear from Teddy until seven years later, when his first letter appeared in my mailbox.

DEAR MISS THOMPSON: I just wanted you to be the first to know. I will be graduating second in my class next month.

Very truly yours,

TEDDY STALLARD.

"I sent him a card of congratulations and a small package, a pen and pencil gift set. I wondered what he would do after graduation.

"Four years later, Teddy's second letter came.

"DEAR MISS THOMPSON: I wanted you to be the first to know. I was just informed that I'll be graduating first in my class. The university has not been easy, but I like it.

Very truly yours,

TEDDY STALLARD.

"I sent him a good pair of sterling silver monogrammed cuff links and a card, so proud of him I could burst!

"And now today—Teddy's third letter:

DEAR MISS THOMPSON: I wanted you to be the first to know. As of today, I am Theodore J. Stallard, M.D. How about that!!?? I'm going to be married in July, the 27th, to be exact. I wanted to ask if you could come and sit where Mom would sit if she were here. I'll have no family as Dad died last year.

Very truly yours,

TEDDY STALLARD.

"I'm not sure what kind of gift one sends to a doctor on completion of medical school and state boards. Maybe I'll just wait and take a wedding gift, but my note can't wait.

"DEAR TED: Congratulations! You made it, and you did it yourself! In spite of those like me and not because of us, this day has come for you. God bless you. I'll be at that wedding with bells on!"

ELIZABETH SILANCE BALLARD.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I read this article, and it is a true story, is because many times we discount kids and we put them in slots and they never achieve what their potential is because we put them in slots. The teacher did not put this boy in the slot, and because of that he became a very outstanding doctor.

Mr. Speaker, what we need is well-trained, well-paid, dedicated teachers. That is what Government should push for, not Federal control. That will help, not hurt.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support of this rule. Goals 2000 is a very complicated bill, with some of the amendments being duplicative. When necessary, we attempted to combine them. This has allowed for various additions to be considered in the bill.

The Rules Committee did an excellent job to accommodate the views and opinions of most, and I think we need to show our full support of the ruling.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1420

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to House Resolution 274 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1804.

The Chair designates the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. CLAYTON] as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] to assume the chair temporarily.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1804) to improve learning and teaching by providing a national framework for education reform; to promote the research, consensus building, and systemic changes needed to ensure equitable educational opportunities and high levels of educational achievement for all American students; to provide a framework for reauthorization of all Federal education programs; to promote the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skill standards and certifications; and for other purposes, with Mr. DERRICK (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] will be recognized for 40 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] will be recognized for 40 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1804, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act.

Goals 2000 represents a major departure from the way that the Federal Government has assisted education in the past.

It is the first effort that seeks to use limited Federal funds as an incentive for public school districts to undertake systemic reform.

Historically, most education reform efforts have dealt with a single part of the system, such as improving testing, or have focused on special populations.

In contrast, Goals 2000 emphasizes systemwide reform because sustained improvements will not occur without coordinated changes in all parts of the education system.

As the National Governor's Association pointed out in their report "From Rhetoric to Action: State Progress in Restructuring Education":

> In the long run, even the most successful innovations will not influence the vast majority of schools and districts unless there has been a simultaneous transformation of the larger system.

Goals 2000 accomplishes its objectives through several steps.

First, it authorizes a process for building a national consensus for education improvement and for overseeing the development of voluntary national education content and student performance standards which describe what all students should know and be able to do; and I emphasize that these are voluntary standards.

It also calls for development of voluntary national opportunity-to-learn standards which describe the factors which must be in place in order for a student to have a reasonable chance of learning the material in the content standards.

We really, in a sense, want to know in some instances: Is it the student who is failing or perhaps is it the school that is failing?

These voluntary national standards would be available as guides that States may use in developing their own high standards for student achievement.

Second, the bill authorizes formula grants to States to assist State and local school districts in carrying out their own reform activities.

These State and local grants differ from most education grant programs currently on the books by focusing on achieving results with the expectation that rules and regulations will be relaxed. This is an area that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] pioneered many years ago, and

has convinced the majority of the committee that this is the right way to go. And I believe it will be helpful to State and local school districts.

The grants to States and local school districts will support a number of reform related activities including the development of State content, student performance, and opportunity-to-learn standards and new forms of assessment to measure student progress toward meeting the State-established standards.

States that wish to have the high quality of their new standards and assessments formally acknowledged may submit them to the National Education Standards and Improvement Council for certification.

I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that certification of State standards and assessments is totally voluntary.

States choosing to participate in Goals 2000 do not have to have their standards or assessments ceritfied.

In addition, participation in Goals 2000 is not a prerequisite for receipt of funds under any other Federal education act.

Goals 2000 is built on the idea that limited Federal dollars can be used to leverage change at the State and local level.

Equally important is the bill's premise that States and local schools must have maximum flexibility in determining how school reform should be carried out.

Goals 2000 contains a number of provisions to ensure that States and localities have broad flexibility in designing and implementing school improvement plans that best meet the needs of their students and communities.

While each improvement must address certain factors, the manner in which they are addressed is completely at the discretion of those developing the plan.

In a further acknowledgement of the importance of the local control and ownership if reform is to be sustained over time, Goals 2000 promotes broad public participation in the development and implementation of State and local improvement plans, including educators, parents, business, and other community representatives.

Additionally, a majority of the funds are driven to the local school districts and schools to support bottom-up reform that will complement State reform activities.

The substitute under consideration today also includes amendments of importance to the administration that are minor and clarifying in nature.

They include:

Clarifying that no State is required to have standards or assessments certified or to participate in title III of Goals 2000 as a condition of receiving Federal funding under any other Federal education act; and

Ensuring the bipartisan nature of the national education goals panel by clarifying that the secretary is to serve as a nonvoting ex officio member of the goals panel if not appointed directly by the President.

Mr. Chairman, goals 2000 is a moderate step to help States and local school districts help themselves by putting in place a general framework of Federal support to promote broad-based education reform to help all children.

The second step in the reform strategy—the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and its related programs—is currently underway in the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education.

Mr. Chairman, this reauthorization will give an added support to reform since the Federal Government now funds programs in nearly every school district in the country through these laws. That basic Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been in place since 1965. And all during that time we have carefully nurtured and carefully cared for the premise that education is primarily a local function, a State responsibility and a Federal concern. And we maintain that balance, local control and State control.

H.R. 1804 is similar in concept to legislation approved by this body twice in the last Congress, and I urge its passage.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WISE). The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin assumed the chair).

The Chair will receive a message.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

GOALS 2000: EDUCATION AMERICA ACT

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WISE). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

□ 1430

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

Mr. Chairman, I hope that everyone who may be listening to this discussion listens carefully because I am afraid an awful lot of people are talking about a bill that is not before us today. As most people know, when H.R. 1804 left committee, there was no Republican support for the bill. Almost all the problems that we found with the bill as it left the committee, I am happy to say, have been worked out between both sides of the aisle and the administration.

So I think it is important that I talk first about what is not in the bill.

What is not in the bill: No. 1, race norming is not in the bill. There were those who were concerned that some of the language in the original bill as it passed committee might have something to do with that issue. I would refer them to page 123 of the bill as it is before you. And the bill before you says, "consistent with Federal civil rights laws," nothing else.

The second area with which I had great concern was that perhaps we might be sending out unfunded mandates like we have never sent them before. We have sent an awful lot. Special education is a good example. I was concerned that we may be sending billions of dollars of unfunded mandates in Goals 2000 out to State and local governments and taking State and local government control from them.

So that was another reason why we did not find the bill acceptable when it left committee.

The amendment which I will offer, which I understand is accepted by both sides, says, "Nothing in H.R. 1804 can be interpreted to give the Federal Government control over State and local activities with regard to curriculum, instruction, and"—and this is an addition to current law—"allocation of State and local resources." This should put to rest the concern that we are going to dictate from the Federal level that somewhere, some way, the local and State Governments will find money for our dictates.

That has been eliminated from the bill with my amendment.

The next issue that I hear people talking about is family planning and reproductive health services. I want to read the language that is in the committee report so that we make it perfectly clear that that is not the intention of this legislation: "The committee wishes to emphasize that the language authorizing the coordination of health and social services with education is not"—and a repeat—"not intended to support projects or activities which provide family planning or reproductive health services."

Again I hope people will understand we are dealing with an entirely different piece of legislation than what was reported out of committee.

The next area that is discussed that is no longer in this legislation—and never was—deals with the whole idea of privacy and the whole idea of parental consent on testing.

You have to understand that there is a law called GEPA, and in GEPA the Buckley amendment handles the privacy issue and Buckley, as amended by Hatch, handles the parental consent in relation to psychological testing.

So we have satisfied, in my estimation, anybody's concern dealing with that issue.

Those are four areas that are no longer a part of the legislation, and I want my colleagues to understand that this is a different bill that is before us today. And those areas—race norming, unfunded mandates, Federal takeover of State and local control, family planning/reproductive health services, privacy, parental consent on testing—all have been taken care of adequately in the legislation.

Now let me talk a few minutes about what is in the bill.

The chairman has done a good job of that, so I will go over it very quickly. In title I we talk about the national education goals, and we put them into cement. This is something that has been going on for many years now, ever since the Charlottesville meeting between President Bush and the Governors. Six goals were set up. I do not think there is anyone in the United States who does not agree with those six goals.

My hope would be, when we are finished with the legislation, conference committee and so on, any additional goals will not be additional goals but will become a part of the six goals.

I say this simply because we now have the public concentrating on six goals and they all agree that they are the six goals we must reach. Let us keep it that way and feed into those six goals some concerns that other Members might have.

In title II, we have the National Education Goals Panel and the National Education Standards and Assessment Council, again all voluntary. I have been a part of the goals panel, along with Congressman KILDEE, since its inception. Everything is voluntary.

What we are trying to do is to say that if a school district, or if a State, wants to adopt goals that have been prepared by experts in the field, by parents, by educators, et cetera, they can do that. But they do not have to.

What we are trying to say is that if you as a parent want to know what it is a youngster should know in mathematics by the time they have completed third grade, we can tell you what they should know. We can also tell you whether they know it or not.

Another concern we had, as the bill was being passed out of committee, was that it might be moving toward a top-down rather than a bottom-up approach. That concern has been addressed. It is strictly a bottom-up effort now.

So we have taken care of that.

In title III we authorize grants that go out to the States and local governments. They do not have to accept them, do not have to apply for them. In fact, as I said, if my amendment is not accepted, I do not think that anybody would apply for funds. But, hopefully, that will change because those in most need should apply for some of those grants in order to improve their local districts.

Keep in mind that this improvement movement did not start here in Washington. The improvement movement has started with parents dealing with school boards dealing with State legislators, and those improvements are taking off all over the country.

So those grants are available.

I am not going to discuss title IV because I am sure Mr. GUNDERSON will. Title IV was added when the new Secretary of Labor came onboard. We can argue whether this bill is or is not the proper vehicle. At any rate, I think Congressman GUNDERSON is now satisfied that title IV is written in such a manner that it is not perfect by a long shot, but can be used as the base on which to build when we go to conference with the Senate.

So I will let him discuss that.

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

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

First of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] for his patience, his persistence, his expertise on this bill. There is no question that this bill is a better bill because of those virtues of Mr. GOODLING in insisting on certain things in the bill and convincing us that that would improve the bill.

As a matter of fact, I might add that in my 17 years that I have been in the Congress, all the successful education legislation, all of that which was introduced that has been passed into law, really has enjoyed strong bipartisan support. I think we can go back and record that very, very well.

When we came out here on the floor and did not have strong bipartisan support, somewhere along the line those bills generally died. Mr. GOODLING certainly has a great deal of input into this bill, and I certainly appreciate that, and I think the House should commend him for that.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3210, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act and to commend my full committee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] for their work in moving this proposal to the floor.

This legislation represents a long overdue commitment by the Federal Government to work in a responsive partnership with every person involved in the enterprise of educating children in this country.

For decades, education reform efforts, serious and well intentioned though they were, have not produced the results that we know are needed today. Our Nation's business community has been sounding alarms for years. International comparisons have put the achievement levels of American students in stark, global relief and I sometimes think they'll need a new wing at the Library of Congress to house all the studies on the condition of American education.

What has been missing is a comprehensive approach, involving all schools, all teachers, and all students. By endorsing this systemic approach to education reform we are stating clearly our belief that all children can meet high expectations and develop the knowledge, skills, and habits of mind that we once expected of only our top students. That is what this legislation offers—a strong framework, upon which real student achievement can be built.

The most important feature of the bill is its endorsement of voluntary national content standards in the core subjects. You will hear arguments today that this will lead to the adoption of a de facto national curriculum. This is simply false. These standards are strictly voluntary and will provide States and local communities models that they can adopt or adapt to meet their own educational needs as they define them. In others words, these voluntary national content standards do not in any way thwart local diversity or decisionmaking. The adoption of standards, will provide schools with an organizing tool, to target their finances, enrich their curriculum and improve their teacher training. For students the standards are a set of clear objectives for what they need to know, and be able to do.

I'd like to make another thing clear to my colleagues. With or without this legislation, the movement toward content standards will move forward. A growing number of schools have already adopted the comprehensive and innovative math curriculum which was designed over a 10-year period by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics [NCTM]. The new math standards have been enthusiastically embraced by teachers thirsty for ways to make the language of math exciting and relevant to their students.

This legislation can help do for science, history, English, and geography what the math teachers have been able to do for math. What we will be doing today is accelerating the process. We cannot afford to do less.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation. With the passage of this legislation we are setting a framework that will enable us to refashion the entire federally supported K–12 delivery system to improve

teaching and learning in all schools for all students.

□ 1440

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER].

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, this House is preparing to vote on a bill that will authorize $420 million, in fiscal year 1994 alone, for the business-as-usual agenda that has systematically eroded the quality of American education. Goals 2000 is a misnomer. This bill does very little to set goals for American education, and even less to make those goals achievable for States.

In reality, this bill creates new and more cumbersome layers of bureaucracy while simultaneously placing unfunded mandate on the States. The opportunity-to-learn standards require that States provide a successful learning environment for students, with no concern about the content of what they are being taught. If States fail to meet the standards, even for lack of funds, they will be penalized. I hope this has been taken care of.

Simply throwing more money at the problem is not the answer to our education woes. America spends more on education than any other country, yet American students have one of the lowest achievement ratings. Instead of spending the money on new and increased bureaucracy, we should be voting to allow for real school reform. Mr. Chairman, later in this debate we will have the opportunity to vote on the Armey substitute, of which I am a cosponsor. I would ask that my colleagues listen closely to the debate on that substitute which shuns the business-as-usual approach to education. Instead of throwing more money at the problem, it cuts to the chase of true reform.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and instead, vote in favor of true education reform contained in the Armey amendment.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY].

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] for their efforts and strong work on this bill.

I rise in support of the Goals 2000 legislation which is before us today. I am pleased that I am able to do so, because at different times during this process I was not sure that I was going to be able to offer support, but I believe the bill we have today is different than the bill that emerged from committee and is one that is closer to the one that was originally presented by President Clinton and Secretary Riley, both of whom had worked on this legislation in establishing these goals when they were respective Governors of their States.

This is a bipartisan bill. It is supported by Democrats and Republicans.

I would say to my colleagues most Americans today do not believe what happens here is relevant to the concerns that they have in their communities, especially as it relates to schools, because in reality most decisions regarding education are made at the local level; however, this goal, the goal established in this legislation I believe does affect education in the future and in a very positive way.

Mr. Chairman, this is a balanced bill. For the first time in educational history, the Federal Government will work with States to establish academic standards. Although they are voluntary, it is important that we finally have a national standard for elementary and high school pupils. There will be Federal grants to incentivize and spur systemic State education reform and upgrade teachers' training.

I believe that is to the betterment of education and I believe it should be supported.

I want to thank the committee, and I hope they will maintain their support throughout the conference, for an amendment that I offered which has been included in the en bloc package.

Most of us who are parents know that beyond having quality teachers, the most important ingredient in the education of our children is parental involvement. I believe we need to encourage parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional, and academic growth of our children.

I introduced an amendment that is supported by the National PTA which establishes as one of the national goals the improved participation and involvement of parents in education.

The objectives of this goal are very straightforward. The States would work to develop partnerships to establish programs for increasing involvement of parents in the home, including parents of children who are disadvantaged, bilingual and disabled. In addition, every school would actively engage parents and families in a partnership which supports the academic work of children at home and shared educational decisionmaking at school.

Finally, all this is a contract, because we need individual parental responsibility for it to work. Every home should be responsible for creating an environment of respect for education and providing the physical and emotional support needed for learning.

Mr. Chairman, too much of the requirement of socializing and educating children has been placed upon the schools. In the final analysis, it is our requirement, it is our responsibility as parents to provide an environment which promotes their education and their improvement.

As I stated earlier, many people wonder why the Federal Government should be involved. Quite frankly, education today is a global issue. If we want to compete in a global economy, we need the finest educated and skilled workers in America and in the world.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, Ms. Pat Henry, immediate past president of the National Parent-Teacher Association and my constituent from Lawton, OK, has worked tirelessly during her administration to raise awareness nationwide of the need for greater parental and family participation in education. This amendment is also supported by numerous advocacy groups for public education such as the NAACP, the National Council of Jewish Women, the American Association of School Administrators, Parents for Public Schools, and the National Coalition of Title I/Chapter I Parents.

I want to thank Ms. Henry and all those who have worked so hard to improve this bill. I urge my colleagues to support final passage.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I would like to especially thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY] for his involvement in this legislation. While not a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, he has worked very closely with us and we certainly appreciate his deep concern for education and his input on this bill.

□ 1450

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] who has also worked long and hard to bring a bipartisan effort on this piece of legislation.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to read from a printed document.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Madam Chairman, let me say a special thanks to our leadership on both sides, and, I think, a special thanks to Secretary Riley and his staff. It is a minor miracle, my colleagues, that we are here at all with this legislation. This has not been an easy process.

It was actually 4 years ago this month, in October 1989, that then-President Bush got together with then-Governor Clinton and the other Governors of this Nation to put together and establish the educational goals to lead this country into the kind of preparation for a competitive global economy that we would see in the 21st century. This legislation is absolutely essential to enable States and local educational agencies, better known as school districts, to implement those Educational 2000 goals.

Madam Chairman, it is incumbent upon us in this body to understand, while we are committed, and I am deeply committed, to local control of education, that we recognize that the buzz word of the 1990's and the 21st century is mobility. It is mobility in the work force, and, because of that, mobility of families, and, because of that, mobility of students. Whereas we do not want a Federal education system, we do want, I think, some attempt at voluntary guidelines from State to State, from local school to local school, to allow them as we move our families and our children from one district to another, to have some sense of security and knowledge that they are going to be at a similar level of educational opportunities in that new school district. That is what H.R. 3210 before us is all about.

It is important to understand, Madam Chairman, that this is not a bill that spends a lot of money on education. Frankly, the new money in education has been something we have done over the last few years. Frankly, we have had a 55-percent increase in chapter 1. We have had a 40-percent increase in special education, a 133-percent increase in math and science, and a 127-percent increase in Head Start since 1989. This bill only provides an authorization that we can set up the structure to move beyond that and work in this area of development of the voluntary, and I emphasize voluntary, national consent student performance and, included not, some opportunity-to-learn standards.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] indicated in his opening statement, the opportunity-to-learn standards were a very crucial and controversial element of the bill during consideration in committee, and I want to say to my Republican colleagues, and I want to say to my moderate and conservative Democrat colleagues, this is not the bill that was approved by the Committee on Education and Labor on a very partisan vote. This is not that bill today. It is important to understand that because, if it were, I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and I and many others from the committee on the Republican side would be down here opposing that bill, unfortunately perhaps, but we would be opposing that bill because of our concerns of a federally regulated education system that we were trying to prevent.

In my ongoing discussions with the Department of Education and the Secretary in this regard, Madam Chairman, I want to read to Members and inset into the RECORD a letter, and I want to read paragraph 3 of a letter I received from the Secretary earlier today referring to this section 306(k)(2) which is the opportunity-to-learn standards. Secretary Riley says:

In other words, The State would be accountable for putting into place a set of actions that are reasonably designed to lead schools and districts to meet the content and opportunity-to-learn standards. It would not, however, compel school districts or schools to meet the standards, nor hold States accountable for the ultimate success of school districts or schools in this regard.

That, I believe, is the necessary language, along with the Goodling amendment, to ensure that, while we encourage, we do not mandate and we do not condition all other Federal education programs on a continuing mandate in this area.

Now, Madam Chairman, let me quickly shift to title IV of this legislation because while it is not directly related to Goals 2000 and education reform, it is just as important. It is as important because it deals with the development of national occupational skills standards in this country, which both parties recognize is absolutely essential if we are going to have any kind of school-to-work transition or other work force preparation programs for that 75 percent of our young people who never graduate from college. During the committee's consideration of title IV, I must tell my colleagues, we made many positive changes and put together provisions which I generally support very, very much. I think it is well constructed.

I think it is important, however, to understand that the development of such a system of skill standards will be worthless unless we are able to develop a system that is well constructed, voluntary, and industry led. We were able to better define the role of the National Board in the development and subsequent endorsement of the standards. We made clear that the actual development of the standards is going to be undertaken voluntarily by partnerships of business, employees, and educators developing those skills standards for each particular occupation on occupational cluster where possible from the bottom up. And, as I said before, we clarified that this is a voluntary process.

The one weakness that remains in the bill, that will not be corrected today, is the concern that there still is not a clear leadership role for business and industry in the development of standards, but I understand and hope that negotiations with the Senate will address this concern. That is why we are not offering an amendment dealing with the issue of business leadership today.

There will, however, be an amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] that I will support that deals with the development of skill standards for occupations with existing apprenticeship standards. During committee consideration of the Goals 2000 bill, there were no less than 258 trades and occupations covered by apprenticeship programs that were exempted from the development of these standards. Very frankly, we cannot have a national voluntary skill standards system that is consistent in this country and still exempt 258 occupations. I am delighted that we have worked out an amendment that will allow for standards to be developed for all occupations and occupational clusters, with the assurance that the standards meet or exceed the highest standards in this country and in the world.

I would simply like to conclude my remarks by encouraging my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to simply recognize and remember what I said earlier. I have in front of me a basic summary of the bill that is before us. There are seven major changes, and I say major changes, that have been made to this bill since it came out of the House Committee on Education and Labor. I think those changes are in the best tradition of bipartisan governing. I think those changes are essential to making this bill the kind of foundation for improvement of education at the State and local level that we want, and, as a result of those changes, I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this bill when we come to final passage.

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

Madam Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON]. I know he was very pained when a bill emerged from committee that he could not in good faith support, but that did not deter him from working very hard with myself and with Secretary Riley on perfecting the bill, and he certainly has added a great deal of those things that he felt very strongly about and has made this a better bill. Madam Chairman, I thank him very much for his work.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of Goals 2000, Education America Act, because after more than a decade of debate on education reform, Goals 2000 will provide a national framework to support education reform for States and local school districts. Madam Chairman, while our children are growing up in a world that is profoundly changed from the one their parents knew, our education and social institutions have been unable to meet the changing and challenging needs of children, their parents, and their teachers. Goals 2000 assists schools to develop challenging curriculum and provides the incentive to find ways to make sure that all students can learn at the highest level.

Madam Chairman, I am particularly proud that Goals 2000 includes plans for coordinated services as a way to ensure that all children come to school ready to learn. As we look for the best ways to educate a child, we must be thinking of the whole child. This means not only

having high education goals and well-trained teachers, but also necessary and appropriate services so that students can learn.

Madam Chairman, Goals 2000 brings together educators, parents, and communities to give all of our students the opportunity to learn the fundamental skills and knowledge they need to be productive and responsible adults.

A vote for Goals 2000 is an important investment in America's future. It's about time Madam Chairman.

□ 1500

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE], the newest member of our committee, and a former Governor of Delaware.

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation Goals 2000. I would, as the newest member, a very new member, as a matter of fact, for about 10 days now, of the Committee on Education and Labor, would also like to add my congratulations to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] for the extraordinary job which they have done on what was perceived to be a contentious piece of legislation. But by listening to one another and other Members, they apparently have put together legislation which hopefully will be broadly supported by all Members in this Chamber.

Madam Chairman, in 1989 I was involved in setting the original goals, with the other Governors and President Bush, in Charlottesville, VA, an exercise that I would trade with none other I have ever had in public life.

We put together a Delaware 2000 program in the State of Delaware mirroring what was done in those goals. We hired Dr. Pat Forgione to be our superintendent in Delaware. He had been head of the education goals panel for a year when we hired him. And I have had the opportunity to visit every single school in the State of Delaware during the time that I was Governor of the State.

From this I have learned simple lessons that other people probably have known for some time. Obviously one is, that I have heard on this floor already today, is that education is and should be a bottom-up process. It starts with the families and the informal aspects of education. It goes into the local schools at the elementary level, and up through the schools, to the local school districts, to the States, and finally to the Federal Government, which indeed does have a role.

But the Federal Government role, although it should not be, in my view, the major role in education, can be a very important role, because it does have a national impact. I believe the role of the Federal Government should be to set voluntary goals and measure progress towards achieving these goals. However, we must give the States and the local school districts the flexibility and creativity to take some risks in setting learning standards and developing innovative programs to meet these standards.

As Delaware's school superintendent said so concisely, if schools are fearful of audits, you will get mediocrity.

This bill sets goals, provides some means to help achieve them, and allows the local schools to construct programs to make it happen.

Madam Chairman, this is as it should be, and I encourage support for the bill.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN].

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1804, Goals 2000: the Educate America Act. By passing this legislation we will finally put in place a national education strategy with clearly defined goals and funds for true education reform.

This bill will set the stage for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act next year which will mean that the bottom-up reforms contained within this bill will help revolutionize the way the Federal Government provides for the education of our Nation's children.

The members of the House Education and Labor Committee have worked closely with the Department of Education to address concerns that have been raised about this bill. Contrary to what you may have heard, no State will have to comply with a laundry list of requirements in order to participate in this program.

Any of you who have ever felt frustrated with our ability to inspire education reform have an opportunity here today to move us in the right direction by voting for this bill. This bill will inspire true reform because it is designed to reach the classroom level. Every time a teacher tries a new approach to reach a student, that is true education reform. This bill will allow teachers and schools to have the freedom to try new approaches without drowning in paperwork.

Madam Chairman, I have an excellent example in my own district. Travis Elementary School in the Houston Independent School District has parents seeking admission for their children. The teachers have the freedom currently to be able to try different methods to educate these elementary schoolchildren, and it is working. It is working today in Houston, and will work today all across the country, if we just let the teachers teach.

Goals 2000 is by no means business as usual. The goals in this bill are amitious and it will be an extreme challenge to meet them. However, we have come to realize that all students can achieve high standards if they are provided the means to do so. This bill is a good first step in providing those means and I urge my fellow Members to support passage of H.R. 1804.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Chairman, I too rise in support of Goals 2000, the Educate America Act. Before I do that, I want to make sure I acknowledge the efforts of my chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], and also the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], for their great efforts to make sure that this is a bipartisan effort to make sure that Congress and the administration are doing their job to educate America's children.

Madam Chairman, this week, the House of Representatives will have the opportunity to take an important step toward revitalizing America's schools and challenging all children—including the poor, disadvantaged, and limited-English proficient—to succeed in education.

For too long, many of our public schools have taught our most at-risk students only the bare minimum. This focus on basic skills has driven classroom curriculum to the lowest common denominator. Archaic multiple choice tests have branded children as failures instead of serving as appropriate tools to measure success. Teachers have given up fighting the bureaucratic redtape. School violence, dropout, and illiteracy statistics grow at an alarming rate.

How do we battle this disturbing trend in our young people? What can we do to assure that America will remain competitive beyond the year 2000? How do we turn this lost generation around? We can solve these problems by giving our children the opportunity to meet the challenging high educational standards we know their young, inquisitive minds can achieve. We must demand high standards from all our children, but especially the poor, disadvantaged, and limited-English proficient.

H.R. 1804, the Goals 2000, Educate America Act, will make reform of the education system a national priority.

Through providing States the tools they need to advance their own school reform initiatives, we will bring focus back to the fragmented and categoricalized American public education system.

By encouraging States to voluntarily adopt challenging curriculum and high standards, all children will be given the chance to move beyond basic skills to higher order learning—from addition and subtraction to calculus and physics.

Through encouraging schools to meet the challenge of providing the tools—the opportunity to learn—that all children need to succeed, Goals 2000 will

give America's children a chance to measure up to tough performance standards.

No longer will children be held to lower standards just because they come from diverse backgrounds, have complicated problems or need a little extra help. This national school reform initiative will give every child a chance. Whether they are native American children in a Bureau of Indian Affairs school in the rural areas of Arizona or inner-city youth in a chapter 1 program in Los Angeles, Goals 2000 leaves no one behind; it treats no one separately and all are equal.

A vote in favor of H.R. 1804, the Goals 2000, Educate America Act, will show that we in Congress believe school reform should be a national priority. It will show that you too believe that all children can and will succeed if given a chance to meet the challenge.

Madam Chairman, I urge all Members to consider this bill not as something that will tax our local schools, but as something that we are doing to voluntarily help the local governments do the best job they can in educating our children. I urge an aye vote on this measure.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK].

Mr. KLINK. Madam Chairman, I also add my congratulations to that of the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] and others who have congratulated the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] on his fine work on the bill, and also the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Madam Chairman, as a cosponsor of this legislation, I rise in strong support of the Goals 2000, Educate America Act.

This legislation will help make the United States competitive in the global economy of today and into the 21st century. Goals 2000 will encourage and support States and local communities to reinvent our education system so that all American students can achieve internationally competitive standards.

The bill establishes national education goals for the United States to achieve by the year 2000. These goals will be the first step toward increased economic competitiveness.

All our children starting school will be ready to learn. Our high schools will graduate at least 90 percent of their students, and those students will have command of the basic subjects.

Teachers will be well trained and have continued development opportunities. In math and science American students will be first in the world.

Every adult will be literate and able to compete. Finally, our schools will be safe, disciplined and drug-free.

The bill establishes a national education goals panel to monitor progress toward the goals and review and approve voluntary national content and student performance standards. It establishes a National Education Standards and Improvement Council to help develop and certify voluntary national standards as well as the same standards submitted by states.

The Educate America Act provides for grants to State and local education agencies to develop new assessment systems, State improvement plans, and the implementation of school reforms.

In addition, the bill provides for a National Skills Standards Board to serve as a catalyst for developing a national system of voluntary occupational standards and certification. The skills standards section of Goals 2000 will provide a benchmark for workers and give them the portable skills and credentials that are critical in our economy.

Finally, the committee has worked out amendments to modify the impact of the bill's opportunity to learn standards in response to the concerns expressed by the States.

The amendments clarify that no State would be required to have any standards or assessments certified or to participate in the bill's school reform program in order to receive funding under any other education program.

I have received a letter from Pennsylvania Secretary of Education Donald Carroll, which says that these changes address his concerns.

Madam Chairman, this legislation, when combined with the School-to-Work Transition Act that the committee is currently working on, will help make the United States economically competitive into the next century. I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 1510

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Chairman, Marian Wright Edelman, in her new book, said that "It takes an entire village to educate a child."

Madam Chairman, our Nation's education bills have been neglected for far too long and our Nation's children are now faced with past due notices. We have left many of our children far too ill-equipped to pay these long overdue obligations.

Many of our schools still use the same methods and lessons that I was taught nearly 20 years ago. And those schools that have developed challenging and innovative programs to teach students the subjects and knowledge they need to know in order to excel in our increasingly global and high-technology world have done so with little encouragement, or assistance, from the Federal Government.

This bill changes all of that.

With Goals 2000 we have a real opportunity to dramatically reform our schools by establishing high academic and occupational standards, and providing support to States and communities to help them reach these standards.

Education reform is not a new endeavor for States. Many States are well on their way to formulating State education improvement programs. What's new is that the Federal Government is going to provide the support staff to assist States to make sure their reform endeavors succeed.

Under H.R. 1804, voluntary national standards would be developed and made available to States to be used as models in developing or modifying their academic standards. The bill also provides Federal funds in the way of grants to States to assist them develop and implement the improvement plans many of them are undertaking right now.

Recognizing the unique successes that local reform initiatives have shown, a portion of these Federal funds would be directed to local school districts to encourage local participation in the school reform efforts.

Most importantly, Goals 2000 emphasizes teacher training and encourages—through Federal grant programs—ongoing professional development to better enable our educators to teach challenging, and certainly ever-changing, curriculum, and to meet the new professional development goal that was added to the bill during committee consideration.

Contrary to what you will hear on the floor today, this bill makes a positive difference to our Nation's children. To oppose this bill is to assert that State and localities can go it alone when they wish to improve education. When I visit schools where clean walls and complete textbooks are hard to come by, there is no question that the Federal Government must do better if States and localities are to succeed in teaching our children the know-how to pay off the debt we have left them.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Arizona [Ms. ENGLISH].

Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me and for his leadership on the issue of school reform. I rise today to let my colleagues know that I support Goals 2000 because the result will be high standards and opportunity for all children.

Today, we have the opportunity to take an important step toward revitalizing America's schools and challenging all children—including the poor, disadvantaged, and limited-English proficient—to succeed in education.

For too long, many of our public schools have taught our most at-risk students only the bare minimum. This focus on basic skills has driven classroom curriculum to the lowest common denominator. School violence,

dropout, and illiteracy statistics grow at an alarming rate.

How do we battle this disturbing trend in our young people? What can we do to assure that America will remain competitive beyond the year 2000?

How do we turn this lost generation around?

We can solve all these problems by giving our children the opportunity to meet the challenging high educational standards we know their young, inquisitive minds can achieve.

We must demand high standards from all our children, but especially the poor, disadvantaged and limited-English proficient. H.R. 1804, the Goals 2000, Educate America Act, will make reform of the education system a national priority.

Through providing States the tools they need to advance their own school reform initiatives, we will bring focus back to the fragmented and categoricalized American public education system.

By encouraging States to voluntarily adopt challenging curriculum and high standards, all children will be given the chance to move beyond basic skills to higher order learning—from addition and subtraction to calculus and physics.

Through encouraging schools to meet the challenge of providing the tools—the opportunity to learn—that all children need to succeed, Goals 2000 will give America's children a chance to measure up to tough performance standards.

No longer will children be held to lower standards just because they come from diverse backgrounds, have complicated problems or need a little extra help.

This national school reform initiative will give every child a chance.

Whether they are native American children in a Bureau of Indian Affairs school in the rural areas of Arizona or innercity youth in a chapter 1 program in Los Angeles, Goals 2000 leaves no one behind; it treats no one separately and all are equal.

A vote in favor of the H.R. 1804, the Goals 2000, Educate America Act, will show that you too believe a school reform should be a national priority. It will show that you too believe that all children can and will succeed if given a chance to meet the challenge.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1804.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Chairman, I am pleased with one thing that evidently is going to be done in this bill. It is the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] on the mandates.

I think that is extremely important, because this bill has the potential of creating a nightmare of mandated, unfunded kind of requirements on local districts.

I still worry about this, because of our experience when we put a similar kind of amendment in the national service bill. And it went out of the House of Representatives with an agreement with the other side that we would have that in the bill. Yet, when it came time for the conference committee, that was immediately stripped out without any regard to the will of the House and without any defense of it before the Senate.

It seems to me that when Members go as our conferees, they have a responsibility. If they have a sense of integrity about their responsibility, they need to go and fight for the will of the House, even if we have to give up and compromise on some of these things. So watch that as we go to conference committee.

But I think it is very important, because I think many school districts will not participate in this bill, in this Education 2000. I am afraid that what is going to happen is that we are going to say, they did not participate, but we know best and so no longer is it going to be voluntary. It is going to be mandatory. Now we are going to make them do it.

So I think that concept of no unfunded mandated requirements stay in there.

I am disappointed in the way choice has been handled in this bill. In the original Education 2000, choice was a very prominent part of that whole bill. As I understand it, this bill has some elements of choice within the public school sector. But no private or parochial choice, that they were not saying that part of reform should be to let the American people, the American parent decide where is best for their child to go to school, as Bill and Hillary Clinton did. Wealthy parents have the opportunity of making those kinds of choices, but poor and middle class parents, most of the time, do not. Yet, we have buckled under to the NEA, I believe, in this bill and said, "If you don't like that idea, we simply won't push that as public policy."

One of the arguments is, that is public money. Nonsense. There is no such thing as public money. That is people's money that we are taking from them, and we ought to give them a choice of how that is spent.

Then we talk about reform. I truly hope that this is a reform bill. I have some question about it, however, as to how much reform is actually here. It appears to me that we set up a Federal bureaucracy to establish goals and targets and guidance and help for the public school districts to set these standards. And it seems to me what we are saying to our local school districts and to our States is that, yes, "You don't know how to do it and we are from the Federal Government, and we are here to help you."

Once again, we know what is best.

□ 1520

Again, we are not going to mandate it, but we are going to suggest it. Once again, we may decide we need to mandate it. I think we need to be very careful about that.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1804, the Goals 2000, Educate America Act. This bill codifies the national education goals and takes the first step toward making them a reality. These goals are vitally important to our children's future, and our Nation's future.

Last winter I held 20 town meetings to discuss the goals, and education reform as a whole. I asked participants at my town meetings to rank the importance of each goal. Goal No. 7, to rid every school of violence and drugs and provide a disciplined environment for learning, was ranked highest even in rural parts of my district.

It was sad to hear such strong concerns about violence and easy access to drugs in schools throughout my district. North Adams—developing a program for violence prevention. Holyoke—with a system of ID cards to keep drug dealers and other unwanted visitors out of the schools. Fitchburg—incorporating violence prevention in its curriculum. But a safer school environment will let us focus on learning and teaching and improved curricula, and creative thinking.

These education goals set benchmarks. But we must recognize that it will be an empty exercise unless we commit dollars along with our creativity and determination. I urge passage of this bill as the first step in giving our students the high-caliber schools they deserve.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1804, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1993.

President Clinton, Secretary of Education Riley, and Secretary of Labor Reich have proposed this legislation, which would make the Federal Government a partner in reforming education and help develop occupational skill standards.

Goals 2000 builds on the work of the last few years to develop voluntary national academic standards, and it encourages the development of voluntary national opportunity-to-learn standards. These standards will be models for the States and local school districts, but will not in any way be imposed on them.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 17) 14

Under H.R. 1804, the Federal Government would provide States and school districts with funds to assist them in establishing their own high academic and performance standards that all children should achieve. In addition, States would establish their own opportunity-to-learn standards, outlining what factors need to be present in a school to enable students to achieve the State's academic standards. States also would develop assessments of student progress toward achieving the State standards. States may use the model national standards or develop their own.

Most of the $427 million authorization provided by the bill would be allotted to States and school districts to carry out these activities. Over the life of the bill, nearly all of the funds would have to be used to improve individual schools.

The Secretary of Education would be authorized to waive Federal statutory and regulatory requirements that States and school districts identify as impeding reform. In exchange for this increased flexibility, States and school districts must demonstrate improved student achievement.

H.R. 1804 would codify the six national education goals, establish the national education goals panel, and create a new National Education Standards and Improvement Council to certify State standards and assessments.

In the labor arena, Goals 2000 would create a National Skill Standards Board to bring together representatives of business, labor, education, and other stakeholders to stimulate the development and adoption of voluntary national skill standards. Those standards could be used by industry, employers, labor organizations, and workers to increase productivity, economic growth, and American economic competitiveness.

President Clinton and Secretary Riley believe that this legislation bill is necessary to establish the framework for the reauthorization of our other education laws. Our work on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is well under way in the Committee on Education and Labor. Passage of this legislation will help us make programs such as chapter 1 even more successful.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1993.

Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Madam Chairman, I wonder if I could get the gentleman to respond to a concern that I have on page 50 in the Education and Labor Committee report language, which appears to place certain unequivocal mandates on the board concerning evaluations of assessments or assessment systems. It seems to be a bit of a straitjacket.

I would ask the gentleman, could we agree that this language allows the Board to exercise discretion in determining how and on what basis assessment procedures or systems should be evaluated? I am talking about the last sentence on page 50.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I would answer the gentleman yes. Of course, that discretion would have to be exercised, however, in a manner consistent with Federal civil rights laws, as the bill provides elsewhere.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for his understanding.

Madam Chairman, I would inquire how much time we have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN (Mrs. CLAYTON). The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has 18 minutes remaining. The gentleman has not used all his time. The Chair would advise the gentleman that he does not have to use it.

Mr. GOODLING. I am well aware of that, Madam Chairman.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1804, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, and urge my colleagues to support this important legislation and oppose any weakening amendment.

Madam Chairman, I want to, at the outset, commend the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], and also Education Secretary Riley, for working so closely with our Committee on Education and Labor in crafting this very important piece of legislation.

Madam Chairman, according to a GAO report which was released on May 4, 1993, many of our schools have made little progress in education reform over the past decade. Twenty years of data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress have shown that our present education performance is low and not improving very much. As a former teacher and guidance counselor in the New York City public school system, and the father of two, and soon to be three, children, I have seen first hand how our Nation is failing to meet the needs of our children. Erratic leadership efforts, diminishing financial resources, inadequate coordination efforts, and insufficient information sources have resulted in sporadic and somewhat isolated educational improvements. It is time to take a comrehensive approach, which is what this legislation does. We can no longer continue business as usual.

H.R. 1804 is a comprehensive plan to provide a national framework for educational reform. The legislation is designed to promote research, consensus building, and systemic changes which are needed to ensure equitable educational opportunities and high levels of achievement for all American students. H.R. 1804 will encourage locally-based reform efforts and increase flexibility, while holding States and localities accountable for their actions.

Certainly, high standards for all children, professional development, parental and community involvement, and expanded flexibility based on increased accountability are appropriate and necessary reform components upon which to build. Therefore, I encourage my colleagues to support the Goals 2000: Educate America Act.

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

Madam Chairman, I take this time, hoping there may be some others that may be watching back in their offices at this particular time that may not have heard me indicate what is not in this bill. I think it is extremely important, for members to have this information because this is a totally different bill than when it left committee, and when it left committee it had no Republican support.

Madam Chairman, what is not in this bill: race-norming is not in the bill. I would suggest that my colleagues look at page 123 of House Resolution 3210 to see that for themselves what is in the present legislation, not what may have come from committee. In the form of House Resolution 1804.

With my amendment, and I guess at this point, Madam Chairman, I might ask a question of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KILDEE].

Since the gentleman just heard the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLIN] say he saw this trick played before where we accepted something here and then went to conference with the idea that it was not going to remain in, in conference. I guess my question to the gentleman would be, will the gentleman and the chairman support me in the conference committee when it comes to my amendment in relationship to this legislation?

□ 1530

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Chairman, the gentleman has been to many conferences with me over the last 20 years, and he knows the way I operate in conference better than anybody else. And I have never been shy about protecting the House position on anything. Our track record indicates the last time we made a cumulative score that we get seven rescissions from the Senate for every one that we give. That is no guarantee that this will not be the one, but at a ratio of 7

to 1 by which we sustain the House position on these, and particularly when it is a member of our committee that presents the amendment, I can assure the gentleman that I will do everything I can to uphold the gentleman's position, should it be adopted here today.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the chairman for that assurance.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, if I may add to that, I also would join not only in defending it procedurally, but defending it philosophically.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the subcommittee chairman also.

Again, race norming is not part of this bill. Page 123 will tell Members that. Unfunded mandates and Federal takeover in State and local school systems will not happen as a result of this legislation with my amendment. Family planning and reproductive health services are not a part of this legislation. There is report language which spells this out. The Buckley amendment in the General Education Provisions Act [GEPA] with the Hatch amendment to the Buckley amendment in GEPA protect the privacy of student records and also protects parental consent in relationship to psychological testing, et cetera.

Again I just want to remind my colleagues that even though we were united in opposition to the bill that left committee, many of us now support the bill as it has been dramatically improved since that time. I want to say that I give an A to Chairman FORD and an A to Chairman KILDEE for helping to make this a bipartisan bill. I give an A-plus to Secretary Riley for his efforts, and an A-plus to the staffs on both sides. I am always fearful that I will forget one name, so I will not name them all. All those who are now beaming are those to whom I am referring.

Between the time this bill left committee and came to the floor of the House, it became a truly great effort of cooperation and togetherness and bipartisanship.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, this has truly been a bipartisan bill. It has not been a short road; it has been a long road, but a very productive road. And I think between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and myself, we have described what is in the bill and what is not in the bill.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1804, Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the bill that will make the difference in the future of American education. With its emphasis on results and flexibility, instead of processes and procedures, H.R. 1804 represents a major change in our approach towards educating our children.

This bill gives us the framework we need for the educational reform that is so long overdue in this country. It takes the seven National Education Goals for the year 2000 that the President and Governors agreed to back in 1990, expands upon them, and establishes them in law. These goals include having every child start school ready to learn; increasing our high school graduation rate to at least 90 percent; ensuring that all of our children leave grades 4, 8, and 12 with demonstrated competency in challenging subjects, such as mathematics, science, and foreign languages; ensuring that teachers have access to the programs they need for their continued professional development; making our students the first in the world in mathematics and science; and making every one of our schools drug- and violence-free.

H.R. 1804 also sets national education standards for the knowledge and skills that students should have—what they should actually be able to do—in order to demonstrate their proficiency, and for evaluating the resources that our educational system needs in order to guarantee that all of our students have the opportunity to learn what they need to.

H.R. 1804 additionally provides States and local school districts with grants so that they can restructure and improve their systems to better educate their students. And, to be sure that school districts get their fair share of the resources that are available, during the first year that this bill is law, if funding permits, 75 percent of any State's allotment must go to its school districts. In succeeding years, at least 90 percent of a State's funding under H.R 1804 must flow to its districts.

So that States and local governments do not get bogged down in redtape, they may apply for waivers from Federal laws and regulations. And, lastly, H.R. 1804 involves one of the most important elements in a child's education—his or her parents—by funding grants that support training and providing information to parents and others in order to promote more effective working relationships between educators and parents in meeting the educational needs of their children.

America's economic health depends on our ability to adequately educate our children, and we have always relied on our public education system to prepare them for the future. If we are to continue to place that kind of trust in the system—as we should—we cannot shirk our responsibility to support it with the resources that it takes to do the job. H.R. 1804 is the first step we need to take if we are to change the face of the American education system. I therefore urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support giving our educational system the stimulus it needs for the changes that must be made if we are to improve the quality of education for all American students.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 1804. I had the privilege of serving as a member of the blue ribbon commission that first focused on the important idea embodied in this bill: that the majority of workers and students who are not college-bound are, by and large, those on whom our productivity rises and falls.

The National Skills Standards Board included in H.R. 1804 is a crucial addition because it insures that structural inequalities, including those that flow from factors such as race and sex, do not sabotage the plan. By the year 2000, 29 percent of all new workers will be people of color and 66 percent of them will be women. It would be counterproductive to adopt skills standards that thoughtlessly and unfairly treat workers who traditionally have been victims of employment discrimination and the much larger number who bring various disadvantages with them when they come to school.

We must not avoid the demonstrable need to move to national standards to ensure that workers are equipped with the cognitive skills necessary to compete today in a work place that encompasses the entire world. The Goals 2000 approach comes late, but hopefully not too late to do what the many piecemeal attempts have failed to do—set national standards and then take the necessary step to help ensure that children and workers reach them, regardless of their background and without discrimination.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1804, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. I commend President Clinton for developing this visionary education measure. I also commend Chairman FORD and Chairman KILDEE for their work in advancing H.R. 1804 through Congress.

I support H.R. 1804 because it makes school reform a national priority. H.R. 1804 authorizes funds for States and local school districts to create or continue systemic education reforms. The purposes of Goals 2000 are clear—to fundamentally improve teaching and learning in our public schools. H.R. 1804 would codify the National Education Goals which were adopted 4 years ago by the country's Governors. It would increase our expectations of students and teachers alike. Goals 2000 would establish high standards for students, equip teachers with new training opportunities, and make schools safe and drug free.

A significant feature of Goals 2000 is that it recognizes the need for and the benefit of a bottom-up approach to reform. National education reform of this magnitude must include the experiences, the input, and the participation of parents, localities, and States. Many school districts and States have already begun to reform their education systems. Goals 2000 makes the Federal Government a partner with parents, communities, and individual schools in that effort.

The objectives of H.R. 1804 are ambitious and important: By the year 2000, the high school graduation rate should increase to at least 90 percent, American students should be the first in the world in science and math, and every American adult should enjoy functional literacy. I agree with the administration that we must set these goals and we must back up these goals with the support necessary to realize them. These objectives are achievable with the cooperation of communities, businesses, and governments at the local, State, and national levels. I am pleased to serve on the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which will fund these important initiatives.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me today in support of H.R. 1804 and in

support of improving the education of our Nation's children.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, in preparing for the debate on education reform, I wanted to hear from the people on the front lines of education. In August, I sent out a questionnaire to teachers and other educational professionals in my district. I received 760 responses to the questionnaire which asked about both the Goals 2000 legislation and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The results of the questionnaire will be helpful to Members of Congress as we consider the future of education in this country. I would like to submit the results into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and quickly share some of the highlights with my colleagues.

The overriding theme of the responses was that education professionals are committed to education reform. They clearly want to be part of the solution, not part of the problem. It is obvious to me that the people involved in education in the Milwaukee area care deeply about children and the future of American education.

Regarding the Goals 2000 legislation, 80 percent of those surveyed believe the Federal Government should adopt national education goals.

Sixty-two percent agreed with the premise behind the Goals 2000 legislation that by developing more challenging expectations, we will see an overall increase in student achievement.

Sixty-eight percent said they would be willing or very willing to promote and support Goals 2000 and related programs. Less than 1 percent said they were opposed or strongly opposed to promoting and supporting the programs.

Many respondents stressed the need for greater parental involvement in education and expressed their hope that more people would support, value, and respect teachers.

The results of my education questionnaire show that we have a real opportunity to work with education professionals to enact education reforms. I hope that my colleagues will be listening to the concerns of educators so that we can create the best educational system in the world.

Mr. CRANE. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1804, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. While there is need for improvement of the education system in America, I deeply resent yet another attempt by the Federal Government to dictate to parents and local school boards the methods for that reform. Despite the thoughts of the so-called experts residing within the beltway, I maintain that no one is better qualified to decide how best to educate a child than a parent. The proponents of Goals 2000 emphasize debunked arguments which mandate spending as a panacea for both poor test performance among students as well as for all other education woes. I submit that before true education reform takes place, parents, not politicians must provide the impetus for that reform.

As introduced, H.R. 1804 will not allow parents to make the key decisions which affect their children's education. Standards by which children will be measured are determined at the national level and while compliance with these standards is voluntary, compliance is mandatory to open the spigot, allowing the flood of Federal funds to flow to the local districts. Furthermore, although this legislation does allow for a diluted form of school choice, the program expressly prohibits Federal funds to be used for private, home, and Christian schools.

In practice, Goals 2000 has the potential to become a vehicle by which liberals will impose their enlightened wisdom upon impressionable youth. Out of this wisdom comes inept programs such as outcome-based education where children are forced into the indoctrination of politically correct ideas and where the students' beliefs and behavior are considered superior to their knowledge of facts. In addition, while school boards are indispensable at the local level, a national school board, as called for in H.R. 1804, adds nothing but another layer of bureaucracy to the already overburdened American school system.

Madam Chairman, our constituents sent us to Washington to protect their interests. Unless we allow the parents to make the critical decisions in education reform, we are violating that trust. We do not need more Federal involvement in education. We need local/parental control and school choice if we are to improve the education our children receive. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 1804.

Mr. BONILLA. Madam Chairman, I am a father of two children, one in the second grade and another about to begin school, so I am deeply concerned about this bill. I strongly support the Armey substitute because it gives choice to parents, not a National School Board in Washington. As contained in H.R. 1804, the National School Board will have 20 members, all hand-picked by the very education establishment that is failing our children.

The Armey substitute would place decision-making at the State and local level. The Armey substitute builds on 4 years' worth of bipartisan teamwork between the National Governors Association developing a plan that focuses on student achievement, not Federal intrusion at the State level.

This bill, unlike the Armey substitute, imposes more Washington-driven redtape, requirements, rules, and regulations on our States, communities, and classrooms. This bill guarantees that those who have a say in education reform will be the bureaucrats in Washington, not the parents and teachers in the cities and towns of America. It opts for top-down reform from Washington, not bottom-up reforms led by parents and tailored to local needs.

The Armey substitute allows localities to define "choice" for themselves. They can include nonpublic schools in their programs if they want, but they are not required to do so. This substitute will give parents more choice of schools for their children.

I believe my wife and I know what is best for our two children and America's parents know what is best for theirs. Goals 2000 mistakenly assumes that Federal school bureaucrats know better how to educate my children.

I don't want to leave Alicia and Austin's future in bureaucrats' hands. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Armey substitute.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Chairman, this Member rises in fundamental opposition to H.R. 1804.

Because article X of the U.S. Constitution gives primary responsibility for education to the States, which may be delegated to their political subdivisions, this Member will always be at least skeptical about any enlargement of the Federal role in public elementary and secondary education and opposed to Federal mandates for the public schools of our Nation—except to, first, assure equal access to educational opportunities under the U.S. Constitution or, second, in a limited number of circumstances where involvement by the Federal Government is viewed by a broad consensus in the American public as necessary to stimulate action by States and school districts to meet, on rare occasions, a limited number of extraordinarily important educational objectives.

While there is value in having identified national education goals, it does not follow that they must be federally mandated goals with oversight for implementation coming from the Federal Government. Continuation of efforts to stimulate programs to develop educational goals and reform efforts by States and local school boards is, in this Member's opinion, the proper way to proceed.

Therefore, Madam Chairman, this Member is for fundamental principles opposed to this legislation.

Mr. VENTO. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. The establishment of important national goals for our education system is long overdue.

The Goals 2000 bill emphasizes results. It is a proven lesson of history that without a clear objective in mind it is impossible to determine a course of action. The national education goals provide the necessary objectives, which have not been in focus with past reform efforts.

This legislation, without restricting the flexibility of the States or local governments, provides important guidelines to use in building a stronger foundation for our education system.

Madam Chairman, if the needs we must address seem greater today, it is because they clearly are more significant. In terms of having to reach out to meet people where they are, not where some assume students will be, our task of providing a quality education for every American has indeed grown. Anyone who has experienced our current system and circumstance firsthand can testify to the fact that it is no longer possible to approach education from a single monolithic perspective, without alternatives, and still maintain a reasonable expectation that education and schooling will reach every student.

I am not among those cynics who believe the sky has fallen upon our public schools and that they are today beyond repair. Yet, I readily admit there are problems too numerous to mention here that have had a detrimental impact upon the quality of education our children receive. Many of these problems are certainly not new and many of them are probably not even unique to our country.

Nevertheless, it is vitally important we confront the status quo and work to challenge

and ensure that our children, all of our children, have access to the best education possible. The Goals 2000: Educate America Act represents a strong first step in this effort.

As for my colleagues, those critics of this bill, who favor vouchers as the panacea for all the ills confronting our education system, I must warn you that you have placed your faith not in school choice—but a HOBSON'S choice.

It sure sounds good to say that providing vouchers for low- and middle-income families will guarantee them a "real choice." But the truth is that there is no requirement that private schools must accept any student who applies for entry, regardless of race, religion, gender, or ability. Moreover, the vouchers families would receive will only be worth a portion of the cost of tuition at most private schools. Yet, this is what constitutes choice in the mind of many of my colleagues. Some choice.

I think it is clear to anyone who takes a close look that the "school choice" proposal we are presented with today will not deliver the alternatives to families that its proponents suggest and doesn't begin to address the challenges facing education today and tomorrow.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. It is a good start down a long road.

Mr. KYL. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Goals 2000: Educate America Act being considered on the floor today because efforts to truly reform our Nation's schools on the local and State level will essentially be gutted as a result of this legislation.

H.R. 3210, the substitute text of H.R. 1804, will effectively rule out the most innovative approaches to education improvement, while encouraging more regulation from Washington. Instead of providing some assistance to States, school districts, and yes, parents who are trying to change the status quo in education, Goals 2000 will instead penalize those very institutions by denying them Federal funding if they do not ensure that "opportunity to learn" standards, to be established by yet another Washington, DC, Federal board, are adopted.

Before a State is eligible to receive Federal funding through this bill, the State must develop "opportunity-to-learn" standards. But the bill does not provide the funds necessary to even begin to meet the requirements of the standards. What that leaves America's school administrators, teachers, and parents is another unfunded mandate imposed by the Federal Government.

This unfunded mandate is a good example of how some believe States look to the Federal Government to show them how to improve education. This simply is not true. My parents were teachers; my sister is a teacher; and from their experiences and mine, I believe part of the answer to education reform is this: Give schools the opportunity to experience an approach emphasizing bottom-up reform and waivers from all the additional redtape that the proponents of Goals 2000 will place on our Nation's schools—among other requirements, President Clinton's Goals 2000 education bill will devise curriculum standards, assessment standards, job skills standards, "opportunity-to-learn" standards, and others.

My support for education reform is straightforward. Representatives ARMEY, BALLENGER, BOEHNER, and HOEKSTRA have authored a plan to authorize $400 million for a 5-year program of Federal matching grants for States devising reform efforts. Money will go to State and local education efforts; in the first year, 75 percent of the funds must go to local communities and 90 percent must go to local communities in years 2–5—one-half of 1 percent, aside from other Federal assistance programs, must go to native American education. In addition, no more than 4 percent of the money under this plan can go toward administrative costs.

State plans must be drawn up by a reform panel chaired by the Governor of the State, consisting of parents, community leaders, business leaders, and educators. Under this plan, the Secretary of Education can permit any waiver necessary to ensure innovation and creativity within the school system.

The education program I support is tightly focused and targets funds to four promising approaches to education reform: School choice—either public or public/private and at local option—merit schools, model schools—allows students to attend a school which may be across town but offers a particular curriculum; model schools have been highly successful—and site-based management. Under the plan, 25 percent of the funds must go to school choice.

The Parent and Student Empowerment Act will also establish the six education goals as our Nation's 50 Governors envisioned them 3 years ago. The six goals: By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn; by the year 2000, the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent; American students will have demonstrated competency in English, math, science, history, and geography; by the year 2000, United States students will be first in mathematics and achievement; by the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in the global economy; by the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.

The Clinton administration's education bill under consideration today will add a seventh education goal. I do not believe that our national education goals should be changed at this time. Without discussion of the merits of a new goal, changing them arbitrarily sends a signal that the fundamental goals of education can change with the wind. No one will take the goals seriously.

The Parent and Student Empowerment Act is important for another reason. It emphasizes the role of parents, who, after all, are the greatest catalyst for change in our education system. The Parent and Student Empowerment Act supports parental choice in education, which will make it possible for families to no longer be relegated to ineffective schools simply because of the location of their homes. It also gives parents the right to say "no" to programs they deem as detrimental to their child's education. The Clinton education bill does not allow for public/private school choice or for parents to "opt" their children out of programs they feel are harmful.

Madam Chairman, our education system is in need of just as much repair today as our health care system. In fact, education costs are rising just as fast as health care costs. But, at least with health care most people agree that, as a nation, we receive the best care in the world. We can not say that about the current state of American education and yet, the Goals 2000 bill under consideration today is about more money for more bureaucracy, more money for more of the same.

It is time to take a stand on the state of education in our Nation, one of the most important issues facing us today. In our increasingly competitive, technologically advanced world, Americans must strive for dramatic and effective changes in our education system. I cannot support the Clinton education bill, knowing it will not begin to achieve these changes. The Parent and Student Empowerment Act, on the other hand, will empower parents and teachers to continue to work toward grassroots, community-based reforms where the needs and strengths of particular communities can be addressed and, therefore, important changes in our Nation's schools and to our education system.

Mr. ORTON. Madam Chairman, today I will be voting in favor of the Goals 2000 legislation. This bill provides additional education funding to enable States to develop and implement basic educational standards and goals.

Parents, teachers, principals and State school officials have consistently requested one thing from the Federal Government—the elimination of burdensome Federal requirements that consistently inhibit State and local efforts to improve their education systems. They argue that Federal regulations require teachers to teach low level, inferior skills instead of problem-solving and analysis. Outdated tests focus on rudimentary methods and ignore new programs, technology and techniques. I believe that parents, teachers and school districts should have the freedom to improve the quality of education without the constant threat of losing essential Federal funding.

Goals 2000 aims to alleviate these burdensome requirements by allowing States, school districts and individual schools to waive Federal regulations. At the same time, it encourages them to implement their own system-wide reforms by providing grants to assist States and school districts with these efforts. States, not the Federal Government, will join with parents, teachers and others to formulate plans, set goals for achievement and provide for assessment of progress toward these goals.

The bill, originally set forth by the National Governors Association and adopted by President Bush, is not a Federal effort to take over the education system. Instead, it aims to enact the National Education Goals shared by President Bush and President Clinton, into law while responding to legitimate local concerns. This legislation includes a safeguard to ensure that States are not forced to participate. It is a voluntary program that States may utilize to assist their own reform efforts if they so choose.

However, while I will be voting for this bill, I also want to make it clear that this is not a perfect bill. For example, I believe that the

funding formula proposed in the bill does not treat all States equitably. The use of a State per-pupil expenditure does not take into account a State's ability to raise money, the percentage of the State's budget spent on education or the number of children per household. Students from Utah consistently score among the top on national tests, and the State spends over half of its annual budget on education. Unfortunately, since its per-pupil expenditure is low, Utah will probably receive a lower funding level than it deserves, relative to local effort.

I am also aware of the possibility that the creation of more panels and boards may lead to an unnecessary expansion of Federal bureaucracy, instead of cutting it back. However, these panels will also provide a means to arrive at an educated, well thought out consensus among many groups and individuals. this form will probably be the most effective way to arrive at decisions that we can all support.

Finally, I would like to address some of the concerns raised by the opponents of this bill. I have heard many of my colleagues mention that this bill is the first step on a slippery slope to Federal control over education. Let me clearly state that I do not favor, nor will I ever vote for a national education system. I sincerely believe that education is best managed in the hands of the people who are closest to the issue—the parents, teachers, and administrators who work in the communities daily. The Federal Government should not enforce standards or design curriculum for education at any level.

Quite simply, this bill does not increase Federal control over education. Instead, it identifies general standards and provides information that States may use to develop their own plans. It simply provides another resource for educators and State administrators. It is consistent with my policy of voting for fewer Federal mandates on States and for less Federal Government involvement in education.

Opponents of the bill have also argued that we should replace this bill with a so-called program of school choice. I believe that choice is an essential component of any functional school system. For this reason, I support magnet and charter school programs that allow parents to choose better or more specialized schools for their children. Allowing flexibility to chose among different schools in the school district should force schools to compete, and should result in a better, more responsive school system.

However, I do not support the more radical version of school choice, which is nothing more than the use taxpayer monies to support private institutions. In an age of scarce Federal resources, we cannot afford the luxury of taking funds from the public school system to subsidize wealthy, private schools, which reserve the right to exclude any student on any grounds, including religion, race, or socioeconomic status. Families can and do make the private school choice today and should continue to do so.

In conclusion, Goals 2000 is about setting goals for the future and moving toward accomplishment of these goals. It promotes a sound basic education in math, English, science, and other core subjects that our children need to be better citizens and to earn a decent living. These are goals that I think we can all support. No one can deny that our education system needs to be improved. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so that our schools may move toward higher levels of achievement and our students may once again have the opportunity to be the best.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, we have a very important piece of legislation before the House today. I hope that all the Members and their staff will listen to the debate we are about to engage in on the Goals 2000 education bill.

This is not a technical amendments bill. This is not a reauthorization bill. This legislation is breaking new ground with regard to the Federal role in education and, if enacted into law, would be the first Federal effort to improve all schools for all children. In this regard, I think it is critically important to allow the broadest degree of discussion, debate, and amendments.

I have been a part of the debate on the Federal role in school reform from the outset. The original school reform bill was a Hawkins-Goodling bill in the 101st Congress. In addition, I sit on the National Education Goals Panel with Mr. KILDEE as representatives of the House Members. I also had a major role in shaping the Kildee-Goodling school reform legislation considered in the 102d Congress.

The bill being considered today is the product of a 5-year process to determine how the Federal Government can assist State and local school reform efforts without doing damage to the excellent progress being made across the country. As you can imagine, it is not easy for the Congress to get involved in something as new and dynamic as the school reform movement without dictating what exactly we think everyone should or should not do.

Generally, the bill before you today is a good one. It incorporates many of the ideas that President Bush and Lamar Alexander talked about under the title of "America 2000".

It authorizes the National Education Goals Panel to inform the Nation about our progress toward the six national education goals—which, by the way, we are never going to reach at the current pace.

It creates a process whereby national organizations of teachers and other educators can create descriptions of what all American students should know in the core curriculum areas—voluntary national content standards.

A grant program is authorized that would give States limited Federal funds to carry out the activities associated with school reform efforts. At least 75 percent of these funds would go to the school level to provide the wherewithall to make the systemic changes necessary to increase student learning.

From the start, writing effective legislation in this area has been a balancing act. By its very nature, the school reform movement is a grassroots, bottom-up effort that began with, and has been driven by, States and schools across the country. The lack of Federal involvement up to this point has probably been a good thing.

The danger of Federal assistance in this area has always been that Congress' form of help would be an example of what States were trying to get away from—uniform, top-down, regulation driven, one-size-fits-all solutions.

For the most part, the bill sent to us by the administration avoided this pit fall. Perhaps because both President Clinton and Secretary Riley had experience as Governors actually implementing school reform, the introduced bill was outcome oriented, and generally non-prescriptive.

However, as the bill moved through the committee, amendments were added that made the bill unacceptable to the President, Secretary Riley, the Governors, the business organizations that originally supported the bill, and, most importantly, the educators who are trying to implement these difficult changes. I was pleased to hear that the substitute bill, H.R. 3210, removes most of those objectionable amendments.

There remains some contradictory provisions in the bill relating to how prescriptive the Federal Government will be in requiring States to enforce their standards. Some of us, including Mr. CONDIT and myself, feel that this lack of clarity in the bill could be interpreted to be a mandate on States to meet standards required by the Act, even though Federal funds will never come close to covering it.

I believe that ours is really a clarifying amendment in that the committee report clearly states that there was no intention to create such an unfunded mandate on States. The President in a letter to me on H.R. 1804 stated that it was not his intention to influence State fiscal priorities with this legislation. The Governors and chief State school officers support the intentions of this amendment.

Further, there has been some concerns raised about the effects of this bill on State and local control of curriculum and instructional practice. Our amendment clarifies the intent of Congress in this regard as well.

It is very important that this amendment be adopted and made part of H.R. 1804. Only with its adoption will many of us who share these concerns vote in support of the legislation.

With regard to title IV of H.R. 3210, establishing a National Board for the development of industry-recognized skill standards, I continue to have specific concerns over the lack of a leadership role provided in the legislation for business and industry. Due to the realization that U.S. competitiveness is increasingly dependent on the skills of the American workforce—broad-based support has arisen for development of a national system of occupational skill standards in the United States. While I support the development of such a system, I am convinced that our success is dependent on making this an industry-led effort—otherwise the standards will not be used.

During committee consideration of the Goals 2000 legislation, we offered amendments to address these concerns. Unfortunately our efforts failed, but our resolve has not. While our concerns persist, we will not offer any amendments to title IV today dealing with the issue of industry leadership, based on knowledge that a compromise is being developed in the Senate that will address these concerns. We understand that the Senate compromise will make changes in the composition of the National Board, as well as require that the board's chairperson come from the business

community for the first 2-year terms. It is our hope to work toward this compromise as we go to conference with the Senate on the Goals 2000 legislation.

Even with these reservations, I do recognize the fact that we have come a long way in addressing concerns originally identified in title IV of H.R. 1804, as introduced—resulting in a much better piece of legislation.

Finally, I wish to note that while I am pleased that most of the very contentious civil rights issues raised by earlier drafts of title IV have been resolved, I do have concern over certain language in the committee report, the last sentence on page 50, which appears to require rigid adherence to the uniform guidelines on employee selection procedures and the standards of the American Psychological Association. This very well may not be a correct reading, but, if it is, I believe this will create problems for many reasons. I believe the board should be allowed broad discretion in this area.

In closing, Madam Chairman, I am prepared to support this legislation with the adoption of the amendments I have just described. It will be my goal in the conference to move the final bill in the direction of allowing States the greatest discretion in determining their own vision of school reform.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to H.R. 1804 being offered by my colleague from Illinois. This amendment would prevent any school district with more than 250,000 students from receiving any State grant funds for school reform. As a result, four of the most beleaguered school districts in the country, Chicago, New York City, Los Angeles and Miami, would all be denied any of the important grant funds in H.R. 1804.

Not only is this amendment insensitive and mean-spirited but it would be genuinely detrimental to many of my constituents who attend Chicago public schools. The problems of the Chicago public schools are well known and daunting. After a frustrating delay, the Chicago public schools have again had to start out their school year facing enormous obstacles and insufficient funds to meet the needs of its students. Because more than 80 percent of Chicago public school students are eligible for the lunch program, the school system is plagued by problems of poverty. Not only are funds desperately needed to recruit and retain teachers, increase school safety and anti-crime efforts, reduce class sizes, and meet the needs of the thousands of students who are not English proficient but funding is also needed to rebuild or renovate the hundreds of Chicago school facilities that are in shameful states of disrepair. In fact, 15-percent of Chicago's public schools were built before the turn of the century and more than half were built before World War II.

Despite these extraordinary obstacles, Chicago has been a leader in school reform efforts. In 1989, the central school board was virtually eliminated, empowering teachers, parents, and principals to manage individual schools. The Consortium on Chicago School Research estimates that from 36 to 45 percent of the newly self-governing elementary schools have taken on systemic restructuring. Such schools are considered more than twice as likely to exhibit student-centered learning practices which is critical to improving our students' education and meeting the goals included in Goals 2000.

To target Chicago, or any other city, and prevent its schools from continuing their reform efforts with the assistance of State grant funds simply because of its size is blatantly unfair and unjustified. On behalf of the millions of students who would suffer from this amendment, I urge my colleagues to join me and oppose it.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1804, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act.

Providing our children with a quality education is one of the most important responsibilities we have as a Nation. America's future economic welfare depends on having a well-trained, well-educated labor force capable of maintaining and advancing the competitive position which the U.S. currently enjoys.

Goals 2000 brings together our local, State and Federal Government, with parents, educators, community groups, and business and labor leaders to improve our education and training system. Governors around the country have worked with the administration to develop this legislation.

Giving States and school districts the flexibility they need to make vital reforms is crucial. H.R. 1804 will waive rules and regulations that currently impede such reform. Teacher training will be improved and schools will have the textbooks and instructional materials needed in order for them to reach the agreed upon goals.

The bill will develop voluntary national performance standards which will give students and teachers a better understanding of what should be learned before a student is allowed to graduate. It is a tragic fact that too many students leave school without having a basic knowledge of reading, math, science and other subjects vital in today's complex society.

The United States will lose its competitive edge if our children fail to master the changing workplace technologies that their European and Japanese counterparts are mastering. It is unfortunate that today American businesses are forced to spend millions of dollars in training workers who come into the workforce unable to perform even rudimentary tasks.

The Goals 2000 legislation before us today will play a major role in alleviating this problem. Demonstration programs—such as the Chicago Yes! Program—have been extremely successful in targeting high school students in Chicago and providing vocational, academic, and support services to at-risk students. Working with business, the school provides exposure and pre-apprenticeship training in different local industries. Business and industry provide the equipment, on-site training and school to work transition assistance. Programs like this have proven cost-effective to business and invaluable to students. The voluntary national workplace skill standards, which will be developed under this legislation, will continue efforts such as Chicago Yes! by providing industry with a well-trained workforce that meets their needs and ensuring that high school graduates have the skills necessary to find the quality employment needed to support a family.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support Goals 2000. By giving full support to our educational system, we are making a strong commitment to the future of our children and our Nation.

Mr. REED. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1804, and to correct some of the misstatements and misperceptions surrounding an amendment I added to the bill at full committee. Some of these comments have distorted the intent of the amendment and created a red herring totally out of proportion to the actual scope of the amendment.

The provision I added attempts to inject a measure of accountability into education reform efforts. It is a truth in reform provision.

This provision asks States, if they choose to apply for Federal planning grants under title III of Goals 2000, to describe in their application what they will do when a school or school system fails to meet the standards.

It is the only part of the bill that looks beyond standard setting. Active reform requires promulgating standards, making assessments, and then taking deliberate steps to raise performance to meet the standards. I do not believe it is unreasonable to ask States to plan for the final part of the equation: What will you do to meet the standards?

Much attention has been paid to standard setting. This amendment directs a modest amount of attention to meeting the standards.

The provision does not restrict a State's flexibility in any way. A State can plan to adopt a variety of procedures in order to meet the standards, and the procedures chosen will vary from State to State. The committee report cites a broad range of possible alternatives: Sending evaluation teams into the schools, improving parental involvement, providing increased training and professional development for staff, or other actions designed to improve schools and achieve compliance with appropriate standards. States have the flexibility to adopt different approaches in different situations. For example, a State may want to take aggressive action if a school system cannot meet both content standards and opportunity to learn standards, while adopting a different approach in school systems where content standards are met.

The standards themselves are chosen by the State itself and subject to the State's own timelines for achievement. The provision applies to both content standards and opportunity to learn standards, it does not emphasize one standard over another.

Some have charged that this provision is an unfunded mandate. It is not. It is a planning requirement. States choose to apply for the various grants authorized under H.R. 1804. This provision applies only if a State chooses to apply for a planning grant. If a State chooses not to apply for a planning grant, then there is no obligation for that State to do anything. The State can still apply for other grants under H.R. 1804, can still adopt and certify standards, and can still continue receiving other Federal education funds.

We should not sit idly by during this reform debate and watch Federal resources go into another paper drill which will enrich educational consultants and only coincidentally help students because we do not face the tough question of what actions must be taken to ensure that standards are met.

To do any less than this is to say that Federal money for change means nothing.

Mr. HUGHES. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1804, Goals 2000: Educate America Act, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

One of the important principles on which our country was founded—that all Americans are entitled to a free public education—has served as the great leveler between the well-to-do, and the less fortunate in our society. We all know stories of great Americans of humble origins who were aided in achieving their goals, and in turn making great contributions to our society, as a result of the educational opportunities our Nation provides. And there are millions of Americans, perhaps not infamous, who have been able to vastly improve their standard of living because our society cares enough to make the sacrifice that is needed to educate our young people.

However today, the great American dream is threatened by a public school system that is not functioning well. Many of our schools are not providing our young people with the knowledge, skills, and tools necessary to achieve their individual goals; and as a result, our entire Nation is suffering.

We have all read numerous studies reporting poor student performance in basic subjects and graduates entering the job market unequipped with the skills necessary in today's workforce. How can we expect today's graduates to carry on the tradition of American innovation in the global marketplace and lead this great Nation into the next century when the failures of our education system are so evident? Is there any issue as important to the future security of our country as the quality of education we provide our children?

We must make a commitment now to improving our Nation's education system. All American children deserve access to a quality education and the ability to pursue their dreams and goals. We can afford to wait no longer.

The legislation we consider today will promote positive reforms in school systems across the country and facilitate the achievement of our national education goals. These important objectives are accomplished by writing into law the seven national education goals, encouraging States to meet them by the year 2000, and providing long overdue funding to our local school districts for the development of innovative educational strategies.

School districts can apply for these funds by describing how the funds would be used to further the educational reform efforts in their individual communities. Because educational needs vary from community to community, this legislation explicitly recognizes diversity and the need for local autonomy in reform efforts. Those who are in a position to know best how to enhance the educational process—school teachers, principals, superintendents, and parents—will be the architects of this new effort.

H.R. 1804 does not contain any Federal mandates. State participation in this program is voluntary, and does not affect a State's entitlement under any other federally funded program. Passage of this measure will allow the Federal Government to encourage and stimulate reform efforts in communities. As new programs and strategies are developed at the local level to achieve voluntary student performance standards, the Federal Government can then assume a more appropriate role as a clearinghouse for information. Innovative ideas that have been successfully implemented can be shared with other school districts around the country.

H.R. 1804, Goals 2000: Educate America Act, is a good bill and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CLEMENT. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this critical legislation. Many of my colleagues in the House know of my commitment to education reform efforts that ensure every child in America will have access to a high quality education. Because of this, it is with great pleasure that I stand before you today to endorse the Goals 2000—Educate America project.

Madam Chairman, it was only a short time ago that arts curriculums in our Nation's schools were considered extracurricular activities. Fortunately, however, due to the vision of Education Secretary Richard Riley, a new philosophy has emerged from the administration and is encompassed in the Goals 2000 Program.

The voluntary standards set forth in this program assures that every child, in every school district, in every State across America, will have the opportunity to develop their minds through exposure to music and the other arts. In Tennessee alone, education reform initiatives will lead to a hiring of over 200 music, art, and physical education teachers in Tennessee for the current school year and will eventually lower the teacher/student ratio from the current level of 1 to 1,175 to 1 to 525 when the reform package is fully implemented.

Congress should pass this plan and dedicate itself to the continued effort to see that these voluntary national standards are implemented in all of the 16,000 school districts across our Nation. Goals 2000 encourages us to be equal partners in the education reform effort and prove once and for all that we want to invest in our children's education.

Madam Chairman, Goals 2000 is a welcome change in philosophy and I am pleased that the current administration has chosen to acknowledge the critical importance of the arts in education reform. It is my feeling that passing this bill will allow 1993 to be hailed as the commencement of a new cultural renaissance in education for this Nation and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support for Goals 2000: Educate America Act. I commend Chairman FORD and Subcommittee Chair KILDEE for their work on this legislation and their collaboration with the administration.

I supported the national education goals agreed upon by former President Bush and the Nation's Governors, including then-Governor Clinton of Arkansas back in 1990. The House of Representatives passed similar legislation last year which was later subject to a filibuster in the other body.

This new bill represents a departure from traditional Federal assistance to State and local education reform. This bill will serve as a catalyst to systemic reform. Rather than targeting specific programs, this bill allows for coordinated reform in all parts of the education system. Rather than targeting special groups of children, this bill seeks broad based improvement for all children.

Additionally, this legislation emphasizes three vital elements of reform: flexibility, creativity, and results. Our schools have been lacking these for far too long. This bill's focus on academic results demonstrates a national commitment to our children's development. To that end, this legislation encourages increased parental involvement in educational improvement. Traditionally the Federal Government has served to provide funding for programs carried out at State and local levels. I firmly believe in the right of parents and local communities to exercise responsibility for their children's education. This bill does not take that responsibility away. I think it has become all too clear that our Nation's education system is in need of reform and new direction. It is time this country examine its future and it is within our education system that our future lies. It is time for us to decide how our children should be prepared, what skills they will need, and how to accomplish that learning. We must teach our children well; we must invigorate their learning process; we must encourage them to pursue learning at all levels. And importantly we must provide them with the necessary knowledge and skills to enter the work force as competent and productive workers.

I believe these goals are well within our grasp. This Nation cannot accept the academic decline of its children. The time has come to welcome the challenges set forth in these goals. I urge my colleagues to support Goals 2000.

Ms. MOLINARI. Madam Chairman, few, if any issues are more important to the future of the country than the quality of our schools. In the past years, the subject of education reform has received a great deal of attention. Under the last administration, and again with the new administration education reform is the hot topic of debate. And no wonder. Student achievement is too low. According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress, fewer than one out of every five pupils in grades 4, 8, and 12 can demonstrate competency in mathematics. Scores on Scholastic Achievement Test [SAT] have fallen significantly over the last 20 years. The decline in the number of high-scoring students on the SAT-verbal exam is especially serious.

The shortcomings of American students in comparison with those from other countries have been widely documented. The bottom line is clear. We need to improve all schools so that all students will have access to quality education. This will take time and a great deal of effort. It will require hard work by the Federal, State, and local governments, as well as by the business and community groups.

The Federal Government has an essential role to play in helping to improve America's schools. Our goal must be to encourage as many schools as possible to take the steps needed to achieve reform. The leadership to do so—the ideas, the plans, and the commitment—must be supplied by the local schools. They are the ones who know what it will take to succeed. True education reform must be developed by teachers who work in the schools, by parents whose children attend the schools, and by the community served by the schools.

For these reasons, I am an original cosponsor to the ranking minority member's bill, The Educational Excellence for All Students Act. This bill assists in the development of voluntary world class standards and assessments to help our students meet the National Education Goals. It funnels Federal money to the States and local school districts to help foster real education reform. And, it provides the flexibility school districts need to develop creative education programs. All concepts I strongly support to help foster real education reform.

The education reform bill before us today does incorporate many of these concepts, and I support those sections. However, I have some reservations surrounding the opportunity to learn standards, but I do believe that the time to act is now. This issue is too important to get bogged down in partisan politics. We need to work together and come up with realistic solutions for our students.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, today this House debates education reform. We have a stark choice between the status quo and change. Nationally, we have low student achievement scores yet this country is spending records amount of money on education. Our children need the assurance that they will receive a good sound education and that they will be able to compete in an international work force.

The Department of Education has stated that approximately $450 billion was spent, in 1991—the latest year for which statistics are available—for public and private education, K through post-graduate. Ninety-four percent of all education funding in this Nation comes from State, local, and private sources. The Federal Government contributes only 6 percent to education programs. I have always strongly believed that parents and the local school boards know what is best for their children. I want to keep the Federal role in education to an absolute minimum.

But that's not what we have before us today. The bill up for consideration, as amended by the Democrat-led Education and Labor Committee, is more of the status quo. Goals 2000 creates more bureaucracy by establishing three separate panels to develop national standards. Each school district would have to measure up to these standards if it wishes to receive any Federal assistance. These standards could dictate everything from classroom size to curriculum.

Goals 2000 would also cost $420 million for the first year alone and impose more regulations on schools. Money and more regulations are not the answer. True educational reform will not come from the bureaucrats in Washington, but from people in the grass roots level becoming involved in PTA's, local school boards, and other local organizations.

That's why I support the reform amendment offered by my good friend and colleague from Texas, Mr. ARMEY. The Armey amendment, while not perfect, is the best choice of all the options up for consideration.

I support the Armey amendment because it endorses educational reform from the bottom up and requires parental involvement. Contrary to the Goals 2000 legislation, the Armey amendment does not create three Federal boards to come up with national standards. The Armey amendment empowers local communities to enact their own reforms.

It will accomplish this by using $400 million in this bill for one or more of the four most promising reform approaches. These include school choice plans, to be flexibly designed by local communities; model schools that try to break the mold by implementing new and unique plans; merit awards that monetarily reward schools that, as a whole, show academic improvement; and enactment of decentralized management plans, to cut down on top-heavy school administrations.

Another positive feature of the Armey amendment is that it will allow parents to exclude their children from programs and tests that they think are detrimental to their children's education and health. There have been numerous reports of students receiving psychological testing without their parent's permission. The Goals 2000 legislation has no such parental opt-out right in the bill.

The Armey amendment also protects the parent's right to determine who can view their children's school records, with exception for legitimate education purposes. Once again, the Goals 2000 legislation does not have a similar provision.

Furthermore, this amendment would bar the use of these Federal funds for school-based clinics, which is permitted in the Goals 2000 bill for the purpose of coordinating health and social services. Some of these clinics administer birth control devices without parental knowledge or consent, and Americans simply do not want their taxpayers' dollars being used for these purposes.

However, the Armey amendment is not perfect, and I still have reservations about it. First, the amendment proposes to spend nearly the same amount as contained in Goals 2000. However, Armey sunsets, or automatically ends the program after 4 years, as opposed to the Goals 2000 bill which has no end to it.

I also have serious concerns about requiring that 25 percent of funds received by local communities be used for school choice programs. Even though the Armey amendment leaves the definition of choice up to the local communities, which many include or exclude non-public schools as they see fit, this can still be perceived by school districts as a mandate from Washington. It could also be interpreted by some as a limitation of parental and local school board jurisdictional powers.

Mr. Chairman, parents don't want more governmental involvement. They want to work within their communities to develop goals of their own. They want to reward their children excelling in the classroom, not by an incentive of Federal dollars molding their children to Washington's answer to education reform, but by their own initiative. It is important for everyone—both liberal and conservative—to remember that local solutions to educational reform are best. They are closest to the problems and they know, much better than Washington, the solutions to them.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment offered by Congressman ARMEY to the Goals 2000: Educate America Act.

In early September, I was dismayed to read a front page story in the Washington Post reporting that almost half of all American adults do not possess the basic literacy and arithmetic skills to hold a decent job. The Department of Education's "Adult Literacy in America" study confirmed the beliefs of many business and academic leaders who have warned that the deteriorating quality of our school systems is having a drastic, long-term effect on the international competitiveness of the American work force.

As the world becomes more technologically advanced and everyday life becomes more sophisticated, it has become increasingly difficult to support a family and make a decent living with a manual labor job. In modern society, businesses need workers with solid reading, writing, and arithmetic skills who can identify and solve problems.

The fact of the matter is our elementary and secondary education system is in dire straits and failing to adequately prepare many of our youth to become productive members of the American work force in an increasingly competitive global economy. Excessive bureaucracy, violence in the schoolyard, no discipline in the classroom, and declining parental involvement have allowed too many of our children to graduate from high school unable to read. We must reform the system if the United States is to maintain its position as the world's premier economic power.

During my tenure in Congress, I have considered countless approaches and solutions to fixing our declining educational system. However, when weighing the merits of these proposals, I have always sought an approach that preserves local control over education.

To earn my support, a reform proposal must be flexible, facilitate grassroots reform, and encourage local innovation and experimentation. It must maximize local decisionmaking of parents, teachers, and local school boards, not augment the power of Government bureaucratic in Washington, DC. It must also recognize that parents and teachers are best able to forge personal relationships with the students, while Government bureaucrats merely view our children as statistics. All in all, Federal mandates handcuff local educators when we should instead be empowering those who best know how to motivate and educate our young ones.

Congressman ARMEY's pending amendment is very similar to the one he offered last year to the ill-fated Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act. Both amendments earmarked 25 percent of the funds allocated to local school districts under the act for school choice programs. Although school choice proposals may vary in content, most versions aim to involve parents in their child's education and reform educational bureaucracies by allowing parents to choose among schools. Most programs differ only by the scope of shools from which to choose—intradistrict, interdistrict, public, or private schools.

Although I have some doubts that school choice programs are workable in rural areas where schools are separated by such great distances and where there is rarely a viable alternative to the public school system, I do remain philosophically supportive of the concept. Generally, I believe school choice programs can improve the quality of our schools by fostering competition among schools. For

this reason, I supported the Armey substitute amendment last year when it was defeated during consideration of the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act.

However, this year I closely examined the revised Armey substitute amendment and recognized a fundamental conflict between my advocacy for local control of education and my support for the Armey amendment. The text of the Armey amendment reads, "Not less than 25 percent of the amounts made available to local education agencies under this title shall be used for choice programs." As anyone can plainly see, this language is rather rigid and provides for very little local decision making. What happens if only a few families participate in a school choice program and the local educators determine that the remaining funds could be used to buy new books, patch a leaky ceiling, or deal with other pressing matters? Whether one supports school choice policies or not, one has to admit that the Armey amendment is a Federal mandate, devoid of flexibility and local discretion.

As a Republican who is wary of Federal Government intrusion in local education and who strongly supports a local, decentralized educational system, I would be guilty of hypocrisy if I voted for the Armey amendment. Although I remain philosophically supportive of school choice, I cannot in good faith support another Federal mandate that ties the hands of parents and local educators.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the bill H.R. 3210 is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1804

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Goals 2000: Educate America Act".

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to provide a framework for meeting the National Education Goals established by title I of this Act by—

(1) promoting coherent, nationwide, systemic education reform;

(2) improving the quality of learning and teaching in the classroom and in the workplace;

(3) defining appropriate and coherent Federal, State, and local roles and responsibilities for education reform and lifelong learning;

(4) establishing valid, reliable, and fair mechanisms for—

(A) building a broad national consensus on American education reform;

(B) assisting in the development and certification of high-quality, internationally competitive content and student performance standards;

(C) assisting in the development and certification of opportunity-to-learn standards; and

(D) assisting in the development and certification of high-quality assessment measures that reflect the internationally competitive content and student performance standards;

(5) supporting new initiatives at the Federal, State, local, and school levels to provide equal educational opportunity for all students to meet high standards and to succeed in the world of employment and civic participation;

(6) providing a framework for the reauthorization of all Federal education programs by—

(A) creating a vision of excellence and equity that will guide all Federal education and related programs;

(B) providing for the establishment of high-quality, internationally competitive content and student performance standards that all students will be expected to achieve;

(C) providing for the establishment of high quality, internationally competitive opportunity-to-learn standards that all States, local educational agencies, and schools should achieve;

(D) encouraging and enabling all State educational agencies and local educational agencies to develop comprehensive improvement plans that will provide a coherent framework for the implementation of reauthorized Federal education and related programs in an integrated fashion that effectively educates all children enabling them to participate fully as workers, parents, and citizens; and

(E) providing resources to help individual schools, including those serving students with high needs, develop and implement comprehensive improvement plans;

(7) stimulating the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skill standards and certification to serve as a cornerstone of the national strategy to enhance workforce skills; and

(8) assisting every elementary and secondary school that receives funds under this Act to actively involve parents and families in supporting the academic work of their children at home and in providing parents with skills to advocate for their children at school.

TITLE I—NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS

SEC. 101. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to establish national education goals.

SEC. 102. NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS.

The Congress declares that the National Education Goals are the following:

(1) SCHOOL READINESS.—(A) By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn.

(B) The objectives for this goal are that—

(i) all children will have access to high-quality and developmentally appropriate preschool programs that help prepare children for school;

(ii) every parent in America will be a child's first teacher and devote time each day to helping his or her preschool child learn, and parents will have access to the training and support they need; and

(iii) all children will receive the nutrition and health care needed to arrive at school with healthy minds and bodies, and to maintain the mental alertness necessary to be prepared to learn, and the number of low-birthweight babies will be significantly reduced through enhanced prenatal health systems.

(2) SCHOOL COMPLETION.—(A) By the year 2000, the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.

(B) The objectives for this goal are that—

(i) the Nation must dramatically reduce its dropout rate, and 75 percent of those students who do drop out will successfully complete a high school degree or its equivalent; and

(ii) the gap in high school graduation rates between American students from minority backgrounds and their non-minority counterparts will be eliminated.

(3) STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND CITIZENSHIP.—(A) By the year 2000, all students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, arts, history, and geography, and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy.

(B) The objectives for this goal are that—

(i) the academic performance of all students at the elementary and secondary level will increase significantly in every quartile, and the distribution of minority students in each level will more closely reflect the student population as a whole;

(ii) the percentage of all students who demonstrate the ability to reason, solve problems, apply knowledge, and write and communicate effectively will increase substantially;

(iii) all students will be involved in activities that promote and demonstrate good citizenship, community service, and personal responsibility;

(iv) the percentage of all students who are competent in more than one language will substantially increase; and

(v) all students will be knowledgeable about the diverse cultural heritage of this Nation and about the world community.

(4) TEACHER EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.—(A) By the year 2000, the Nation's teaching force will have access to programs for the continued improvement of their professional skills and the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to instruct and prepare all American students for the next century.

(B) The objectives of this goal are that—

(i) every State will establish opportunity-to-learn standards and create an integrated strategy to attract, recruit, prepare, retrain, and support the continued professional development of teachers, administrators, and other educators, so that there is a highly talented workforce of professional educators to teach challenging standards;

(ii) subgrants for preservice teacher education and professional development activity will be made to local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, private nonprofit organizations, or consortia of such organizations, to support continuing, sustained, professional development activities for all educators; and

(iii) partnerships shall be established, whenever possible, between local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, local labor, business, and professional associations to provide and support programs for the professional development of educators, particularly in the area of emerging new technologies in education.

(5) MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE.—(A) By the year 2000, United States students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement.

(B) The objectives for this goal are that—

(i) math and science education will be strengthened throughout the system, especially in the early grades;

(ii) the number of teachers with a substantive background in mathematics and science will increase by 50 percent; and

(iii) the number of United States undergraduate and graduate students, especially women and minorities, who complete degrees in mathematics, science, and engineering will increase significantly.

(6) ADULT LITERACY AND LIFELONG LEARNING.—(A) By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

(B) The objectives for this goal are that—

(i) every major American business will be involved in strengthening the connection between education and work;

(ii) all workers will have the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills, from basic to highly technical, needed to adapt to emerging new technologies, work methods, and markets through public and private educational, vocational, technical, workplace, or other programs;

(iii) the number of quality programs, including those at libraries, that are designed to serve more effectively the needs of the growing number of part-time and midcareer students will increase substantially;

(iv) the proportion of those qualified students, especially minorities, who enter college, who complete at least two years, and who complete their degree programs will increase substantially;

(v) the proportion of college graduates who demonstrate an advanced ability to think critically, communicate effectively, and solve problems will increase substantially; and

(vi) schools, in implementing comprehensive parent involvement programs, will offer more adult literacy, parent training and lifelong learning opportunities to improve the ties between home and school, and enhance parents' work and home lives.

(7) SAFE, DISCIPLINED, AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS.—(A) By the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.

(B) The objectives for this goal are that—

(i) every school will implement a firm and fair policy on use, possession, and distribution of drugs and alcohol;

(ii) parents, businesses, and community organizations will work together to ensure the rights of students to study in a safe and secure environment that is free of drugs and crime;

(iii) every school district will develop a comprehensive K-12 drug and alcohol prevention education program. Drug and alcohol curricula should be taught as an integral part of health education. In addition, community-based teams should be organized to provide all students and teachers with needed support; and

(iv) every school district will develop and implement a policy to ensure that all schools are free of weapons and violence.

TITLE II—NATIONAL EDUCATION REFORM, LEADERSHIP, STANDARDS, AND ASSESSMENTS

PART A—NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

SEC. 201. PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this part to establish a bipartisan mechanism for—

(1) building a national consensus for education improvement;

(2) reporting on progress toward achieving the National Education Goals; and

(3) reviewing the voluntary national content and student performance standards and opportunity-to-learn standards certified by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council, as well as the criteria for their certification, and the criteria for the certification of State assessments by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council with the option of disapproving such standards and criteria not later than 60 days after receipt from such Council.

SEC. 202. NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the executive branch a National Education Goals Panel (referred to in this Act as the "Goals Panel") to advise the President, the Secretary, and the Congress.

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Goals Panel shall be composed of eighteen members (referred to in this part as "members"), including—

(1) two members appointed by the President;

(2) eight members who are Governors, three of whom shall be from the same political party as the President and five of whom shall be of the opposite political party of the President, appointed by the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the National Governors' Association, with each appointing representatives of his or her respective political party, in consultation with each other;

(3) four Members of Congress appointed as follows—

(A) one member appointed by the majority leader of the Senate from among the Members of the Senate;

(B) one member appointed by the minority leader of the Senate from among the Members of the Senate;

(C) one member appointed by the majority leader of the House of Representatives from among the Members of the House of Representatives; and

(D) one member appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives from among the Members of the House of Representatives; and

(4) four members of State legislatures appointed by the President of the National Conference of State Legislatures, of whom not more than two may be of the same political party as the President of the United States.

(c) SPECIAL APPOINTMENT RULES.—(1) The members appointed pursuant to subsection (b)(2) shall be appointed as follows:

(A) If the Chairperson of the National Governors' Association is from the same political party as the President, the Chairperson shall appoint three individuals and the Vice Chairperson shall appoint five individuals.

(B) If the Chairperson of the National Governors' Association is from the opposite political party as the President, the Chairperson shall appoint five individuals and the Vice Chairperson shall appoint three individuals.

(2) If the National Governors' Association has appointed a panel that meets the requirements of subsections (b) and (c), except for the requirements of subsection (b)(4), prior to the date of enactment of this title, then the members serving on such panel shall be deemed to be in compliance with subsections (b) and (c) and shall not be required to be reappointed pursuant to such subsections.

(3) To the extent feasible, the membership of the Goals Panel shall be geographically representative and reflect the racial, ethnic, and gender diversity of the United States.

(d) TERMS.—The terms of service of members shall be as follows—

(1) Members appointed under subsection (b)(1) shall serve at the pleasure of the President.

(2) Members appointed under subsection (b)(2) shall serve a two-year term, except that the initial appointments under such paragraph shall be made to ensure staggered terms with one-half of such members' terms concluding every two years.

(3) Members appointed under subsection (b)(3) and (4) shall serve a term of two years.

(e) DATE OF APPOINTMENT.—The initial members shall be appointed not later than sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) INITIATION.—The Goals Panel may begin to carry out its duties under this part when ten members of the Goals Panel have been appointed.

(g) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Goals Panel shall not affect the powers of the Goals Panel, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(h) TRAVEL.—Each member may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for each day the member is engaged in the performance of duties away from the home or regular place of business of the member.

(i) CHAIRPERSON.—From among the members, the President shall appoint the Chairperson who shall serve a one-year term and shall alternate between political parties.

(j) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—A member of the Goals Panel who is an elected official of a State which has developed content, student performance, or opportunity-to-learn standards may not participate in Goals Panel consideration of such standards.

(k) EX OFFICIO MEMBER.—If the President has not appointed the Secretary of Education as 1 of the 2 members he appoints pursuant to subsection (b)(1), then the Secretary shall serve as a nonvoting ex officio member of the Goals Panel.

SEC. 203. DUTIES.

(a) DUTIES.—The Goals Panel shall—

(1) report to the President, the Secretary, and the Congress regarding the progress the Nation and the States are making toward achieving the National Education Goals established under title I of this Act, including issuing an annual report;

(2) report on State opportunity-to-learn standards and the progress of States in meeting such standards;

(3) review, after taking into consideration the public comments received pursuant to section 216, with the option of disapproving by a two-thirds majority vote of the full membership not later than 60 days after receipt of the—

(A) criteria developed by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council for the certification of content and student performance standards, assessments, and opportunity-to-learn standards; and

(B) voluntary national content and student performance standards and opportunity-to-learn standards certified by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council;

(4) report on promising or effective actions being taken at the national, State, and local levels, in the public and private sectors, to achieve the National Education Goals; and

(5) help build a nationwide, bipartisan consensus for the reforms necessary to achieve the National Education Goals.

(b) REPORT.—(1) The Goals Panel shall annually prepare and submit to the President, the Secretary, the appropriate committees of Congress, and the Governor of each State a report that shall—

(A) report on the progress of the United States toward achieving the National Education Goals;

(B) identify actions that should be taken by Federal, State, and local governments to

enhance progress toward achieving the National Education Goals and State opportunity-to-learn standards; and

(C) report on State opportunity-to-learn standards and the progress of States in meeting such standards.

(2) Reports shall be presented in a form, and include data, that is understandable to parents and the general public.

SEC. 204. POWERS OF THE GOALS PANEL.

(a) HEARINGS.—(1) The Goals Panel shall, for the purpose of carrying out this part, conduct such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence, as the Goals Panel considers appropriate.

(2) In carrying out this part, the Goals Panel shall conduct hearings to receive reports, views, and analyses of a broad spectrum of experts and the public on the establishment of voluntary national content and student performance standards, assessments, and opportunity-to-learn standards.

(b) INFORMATION.—The Goals Panel may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable the Goals Panel to carry out this part. Upon request of the Chairperson of the Goals Panel, the head of a department or agency shall furnish such information to the Goals Panel to the extent permitted by law.

(c) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Goals Panel may use the United States mail in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(d) USE OF FACILITIES.—The Goals Panel may, with consent, use the research, equipment, services, and facilities of any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or of any State or political subdivision thereof.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS AND SUPPORT.—(1) The Secretary shall provide to the Goals Panel, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services as the Goals Panel may request.

(2) The Secretary shall, to the extent appropriate, and on a reimbursable basis, make contracts and other arrangements that are requested by the Goals Panel to help it compile and analyze data or carry out other functions necessary to the performance of such responsibilities.

SEC. 205. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) MEETINGS.—The Goals Panel shall meet on a regular basis, as necessary, at the call of the Chairperson of the Goals Panel or a majority of its members.

(b) QUORUM.—A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(c) VOTING.—No individual may vote, or exercise any of the powers of a member, by proxy.

(d) PUBLIC ACCESS.—The Goals Panel shall ensure public access to its proceedings (other than proceedings, or portions of proceedings, relating to internal personnel and management matters) and make available to the public, at reasonable cost, transcripts of such proceedings.

SEC. 206. DIRECTOR AND STAFF; EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.

(a) DIRECTOR.—The Chairperson of the Goals Panel shall, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to the appointment and compensation of officers or employees of the United States, appoint a Director to be paid at a rate not to exceed the rate of basic pay payable for level V of the Executive Schedule.

(b) APPOINTMENT AND PAY OF EMPLOYEES.—(1)(A) The Director may appoint not more than four additional employees to serve as staff to the Goals Panel without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service.

(B) The employees appointed under paragraph (1)(A) may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, but shall not be paid a rate that exceeds the maximum rate of basic pay payable for GS-15 of the General Schedule.

(2) The Director may appoint additional employees to serve as staff to the Goals Panel consistent with title 5, United States Code.

(c) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Goals Panel may procure temporary and intermittent services of experts and consultants under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(d) STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon the request of the Goals Panel, the head of any department or agency of the United States may detail any of the personnel of such agency to the Goals Panel to assist the Goals Panel in its duties under this part.

SEC. 207. EARLY CHILDHOOD ASSESSMENT.

(a) GENERAL.—(1) The Goals Panel shall support the work of its Resource and Technical Planning Groups on School Readiness (referred to in this section as the Groups) to improve the methods of assessing the readiness of children for school that would lead to alternatives to currently used norm-referenced early childhood assessments.

(2) The Groups shall—

(A) create clear guidelines regarding the nature, functions, and uses of early childhood assessments, including a model of school readiness that addresses a broad range of early childhood developmental needs;

(B) monitor and evaluate early childhood assessments, including the ability of existing assessments to provide valid information on the readiness of children for school; and

(C) monitor and report on the long-term collection of data on the status of young children to improve policy and practice, including the need for new sources of data necessary to assess the broad range of early childhood developmental needs.

(b) ADVICE.—The Groups shall advise and assist the Congress, the Secretary, the Goals Panel, and others regarding how to improve the assessment of young children and how such assessments can improve services to children.

(c) REPORT.—The Goals Panel shall provide reports on the work of the Groups to the Congress, the Secretary, and the public.

PART B—NATIONAL EDUCATION STANDARDS AND IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

SEC. 211. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this part is to establish a mechanism to—

(1) certify and regularly review voluntary national content and student performance standards that define what all students should know and be able to do;

(2) certify content and student performance standards submitted by States on a voluntary basis, if such standards are of equal or higher quality to the voluntary national content and student performance standards certified by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council;

(3) certify and regularly review voluntary national opportunity-to-learn standards that describe the conditions of teaching and learning necessary for all students to have a fair opportunity to achieve the knowledge and skills described in the voluntary national content and student performance standards certified by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council;

(4) certify opportunity-to-learn standards submitted by States on a voluntary basis, if such standards are of equal or higher quality as compared with the voluntary national opportunity-to-learn standards; and

(5) certify assessment systems submitted by States on a voluntary basis, if such systems are aligned with State content standards certified by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council and if such systems are valid, reliable, and consistent with relevant, nationally recognized, professional and technical standards for assessment when used for their intended purposes.

SEC. 212. NATIONAL EDUCATION STANDARDS AND IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the executive branch a National Education Standards and Improvement Council (referred to in this title as the "Council").

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Council shall be composed of twenty members (referred in this part as "members") who shall be appointed as follows:

(1) 8 members (2 from each of subparagraphs (A) through (D) of subsection (c)(1)) shall be appointed by the President;

(2) 4 members (1 from each of subparagraphs (A) through (D) of subsection (c)(1)) shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the majority and minority leaders of House;

(3) 4 members (1 from each of subparagraphs (A) through (D) of subsection (c)(1)) shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, in consultation with the minority leader of the Senate; and

(4) 4 members (1 from each of subparagraphs (A) through (D) of subsection (c)(1)) shall be appointed by the National Education Goals Panel.

(c) QUALIFICATIONS.—(1) The members of the Council shall include—

(A) 5 professional educators, including elementary and secondary classroom teachers, preschool educators and other school-based professionals, local district or State administrators, related service personnel, and other educators;

(B) 5 representatives of business and industry, organized labor, and postsecondary educational institutions, including at least 1 representative of postsecondary educational institutions, at least 1 representative of organized labor, and at least 1 representative of business who is also a member of the National Skill Standards Board;

(C) 5 representatives of the public, including representatives of advocacy, civil rights and disability groups, parents, civic leaders, and local and State education policymakers (including State, local, or tribal school boards); and

(D) 5 education experts, including experts in measurement and assessment, curriculum, school finance and equity, and school reform.

(2) To the extent feasible, the membership of the Council shall be geographically representative of the United States and reflect the diversity of the United States with regard to race, ethnicity, gender, and disability characteristics.

(3) One-third of the Council shall consist of individuals with expertise in the educational needs of children who are from low-income families, minority backgrounds, have limited-English proficiency, or have disabilities.

(d) TERMS.—(1) Members shall be appointed for 3-year terms, with no member serving more than 2 consecutive terms.

(2) The Council shall establish by lot initial terms for individuals of one, two, or three years in order to establish a rotation in which one-third of the members are selected each year.

(e) DATE OF APPOINTMENT.—The initial members shall be appointed not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) INITIATION.—The Council shall begin to carry out the duties of the Council under this part when all 20 members have been appointed.

(g) RETENTION.—In order to retain an appointment to the Council, a member must attend at least two-thirds of the scheduled meetings of the Council in any given year.

(h) VACANCY.—A vacancy on the Council shall not affect the powers of the Council, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(i) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States may, while attending meetings or hearings of the Council, be provided compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding the maximum rate of basic pay payable for GS-15 of the General Schedule.

(j) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—(1) A member of the Council may not concurrently serve as a member of the Goals Panel.

(2) Section 208 of title 18 of the United States Code shall apply to members of the Council except that, for the purposes of making written determinations under subsection (b)(1), the Government official responsible for the appointment of any member of the Council is deemed to be the Director of the Office of Government Ethics.

(3) A member of the Council who resides in a State which has developed standards and assessments may not participate in Council consideration of such standards and assessments.

(k) TRAVEL.—Each member of the Council may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for each day the member is engaged in the performance of duties away from the home or regular place of business of the member.

(l) OFFICERS.—The members of the Council shall select officers from among its members. The officers of the Council shall serve for one-year terms.

SEC. 213. DUTIES.

(a) VOLUNTARY NATIONAL CONTENT STANDARDS.—(1) The Council shall—

(A) identify areas in which voluntary national content standards need to be developed;

(B) certify voluntary national content and student performance standards using the criteria developed under paragraph (2)(A)(i), that define what all students should know and be able to do;

(C) forward such voluntary national content and student performance standards to the Goals Panel for review, except that the Goals Panel shall have the option of disapproving such standards by a two-thirds majority vote of the full membership not later than 60 days after receipt of such standards; and

(D) develop a process for regularly reviewing any national voluntary content, student performance, and opportunity-to-learn standards that have been certified.

(2)(A) The Council shall—

(i) identify and develop criteria to be used for certifying the voluntary national content and student performance standards; and

(ii) before applying such criteria, forward them to the Goals Panel for review, except that the Goals Panel shall have the option of disapproving such criteria by a two-thirds majority vote of the full membership not later than 60 days after receipt of such criteria.

(B) The criteria developed by the Council shall address—

(i) the extent to which the proposed standards are internationally competitive and comparable to the best in the world;

(ii) the extent to which the proposed content and student performance standards reflect the best available knowledge about how all students learn and about how the content area can be most effectively taught;

(iii) the extent to which the proposed content and student performance standards have been developed through an open and public process that provides for input and involvement of all relevant parties, including teachers, related services personnel, and other professional educators, employers and post-secondary education institutions, curriculum and subject matter specialists, parents, advocacy groups, and the public; and

(iv) other factors that the Council deems appropriate.

(C) In developing the criteria, the Council shall work with entities that are developing, or have already developed, content and student performance standards, and any other entities that the Council deems appropriate, to identify appropriate certification criteria.

(b) VOLUNTARY STATE CONTENT STANDARDS.—The Council may certify content and student performance standards presented on a voluntary basis by States, using the criteria developed under subsection (a)(2)(A)(i), if such standards are of equal or higher quality to the voluntary national content and student performance standards certified by the Council.

(c) VOLUNTARY NATIONAL OPPORTUNITY-TO-LEARN STANDARDS.—(1) The Council shall certify exemplary, voluntary national opportunity-to-learn standards that will establish a basis for providing all students a fair opportunity to achieve the knowledge and skills set out in the voluntary national content standards certified by the Council.

(2) The voluntary national opportunity-to-learn standards certified by the Council shall address—

(A) the quality and availability of curricula, instructional materials, and technologies, including distance learning, to all students;

(B) the capability of teachers to provide high-quality instruction to meet diverse learning needs in each content area to all students;

(C) the extent to which teachers, principals, and administrators have ready and continuing access to professional development, including the best knowledge about teaching, learning, and school improvement;

(D) the extent to which curriculum, instructional practices, and assessments are aligned to content standards;

(E) the extent to which school facilities provide a safe and secure environment for learning and instruction and have the requisite libraries, laboratories, and other resources necessary to provide an opportunity to learn;

(F) the extent to which schools utilize policies, curricula, and instructional practices which ensure nondiscrimination on the basis of gender; and

(G) other factors that the Council deems appropriate to ensure the students receive a fair opportunity to achieve the knowledge and skills described in the voluntary content and student performance standards certified by the Council.

(3) In carrying out this subsection, the Council shall—

(A) identify what countries with rigorous content standards do to—

(i) provide their children with opportunities to learn;

(ii) prepare their teachers; and

(iii) provide continuing professional development opportunities for their teachers; and

(B) develop criteria to be used for certifying the voluntary national and State opportunity-to-learn standards and, before applying such criteria, forward them to the Goals Panel for review, except that the Goals Panel shall have the option of disapproving such standards by a two-thirds majority vote of the full membership not later than 60 days after receipt of such criteria.

(4) The Council shall assist in the development of the voluntary national opportunity-to-learn standards developed by the consortium under section 219 by—

(A) making recommendations to the Secretary regarding priorities and selection criteria for the award made under section 219; and

(B) coordinating with the consortium receiving an award under section 219 to ensure that the opportunity-to-learn standards the consortium develops are appropriate for the needs of all students, are of high quality, and are consistent with the criteria developed by the Council for the certification of such standards.

(5) The Council shall forward the voluntary national opportunity-to-learn standards it certifies to the Goals Panel for review, except that the Goals Panel shall have the option of disapproving such standards by a two-thirds majority vote of the full membership not later than 60 days after receipt of such standards.

(d) VOLUNTARY STATE OPPORTUNITY-TO-LEARN STANDARDS.—The Council may certify opportunity-to-learn standards submitted voluntarily by a State, using the criteria developed under subsection (c)(3)(B), if such standards are of equal or higher quality as compared to the voluntary national opportunity-to-learn standards.

(e) GENERAL PROVISION REGARDING VOLUNTARY NATIONAL STANDARDS.—The Council may certify voluntary national content, student performance, and opportunity-to-learn standards if such standards are sufficiently general to be used by any State without restricting State and local control of curriculum and prerogatives regarding instructional methods to be employed.

(f) ASSESSMENTS.—(1)(A) The Council may certify an assessment system that is submitted voluntarily by a State, using the criteria developed under paragraph (2)(A), if such system is aligned with the State's content standards certified by the Council.

(B) Assessment systems shall be certified by the Council for the purposes of—

(i) informing students, parents, teachers, and related services personnel about the progress of all students toward the standards;

(ii) improving classroom instruction and improving the learning outcomes for all students;

(iii) exemplifying for students, parents, and teachers the kinds and levels of achievement that should be expected of all students, including the identification of student performance standards;

(iv) measuring and motivating individual students, schools, districts, States, and the Nation to improve educational performance; and

(v) assisting education policymakers in making decisions about education programs.

(C) The Council shall certify an assessment system only if—

(i) the State has established or adopted opportunity-to-learn standards;

(ii) such system will not be used to make decisions regarding graduation, grade promotion, or retention of students for a period of five years from the date of enactment of this Act; and

(iii) the State has submitted—

(I) a description of the purposes for which the assessment system has been designed;

(II) the methodologies and process used to develop, select, validate, and use such assessment systems;

(III) a copy of the test instrument and, as appropriate, other measures that will make up the system; and

(IV) evidence that the test or tests which are part of the assessment system are valid, reliable measures of their intended purposes, are aligned with the State content standards, are capable of assessing the progress of all students toward learning the material in the State content standards, and are consistent with relevant nationally recognized professional and technical standards.

(D) The Council shall, at the request of a State prior to developing an assessment system for a proposed use, review and provide guidance to such State on a proposed package of measures, including tests that would be included in such a system.

(2)(A) The Council shall develop and, no sooner than three years or later than four years after the enactment of this Act, begin utilizing criteria for the certification of assessment systems for the purposes indicated in paragraph (1)(B). Before using such criteria, the Council shall forward the criteria to the Goals Panel for review, except that the Goals Panel shall have the option of disapproving such criteria by a two-thirds majority vote of the full membership not later than 60 days after receipt of such criteria.

(B) The certification criteria developed by the Council shall address the extent to which the assessment system—

(i) is aligned with State content standards certified by the Council; and

(ii) is to be used for a purpose for which it is valid, reliable, free of discrimination, and is consistent with relevant, nationally recognized professional and technical standards for assessment.

(C) In determining appropriate certification criteria, the Council shall—

(i) consider standards and criteria being developed by other national organizations, research on assessment, and emerging new State and local assessments;

(ii) recommend needed research;

(iii) encourage the development and field testing of assessment systems; and

(iv) provide a public forum for discussing, debating, and building consensus for the criteria to be used for the certification of assessment systems.

(D) Prior to determining the certification criteria, the Council shall seek public comment regarding the proposed criteria.

(E) The Council shall certify an assessment system only if such system includes all students.

(g) PERFORMANCE OF DUTIES.—In carrying out its responsibilities under this title, the Council shall—

(1) provide for a process of broad public input as part of the process of developing criteria for standards and assessments;

(2) work with Federal and non-Federal agencies and organizations which are conducting research, studies, or demonstration projects to determine internationally competitive standards and assessments, and may establish subject matter and other panels to advise it on particular content, student performance, and opportunity-to-learn standards and on assessments;

(3) shall establish cooperative arrangements with the National Skill Standards Board to promote the coordination of the development of content and student performance standards under this title with the development of skill standards under title IV of this Act;

(4) recommend studies to the Secretary that are necessary to carry out the Council's responsibilities;

(5) inform the public about what constitutes high quality, internationally competitive, content, student performance, and opportunity-to-learn standards, and assessment systems;

(6) on a regular basis, review and update criteria for certifying content, student performance, and opportunity-to-learn standards, and assessment systems; and

(7) periodically recertify, as appropriate, the voluntary national content and student performance standards, and the voluntary national opportunity-to-learn standards and the assessments that it certifies under this section.

(h) UNCONDITIONED STATE PARTICIPATION.—No State shall be required to obtain certification of standards or assessments developed under subsection (b), (d), or (f) of this section or to participate in programs under title III of this Act, as a condition of participating in any Federal education program under this or any other Act.

SEC. 214. ANNUAL REPORTS.

Not later than one year after the date the Council concludes its first meeting, and in each succeeding year, the Council shall prepare and submit a report to the President, the Secretary, the appropriate committees of Congress, the Governor of each State, and the Goals Panel regarding its work.

SEC. 215. POWERS OF THE COUNCIL.

(a) HEARINGS.—(1) The Council shall, for the purpose of carrying out its responsibilities, conduct such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence, as the Council considers appropriate.

(2) In carrying out this part, the Council shall conduct public hearings in different geographic areas of the United States, both urban and rural, to receive the reports, views, and analyses of a broad spectrum of experts and the public on the establishment of voluntary national content, student performance, and opportunity-to-learn standards, and assessment systems.

(b) INFORMATION.—The Council may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable the Council to carry out this part. Upon request of the Chairperson of the Council, the head of a department or agency shall furnish such information to the Council to the extent permitted by law.

(c) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Council may use the United States mail in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(d) USE OF FACILITIES.—The Council may, with their consent, use the research, equipment, services, and facilities of any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or of any State or political subdivision thereof.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS AND SUPPORT.—(1) The Secretary shall provide to the Council, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services as the Council may request.

(2) The Secretary shall, to the extent appropriate, and on a reimbursable basis, make contracts and other arrangements that are requested by the Council to help it compile and analyze data or carry out other functions necessary to the performance of its responsibilities.

SEC. 216. PUBLICATION FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.

(a) TRANSMITTAL.—For the purpose of obtaining public comment through publication in the Federal Register, the Council shall transmit to the Secretary—

(1) proposed criteria for certifying national and State content and performance standards;

(2) proposed criteria for certifying national and State opportunity-to-learn standards;

(3) proposed criteria for certifying State assessment systems; and

(4) proposed national content, performance, and opportunity-to-learn standards.

(b) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish such proposed procedures, standards, and criteria in the Federal Register.

SEC. 217. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) MEETINGS.—The Council shall meet on a regular basis, as necessary, at the call of the Chairperson of the Council, or a majority of its members.

(b) QUORUM.—A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(c) VOTING.—The Council shall take all action of the Council by a majority vote of the total membership of the Council, ensuring the right of the minority to issue written views. No individual may vote or exercise any of the powers of a member by proxy.

(d) PUBLIC ACCESS.—The Council shall ensure public access to its proceedings (other than proceedings, or portions of proceedings, relating to internal personnel and management matters) and make available to the public, at reasonable cost, transcripts of such proceedings.

SEC. 218. DIRECTOR AND STAFF; EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.

(a) DIRECTOR.—The Chairperson of the Council shall, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to the appointment and compensation of officers or employees of the United States, appoint a Director to be paid at a rate not to exceed the rate of basic pay payable for level V of the Executive Schedule.

(b) APPOINTMENT AND PAY OF EMPLOYEES.—(1)(A) The Director may appoint not more than four additional employees to serve as staff to the Council without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service.

(B) The employees appointed under subparagraph (A) may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, but shall not be paid a rate that exceeds the maximum rate of basic pay payable for GS-15 of the General Schedule.

(2) The Director may appoint additional employees to serve as staff of the Council consistent with title 5, United States Code.

(c) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Council may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3019(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(d) STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon the request of the Council, the head of any department or agency of the United States may detail any of the personnel of such department or agency to the Council to assist the Council in its duties under this part.

SEC. 219. OPPORTUNITY-TO-LEARN DEVELOPMENT GRANT.

(a) OPPORTUNITY-TO-LEARN DEVELOPMENT GRANT.—(1) The Secretary is authorized to make a grant, on a competitive basis, to a consortium of individuals and organizations to develop voluntary national opportunity-to-learn standards consistent with the provisions of section 213(c).

(2) To the extent possible, such consortium shall include the participation of—

(A) State-level policymakers, such as Governors, State legislators, chief State school officers, and State school board members;

(B) local policymakers and administrators, such as local school board members, superintendents, and principals;

(C) teachers (especially teachers involved in the development of content standards);

(D) parents and individuals with experience in promoting parental involvement in education;

(E) representatives of business;

(F) experts in vocational-technical education;

(G) representatives of regional accrediting associations;

(H) individuals with expertise in school finance and equity, the education of at-risk students, and the preparation and training of teachers and school administrators;

(I) curriculum and school reform experts;

(J) student and civil rights advocacy groups;

(K) representatives of higher education; and

(L) secondary school students.

(3) In developing voluntary national opportunity-to-learn standards, such consortium shall—

(A) draw upon current research about student achievement and the necessary conditions for effective teaching and learning; and

(B) provide for the development of several consecutive drafts of standards which incorporate the comments and recommendations of educators and other knowledgeable individuals across the Nation.

(4) One-third of the consortium shall consist of individuals with expertise in the educational needs and assessment of children who are from low-income families, minority backgrounds, have limited-English proficiency, or have disabilities.

(5) The membership of the consortium shall be geographically representative and reflect the racial, ethnic, and gender diversity of the United States.

(b) APPLICATIONS.—(1) Any consortium that desires to receive a grant under this subsection shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

(2) In awarding such grant, the Secretary shall give priority to applications from consortia which involve individuals and organizations with the greatest diversity of perspectives and points of view.

(3) In establishing additional priorities and selection criteria for such grant, the Secretary shall give serious consideration to the recommendations made by the Council pursuant to section 213(c)(4)(A).

(c) REPORT.—After the development of the voluntary national opportunity-to-learn standards, the consortium funded under this section shall submit a report to the Secretary which discusses the background, important issues, and rationale regarding such standards.

SEC. 220. ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION GRANTS.

(a) GENERAL.—(1) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States and local educational agencies or consortia of such agencies to help defray the cost of developing, field testing, and evaluating assessment systems, to be used for some or all of the purposes indicated in section 213(f)(1)(B), that are aligned to State content standards certified by the Council.

(2) The Secretary shall reserve a portion of the funds authorized under section 231(d) for grants to State educational agencies and local educational agencies for purposes of developing such assessments in languages other than English.

(b) APPLICATIONS.—A State, local educational agency, or consortium of such agencies that desires to receive a grant under subsection (a)(1) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—(1) A recipient of a grant under this section shall—

(A) examine the validity and reliability of an assessment system for the particular purposes for which such assessment system was developed;

(B) ensure that an assessment system is consistent with relevant, nationally recognized professional and technical standards for assessments; and

(C) devote special attention to how an assessment system, treats all students, especially with regard to the race, gender, ethnicity, disability, and language proficiency.

(2) An assessment system developed and evaluated with funds under this section may not be used for decisions about individual students relating to program placement, promotion, or retention, graduation, or employment for a period of five years from the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 221. EVALUATION.

(a) GRANT.—From funds reserved under section 304(a)(2), the Secretary annually shall make a grant, in an amount not to exceed $500,000, to the Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education of the National Academy of Sciences or to the National Academy of Education to—

(1) evaluate—

(A) the technical quality of the work performed by the Goals Panel and the Council;

(B) the process the Council uses to develop criteria for certification of standards and assessments;

(C) the process the Council uses to certify voluntary national standards as well as standards and assessments voluntarily submitted by States; and

(D) the process the Goals Panel uses to approve certification criteria and voluntary national standards;

(2) periodically provide to the Goals Panel and the Council, as appropriate, information from the evaluation under paragraph (1); and

(3) report on the activities authorized under sections 219 and 220.

(b) REPORT.—The grant recipient shall periodically report to the Congress, the Secretary, and the public regarding findings and shall make a final report not later than January 1, 1998.

PART C—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 231. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL.—There are authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the four succeeding fiscal years to carry out part A of this title.

(b) NATIONAL EDUCATION STANDARDS AND IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL.—There are authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1998 to carry out part B of this title.

(c) OPPORTUNITY-TO-LEARN DEVELOPMENT GRANT.—There are authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995 to carry out the Opportunity-to-Learn Development Grant Program established under section 219 of this title.

(d) ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION GRANTS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1998 to carry out the Assessment Development and Evaluation Grants Program established under section 220 of this title.

TITLE III—STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATION SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 301. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) all students can learn and achieve high standards and must realize their potential if the United States is to prosper;

(2) the reforms in education of the last 15 years have achieved some good results, but these efforts often have been limited to a few schools or to a single part of the educational system;

(3) leadership must come both from teachers, related services personnel, principals, and parents in individual schools and from policymakers at the local, State, tribal, and national levels, in order for lasting improvements in student performance to occur;

(4) simultaneous top-down and bottom-up education reform is necessary to spur creative and innovative approaches by individual schools to help all students achieve internationally competitive standards;

(5) strategies must be developed by communities and States to support the revitalization of all local public schools by fundamentally changing the entire system of public education through comprehensive, coherent, and coordinated improvement in order to increase student learning;

(6) parents, teachers, and other local educators, and business, community, and tribal leaders must be involved in developing systemwide improvement strategies that reflect the needs of their individual communities;

(7) State and local education improvement efforts must incorporate strategies for providing all students and families with coordinated access to appropriate social services, health care, nutrition, and child care to remove preventable barriers to learning and enhance school readiness for all students;

(8) States and local educational agencies, working together, must immediately set about developing and implementing such systemwide improvement strategies if the Nation is to educate all children to meet their full potential and achieve the National Education Goals listed in title I of this Act;

(9) State and local systemic improvement strategies must provide all students with effective mechanisms and appropriate paths to the workforce as well as to higher education;

(10) business should be encouraged to enter into partnerships with schools, provide information and guidance to schools on the needs of area business for properly educated graduates in general and on the need for particular workplace skills, that the schools may provide necessary material and support, and continue the lifelong learning process throughout the employment years of an individual, and schools should provide information to business regarding how the business community can assist schools in meeting the goals of this Act;

(11) institutions of higher education should be encouraged to enter into partnerships with schools to provide information and guidance to schools on the skills and knowledge graduates need in order to enter and successfully complete postsecondary education, and schools should provide information and guidance to institutions of higher education on the skills, knowledge, and preservice training teachers need, and the types of professional development educators need in order to meet the goals of this Act;

(12) the appropriate and innovative use of technology, including distance learning, can be very effective in helping to bring all students the opportunity to learn and meet high standards; and

(13) Federal funds should be targeted to support local and State initiatives, and to leverage State and local resources for designing and implementing system-wide improvement plans.

SEC. 302. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to improve the quality of education for all students by improving student learning through a long-term, broad-based effort to promote coherent and coordinated improvements in the system of education throughout the Nation at the local and State levels. This title provides new authorities and funding for the Nation's school systems without replacing or reducing funding for existing Federal education programs. It is the intention of the Congress that no State or local educational agency will reduce its funding for education or for education reform on account of receiving any funds under this title.

SEC. 303. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

For the purpose of carrying out this title, there are authorized to be appropriated $393,000,000 for the fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1998.

SEC. 304. ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS.

(a) RESERVATIONS OF FUNDS.—From funds appropriated under section 303, the Secretary—

(1) shall reserve a total of one percent to provide assistance, in amounts determined by the Secretary—

(A) to the outlying areas; and

(B) to the Secretary of the Interior to benefit Indian students in schools operated or funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (referred to in this Act as the "Bureau"); and

(2) may reserve a total of up to 6 percent for—

(A) national leadership activities under section 313;

(B) the costs of peer review of State improvement plans and applications under this title; and

(C) evaluation activities under section 221.

(b) STATE ALLOTMENTS.—The Secretary shall allot the remaining amount appropriated under section 303 for each fiscal year to the States (which for the purposes of this subsection does not include the outlying areas) as follows:

(1) 50 percent of such remaining amount shall be allocated in accordance with the relative amounts such State received under chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for the preceding fiscal year.

(2) 50 percent of such remaining amount shall be allocated in accordance with the relative amounts each such State received under part A of chapter 2 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for the preceding fiscal year.

(c) REALLOTMENTS.—If the Secretary determines that any amount of a State's allotment for any fiscal year under subsection (b) will not be needed for such fiscal year by the State, the Secretary shall reallot such amount to other States that need additional funds, in such manner as the Secretary determines is appropriate.

SEC. 305. STATE APPLICATIONS.

(a) GENERAL.—(1) If a State desires to receive a grant under this title, the State educational agency shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may determine.

(2) In addition to the information described in subsections (b) and (c), each such application shall include—

(A) an assurance that the State educational agency will cooperate with the Secretary in carrying out the Secretary's responsibilities under section 312, and will comply with reasonable requests of the Secretary for data related to the State's progress in developing and implementing its State improvement plan under this title;

(B) an assurance that State law provides adequate authority to carry out each component of the State's improvement plan developed, or to be developed under section 306, or that such authority will be sought;

(C) an assurance that the standards developed for student achievement are not less rigorous than student achievement standards used prior to the date of enactment of this Act;

(D) an assurance that the State will provide for broad public participation in the planning process; and

(E) such other assurances and information as the Secretary may require.

(b) FIRST YEAR.—A State's application for the first year of assistance under this title shall—

(1) describe the process by which the State will develop a school improvement plan that meets the requirements of section 306; and

(2) describe how the State educational agency will use funds received under this title for such year, including how the State educational agency will make subgrants to local educational agencies and for teacher training.

(c) SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—A State's second application under this title shall—

(1) cover the second through fifth years of its participation;

(2) include a copy of the State's improvement plan that meets the requirements of section 306 or, if the State plan is not complete, a statement of the steps it will take to complete the plan and a schedule for doing so; and

(3) include an explanation of how the State will use funds received under this title, including how it will make subgrants to local educational agencies and for teacher training under section 309(b)(1).

SEC. 306. STATE IMPROVEMENT PLANS.

(a) BASIC SCOPE OF PLAN.—Any State educational agency that wishes to receive a grant under this title after its first year of participation shall develop and implement a plan for the fundamental restructuring and improvement of elementary and secondary education in the State. This plan must address—

(1) in accordance with subsection (c), the establishment or adoption of challenging content and student performance standards for all students and the use of curricula, instructional practices, assessments, technology, parental involvement programs, and professional preparation and development approaches appropriate to help all students reach such standards;

(2) in accordance with subsection (d), the establishment or adoption of opportunity-to-learn standards that will define the conditions of teaching and learning that provide all students the opportunity to meet the challenging content and student performance standards;

(3) in accordance with subsection (e), needed changes in the governance and management of the education system in order to effectively focus schools on, and assist them in, preparing all students to meet the challenging State standards;

(4) in accordance with subsection (f), comprehensive strategies to involve communities, including parents, businesses, libraries, institutions of higher education, employment and training agencies, health and human service agencies, advocacy groups, cultural institutions, and other public and private agencies that provide social services, health care, child care, early childhood education, and nutrition to students, in helping all students meet the challenging State standards;

(5) in accordance with subsection (g), strategies for ensuring that all local educational agencies and schools within the State are involved in developing and implementing needed improvements within a specified period of time;

(6) in accordance with subsection (h), strategies for ensuring that comprehensive, systemic reform is promoted from the bottom up in communities, local educational agencies, and schools; and

(7) the needs of the children, ages 5 through 18, who are out of school and the extent to which such children can be brought back into the education system and meet the standards set forth in this Act.

(b) PLAN DEVELOPMENT.—(1) A State improvement plan under this title must be developed by a broad-based panel (referred to in this title as the "panel") in cooperation with the State educational agency and the Governor. The panel shall include—

(A) the Governor and the chief State school officer, or their designees;

(B) the chairman of the State board of education and the chairmen of the appropriate authorizing committees of the State legislature, or their designees;

(C) teachers, principals, and administrators who have successfully improved student performance and deans of colleges of education;

(D) representatives of teacher organizations, parents, institutions of higher education, business and labor leaders, community-based organizations, Indian tribes, local boards of education, State and local officials responsible for health, social services, and other related services, and others, as appropriate;

(E) representatives from rural and urban local educational agencies in the State; and

(F) experts in educational measurement and assessment.

(2) The Governor and the chief State school officer shall each appoint half the members of the State panel. The full panel shall establish the procedures regarding the operation of the panel, including the designation of the panel chairperson.

(3) To the extent feasible, the membership of the panel shall be geographically representative of the State and reflect the diversity of the population of the State with regard to race, ethnicity, gender, and disability characteristics.

(4) One-third of the panel members shall be individuals with expertise in the educational needs and assessments of children who are from low-income families, minority group backgrounds, have limited-English proficiency, or have disabilities.

(5) The panel shall consult the Governor, the chief State school officer, the State board of education, and relevant committees of the State legislature in developing the plan.

(6) The panel shall be responsible for conducting a statewide, grassroots outreach process, including conducting public hearings, to involve educators, related services personnel, parents, secondary school students, local officials, private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools, community and business leaders, Indian tribes, citizens, children's advocates, and others with a stake in the success of students and their education system, and who are representative of the diversity of the State and its student population, in the development of the State plan and in a continuing dialog regarding the need for and nature of challenging standards for all students and local and State responsibilities for helping all students achieve them.

(7) The panel shall develop a continuing process for interacting with local educational agencies and individual schools engaged in systemic reform, especially including local educational agencies and schools which receive subgrants under section 309 of this Act, to ensure that the development and implementation of the State plan reflects their needs and experiences.

(8) The panel shall develop a State plan, provide opportunity for public comment, and submit the State plan to the State educational agency for approval.

(9) The State educational agency shall submit the original State improvement plan developed by the panel and the State improvement plan if modified by such agency, together with an explanation of any changes made by such agency to the plan developed by the panel, to the Secretary for approval.

(10) If any portion of the State plan addresses matters that, under State or other applicable law, are not under the authority of the State educational agency, the State educational agency shall obtain the approval of, or changes to, such portion, with an explanation from the Governor or other official responsible for that portion before submitting the plan to the Secretary.

(11) After approval of the State plan by the Secretary, the panel, in close consultation with teachers, principals, administrators, school boards, advocacy groups, advocates of children with disabilities and parents in local educational agencies and schools receiving funds under this title, shall monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the State plan to determine if revisions are appropriate, and shall periodically report its findings to the public.

(c) TEACHING, LEARNING, STANDARDS, AND ASSESSMENTS.—Each State plan shall establish strategies and a timetable for improving teaching and learning, including—

(1) a process for developing or adopting challenging content and student performance standards for all students which includes coordinating the standards developed pursuant to section 115 of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990;

(2) a process for providing assistance and support to local educational agencies and schools to give them the capacity and responsibility to provide all students the opportunity to increase education achievement and meet challenging State content and student performance standards;

(3) assessing the effectiveness and equity of the school finance program of the State to identify disparities in the resources available to each local educational agency and school in such State and how such disparities affect the ability of the State educational agency and local educational agencies to develop and implement plans under this title;

(4) a process for developing, adopting, or recommending instructional materials, including gender equitable and multicultural materials, and technology to support and assist local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to meet the challenging State content and student performance standards;

(5) a process for developing and implementing a valid and nondiscriminatory assessment system or set of locally-based assessment systems which are consistent with relevant, nationally recognized, professional and technical standards for assessment, and are capable of providing coherent information about student attainments relative to the State content standards;

(6) a process for monitoring the implementation of such system or systems and the impact on improved instruction for all students;

(7) a process for improving the State's system of teacher and school administrator preparation, licensure, and continuing professional development so that all teachers, related services personnel, and administrators develop the subject matter and pedagogical expertise needed to prepare all students to meet the challenging standards under paragraph (1);

(8) a process for providing appropriate and effective professional development, including the use of technology, distance learning, and gender-equitable methods, necessary for teachers, school administrators, and others to help all students meet the challenging standards under paragraph (1); and

(9) a process to ensure widespread participation of classroom teachers in developing the portions of the plan described in this subsection.

(d) OPPORTUNITY-TO-LEARN STANDARDS.—Each State plan shall establish a strategy and timetable for—

(1) adopting or establishing opportunity-to-learn standards that are consistent with the challenging content and student performance standards that have been adopted or established;

(2) ensuring that every school in the State is making demonstrable progress toward meeting the State's opportunity-to-learn standards;

(3) ensuring that the State's opportunity-to-learn standards address the need of all students;

(4) providing for periodic assessments of the extent to which opportunity-to-learn standards are being met throughout the State; and

(5) periodically reporting to the public on the extent of the State's improvement in achieving such standards and providing all students with a fair opportunity to achieve the knowledge and skill levels that meet the State's content and student performance standards.

(e) GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT.—Each State plan shall establish strategies for improved governance and management of its education system, such as—

(1) aligning responsibility, authority, and accountability throughout the education system, so that decisions regarding content and student performance standards are coordinated and decisions regarding the means for achieving such standards are made closest to the learners;

(2) creating an integrated and coherent approach to attracting, recruiting, preparing and licensing, appraising, rewarding, retaining, and supporting the continued professional development of teachers (including vocational teachers), administrators, and other educators, including bilingual educators and special education providers, so that there is a highly talented workforce of professional educators capable of preparing all students to reach challenging standards, with special attention to the recruitment, training, and retention of qualified minorities into the education profession within the State to ensure that the profession reflects the racial and ethnic diversity of the student population;

(3) providing incentives for high performance, such as—

(A) working with employers and institutions of higher education to devise strategies to reward student achievement;

(B) incentives for classroom teachers, principals, and other professional educators to participate in professional development activities; and

(C) school-based incentives for schools and local educational agencies to improve student performance;

(4) increasing the proportion of State and local funds allocated to direct instructional purposes; and

(5) increasing flexibility for local educational agencies and schools by, for example—

(A) waiving State regulations and other requirements that impede educational improvement;

(B) focusing accountability on educational outcomes rather than monitoring compliance with input requirements; and

(C) fostering conditions that allow teachers, principals, and parents in the school community to be creative in helping all students meet challenging standards.

(f) PARENTAL AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND INVOLVEMENT.—Each State plan shall describe strategies for how the State will involve parents and other community members in planning, designing, and implementing its plan, including such strategies as—

(1) educating the public about the need for higher standards, systemic improvement, and awareness of diverse learning needs;

(2) involving parents, communities, and advocacy groups in the standard-setting and improvement process;

(3) linking the family and school in supporting students to meet the challenging student content and performance standards established;

(4) reporting, on an ongoing basis, to parents, educators, and the public on the progress in implementing the plan and improving student performance;

(5) focusing public and private community resources and public school resources on prevention and early intervention to address the needs of all students by—

(A) identifying and removing unnecessary regulations and obstacles to coordination;

(B) improving communication and information exchange; and

(C) providing appropriate training to agency personnel; and

(6) increasing the access of all students to social services, health care, nutrition, related services, and child care services, and locating such services in schools, cooperating service agencies, community-based centers, or other convenient sites designed to provide "one-stop shopping" for parents and students.

(g) MAKING THE IMPROVEMENTS SYSTEMWIDE.—To help provide all students throughout the State the opportunity to meet challenging State standards, each State plan shall describe strategies such as—

(1) ensuring that the improvement efforts expand from the initial local educational agencies, schools, and educators involved to all local educational agencies, schools, and educators in the State education system through such approaches as teacher and administrator professional development, technical assistance, whole school projects, intensive summer training, and networking of teachers and other educators, consortia of schools, and local educational agencies undertaking similar improvements;

(2) developing partnerships among preschools, elementary and secondary schools, institutions of higher education, cultural institutions, health and social service providers, and employers to improve teaching and learning at all levels of the education system for all students and to foster collaboration and continuous improvement;

(3) strategies to provide for the close coordination of standards development and improvement efforts among institutions of higher education and secondary, and elementary schools;

(4) conducting parental involvement activities and outreach programs aimed at parents whose language is a language other than English, individuals with disabilities, and other special populations, including American Indians, Alaskan Natives, and Native Hawaiians, to involve all segments of the community in the development of the State plan;

(5) developing partnerships with Indian tribes and schools funded by the Bureau, where appropriate, to improve consistency and compatibility in curriculum among public and such schools funded by the Bureau at all grade levels;

(6) allocating all available local, State, and Federal resources to achieve system-wide improvement;

(7) providing for the development of objective criteria and measures against which the success of local plans will be evaluated;

(8) providing for the availability of curricular materials, learning technologies, including distance learning, and professional development in a manner ensuring equal access by all local educational agencies in the State;

(9) taking steps to ensure that all local educational agencies, schools, and educators in the State benefit from successful programs and practices supported by funds made available to local educational agencies and schools under this title; and

(10) providing assistance to students, teachers, schools, and local educational agencies that are identified through the assessment system developed under subsection (c)(5) as needing such assistance.

(h) PROMOTING BOTTOM-UP REFORM.—Each State plan shall include strategies for ensuring that comprehensive, systemic reform is promoted from the bottom up in communities, local educational agencies, and schools, as well as guided by coordination and facilitation from State leaders, including strategies such as—

(1) ensuring that the State plan is responsive to the needs and experiences of local educational agencies, schools, teachers, the community, and parents;

(2) establishing mechanisms for continuous input from local schools, communities, advocacy groups, institutions of higher education, and local educational agencies into, and feedback on, the implementation of the State plan;

(3) providing discretionary resources that enable teachers and schools to purchase needed professional development and other forms of assistance consistent with their improvement plan from high-quality providers of their choice;

(4) establishing collaborative networks of teachers centered on content standards and assessments for the purpose of improving teaching and learning;

(5) providing flexibility to individual schools and local educational agencies to enable them to adapt and integrate State content standards into courses of study appropriate for individual schools and communities;

(6) facilitating the provision of waivers from State rules and regulations that impede the ability of local educational agencies or schools to carry out local education improvement plans; and

(7) facilitating communication among educators within and between local educational agencies for the purpose of sharing innovative and effective practices, including, through the use of telecommunications, distance learning, site visits, and other means.

(i) COORDINATION WITH SCHOOL-TO-WORK PROGRAMS.—If a State has received Federal assistance for the purpose of planing for, expanding, or establishing a school-to-work program, then a State shall include in the State plan a description of how such school-to-work program will be incorporated into the school reform efforts of the State. In particular, the State plan shall include a description of how secondary schools will be modified in order to provide career guidance, the integration of academic and vocational education, and work-based learning, if such programs are proposed in the State's school-to-work plan.

(j) BENCHMARKS AND TIMELINES.—Each State plan shall include specific benchmarks of improved student performance and of progress in implementing the improvement plan, and timelines against which the progress of the State in carrying out its plan, including the elements described in subsections (c) through (h), can be measured.

(k) COORDINATING STRATEGIES.—Each State plan shall include strategies for coordinating the integration of academic and vocational instruction pursuant to the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act.

(l) PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—Each State shall describe—

(1) how the State will monitor progress towards implementing the State and local plans; and

(2) procedures the State will use to ensure schools and school districts meet State opportunity-to-learn and content standards within the established time lines.

(m) PEER REVIEW AND SECRETARIAL APPROVAL.—(1) The Secretary shall review each State improvement plan prepared under this section, and each application submitted under section 305, with the assistance and advice of State and local education policymakers, educators, classroom teachers, related services personnel, experts on educational innovation and improvement, parents, advocates for children with disabilities, representatives of other advocacy groups, and other appropriate individuals. The peer review process shall be performed by individuals representative of the diversity of the United States with regard to geography, race, ethnicity, gender, and disability. The review of each State plan shall include at least one site visit to each State.

(2) The Secretary shall approve a State's plan when the Secretary determines, after considering the peer reviewers' comment, that it—

(A) reflects a widespread commitment within the State;

(B) holds reasonable promise of enabling all students to achieve at the high levels called for by this Act;

(C) meets the requirements of subsections (a) through (k); and

(D) allows local schools, local educational agencies and communities the flexibility to implement local improvement plans in a manner which reflects local needs and requirements in order to promote a 'bottom up' system of school reform.

(3) The Secretary shall not decline to approve a State's plan, or any State application submitted under section 305, before offering the State—

(A) an opportunity to revise its plan or application; and

(B) a hearing.

(n) REGULAR REVIEW.—Each State plan shall include a process for regularly reviewing and updating any State content, student performance, and opportunity-to-learn standards and assessment systems.

(o) AMENDMENTS TO PLAN.—(1) Each State shall periodically review its plan and revise it, as appropriate, in accordance with the process described in subsection (b).

(2) The Secretary shall review major amendments to a State's plan through the same process, described in subsection (j), used to review the original plan.

(p) PREEXISTING STATE PLANS AND PANELS.—(1) If a State has developed a comprehensive and systemic improvement plan to help all students meet challenging standards, or any component of such a plan, that otherwise meets the requirements of this section, the Secretary may approve such plan or component notwithstanding that it was not developed in accordance with subsection (b), if the Secretary determines that such approval would further the purposes of State systemic education improvement.

(2) If, before the enactment of this Act, a State has made substantial progress in developing a plan that otherwise meets, or is likely to meet, the requirements of this section, but was developed by a panel that does not meet the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (b), the Secretary may, at the request of the Governor and the State educational agency, treat such panel as meeting the requirements of this title if the Secretary determines that there has been statewide involvement of educators, parents, students, advocacy groups, other interested members of the public in the development of the plan.

SEC. 307. SECRETARY'S REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS; PAYMENTS.

(a) FIRST YEAR.—The Secretary shall approve the initial year application of a State educational agency under section 305(b) if the Secretary determines that—

(1) such application meets the requirements of this title; and

(2) there is a substantial likelihood that the renewal application of the State will be able to develop and implement an education improvement plan that complies with section 306.

(b) SECOND THROUGH FIFTH YEARS.—The Secretary shall approve a renewal application of a State educational agency under section 305(c) for the second through fifth years only if—

(1)(A) the Secretary has approved the State's improvement plan under section 306(1); or

(B) the Secretary determines that the State has made substantial progress in developing such plan; and

(2) such application meets the other requirements of this title.

(c) PAYMENTS.—For any fiscal year for which a State has an approved application under this title, the Secretary shall make a grant to the State educational agency in the amount determined under section 304(b).

SEC. 308. STATE USE OF FUNDS.

(a) FIRST YEAR.—In the first year for which a State educational agency receives a grant under this title, the State—

(1) shall use at least 75 percent of such funds to make subgrants, in accordance with section 309(a), to local educational agencies for the development or implementation of local improvement plans and to make subgrants, in accordance with section 309(b), to improve educator preservice programs and for professional development activities consistent with the State plan, if the amount allocated to States under section 304(b) for such year is at least $50,000,000. The State may use such funds for such subgrants if such amount is less than $50,000,000; and

(2) shall use the remainder of such funds to develop, revise, expand, or implement an education improvement plan described in section 306.

(b) SUCCEEDING YEARS.—A State that receives assistance under this title for any year after the first year of participation shall—

(1) use at least 90 percent of such assistance in each succeeding year to make subgrants—

(A) to local educational agencies, in accordance with section 309(a), for the implementation of the State improvement plan and of local improvement plans; and

(B) in accordance with section 309(b), to improve educator preservice programs and for professional development activities that are consistent with the State improvement plan; and

(2) use the remainder of such assistance for State activities designed to implement its improvement plan, such as—

(A) supporting the development or adoption of State content and student performance standards, State opportunity-to-learn standards, and assessments linked to the standards, including through consortia of States, and in conjunction with the National Education Standards and Improvement Council established under part B of title II of this Act;

(B) supporting the implementation of high-performance management and organizational strategies, such as site-based management, shared decisionmaking, or quality management principles, to promote effective implementation of such plan;

(C) supporting the development and implementation, at the local educational agency and school building level, of improved human resource development systems for recruiting, selecting, mentoring, supporting, evaluating, and rewarding educators;

(D) providing special attention to the needs of minority, limited-English proficient, disabled, and female students, including instructional programs and activities that encourage such students in elementary and secondary schools to aspire to enter post secondary education or training;

(E) supporting the development, at the State or local level, of performance-based accountability and incentive systems for schools;

(F) outreach related to education improvement to parents, Indian tribal officials, classroom teachers, related services personnel, and other educators, and the public;

(G) providing technical assistance and other services to increase the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to develop and implement local systemic improvement plans, implement new assessments, and develop curricula consistent with the content and student performance standards of the State;

(H) promoting public magnet schools, public "charter schools", and other mechanisms for increasing choice among public schools; and

(I) collecting and analyzing data.

(c) LIMIT ON ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—In each year, a State may use not more than four percent of its annual allotment under this title, or $100,000, whichever is greater, for administrative expenses, not including the activities of the panel established under section 306(b)(1).

SEC. 309. SUBGRANTS FOR LOCAL REFORM AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

(a) SUBGRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—(1)(A) Each State educational agency shall make subgrants to local educational agencies (or consortia of such agencies) consistent with subsections (a)(1) and (b)(1)(A) of section 308 through a competitive process.

(B) In making such subgrants, the State educational agency shall award not less than 1 subgrant in each fiscal year to an urban local educational agency and not less than 1 subgrant in each fiscal year to a rural local educational agency, except that this provision shall not apply to the District of Columbia. Rural local educational agencies may include or be represented as a fiscal agent by an education service agency.

(C) Each subgrant shall be for a project of sufficient duration and of sufficient size, scope, and quality to carry out the purpose of this title effectively.

(2) A local educational agency wishing to receive a subgrant under this title for the purpose of developing a comprehensive local plan shall submit an application to the State educational agency. Such application shall contain assurances that the local educational agency intends to develop a plan that meets the requirements of this section.

(3) Each local educational agency wishing to receive a subgrant for the purpose of implementing a plan under this subsection shall submit a local plan to the State educational agency which—

(A) is developed by a broad-based panel that—

(i) is appointed by the local educational agency and is representative of the diversity of students and community with regard to race, language, ethnicity, gender, disability, and socioeconomic characteristics and includes teachers, parents, advocacy groups, school administrators, business representatives, and others, as appropriate; and

(ii) shall, following the selection of its members, establish the procedures regarding the operation of the panel, including the designation of the chairperson;

(B) includes a comprehensive local plan for districtwide education improvement, directed at enabling all students to meet the challenging content and student performance standards of the State, including specific goals and benchmarks, consistent with the State improvement plan (either approved or under development) and includes a strategy for—

(i) implementing opportunity-to-learn standards;

(ii) improving teaching and learning;

(iii) improving governance and management;

(iv) generating and strengthening parental and community involvement; and

(v) expanding improvements throughout the local educational agency;

(C) promotes the flexibility of local schools in developing plans which address the particular needs of their school and community and are consistent with the local plan;

(D) describes a process of broad-based community participation in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the local plan;

(E) describes how the local educational agency will encourage and assist schools to develop comprehensive school improvement plans that focus on helping all students reach challenging content and student performance standards and that address relevant elements of the improvement plan of the local educational agency identified in subparagraph (B);

(F) describes how the local educational agency will implement specific programs aimed at ensuring improvements in school readiness and the ability of students to learn effectively at all grade levels by identifying the most pressing needs facing students and their families with regard to social services, health care, nutrition, and child care, and by entering into partnerships with public and private agencies to increase the access of students and families to coordinated services in a school setting or at a nearby site;

(G) describes how the subgrant will be used by the local educational agency, and the procedures to be used to make funds available to schools in accordance with paragraph (6)(A);

(H) identifies, with an explanation, any State or Federal requirements that the local educational agency believes impede educational improvement and that such local educational agency requests be waived in accordance with section 311 (such requests shall promptly be transmitted to the Secretary by the State educational agency); and

(I) contains such other information as the State educational agency may reasonably require.

(4) A local educational agency which has approved a local plan shall submit such plan to the State for approval together with a description of modifications to such plan and any comments from the local panel regarding such plan.

(5) The panel appointed under paragraph (3)(A) shall, after approval by the State educational agency of the application of the local educational agency, monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the local improvement plan in close consultation with teachers, related services personnel, principals, administrators, community members, and parents from schools receiving funds under this title, to determine if revisions to the local plan should be recommended to the local educational agency. The panel shall make public its findings.

(6)(A) A local educational agency that receives a subgrant under this subsection shall—

(i) in the first year, use not more than 25 percent of subgrant funds to develop a local improvement plan or to implement any local educational activities approved by the State educational agency which are reasonably related to carrying out the State or local improvement plans, and not less than 75 percent of such funds to support individual school improvement initiatives directly related to providing all students in the school

the opportunity to meet challenging State content and student performance standards; and

(ii) in subsequent years, use subgrant funds for any activities approved by the State educational agency which are reasonably related to carrying out the State or local improvement plans, except that at least 85 percent of such funds shall be made available to individual schools to develop and implement comprehensive school improvement plans which are tailored to meet the needs of their particular student populations and are designed to help all students meet challenging State content standards.

(B) At least 50 percent of the funds made available by a local educational agency to individual schools under this section in any fiscal year shall be made available to schools with a special need for such assistance, as indicated by a high number or percentage of students from low-income families, low student achievement, or other similar criteria developed by the local educational agency.

(C) A local educational agency may not use more than five percent of its annual allotment under this Act for administrative expenses.

(7) The State educational agency shall give priority in awarding a subgrant to—

(A) a consortium of local educational agencies; or

(B) a local educational agency that makes assurances that funds will be used to assist a consortium of schools that has developed a plan for school improvement.

(b) SUBGRANTS FOR PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.—(1)(A) Each State educational agency shall make subgrants to consortia of local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, private nonprofit organizations, or combinations thereof, consistent with subsections (a)(1) and (b)(1) of section 308 through a competitive, peer-reviewed process to—

(i) improve preservice teacher education programs consistent with the State plan, including how to work effectively with parents and the community; and

(ii) support continuing, sustained professional development activities for educators which will increase student learning and are consistent with the State plan.

(B)(i) In order to apply for a subgrant described in subparagraph (A)(i), a consortium must include at least one local educational agency and at least one institution of higher education.

(ii) In order to apply for a subgrant described in subparagraph (A)(ii), a consortium must include at least one local educational agency.

(2) A consortium that wishes to receive a subgrant under this subsection shall submit an application to the State educational agency which—

(A) describes how the applicant will use the subgrant to improve teacher preservice and school administrator education programs or to implement educator professional development activities consistent with the State plan;

(B) identifies the criteria to be used by the applicant to judge improvements in preservice education or the effects of professional development activities consistent with the State plan; and

(C) contains any other information that the State educational agency determines is appropriate.

(3) A recipient of a subgrant under this subsection shall use the subgrant funds for activities supporting—

(A) the improvement of preservice teacher education and school administrator programs so that such programs equip educators with the subject matter and pedagogical expertise necessary for preparing all students to meet challenging standards; or

(B) the development and implementation of new and improved forms of continuing and sustained professional development opportunities for teachers, principals, and other educators at the school or district level that equip educators with such expertise, and with other knowledge and skills necessary for leading and participating in continuous education improvement.

(4) A recipient may use the subgrant funds under this subsection for costs related to release time for teachers to participate in professional development activities.

(5) Professional development shall include related services personnel as appropriate.

(6) In awarding subgrants under this subsection, the State educational agency shall give priority to local educational agencies that form partnerships with collegiate educators to establish professional development school sites.

(c) SPECIAL AWARD RULE.—(1) Each State educational agency shall award at least 50 percent of subgrant funds under subsection (a) in each fiscal year to local educational agencies that have a greater percentage or number of disadvantaged children than the statewide average percentage or number for all local educational agencies in the State.

(2) The State educational agency may waive the requirement of paragraph (1) if such State does not receive a sufficient number of applications to comply with such requirement.

SEC. 310. AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION AND TRAINING.

(a) INFORMATION AND TRAINING.—Proportionate to the number of children in a State or in a local educational agency who are enrolled in private elementary or secondary schools—

(1) a State educational agency or local educational agency which uses funds under this title to develop goals, content standards, curricular materials, and assessments shall, upon request, make information related to such goals, standards, materials, and assessments available to private schools; and

(2) a State educational agency or local educational agency which uses funds under this title for teacher and administrator training shall provide in its plan for the training of teachers and administrators in private schools located in the geographical area served by such agency.

(b) WAIVER.—If, by reason of any provision of law, a State or local educational agency is prohibited from providing for the equitable participation of teachers and administrators from private schools in training programs assisted with Federal funds provided under this title, or if the Secretary determines that a State or local educational agency has substantially failed or is unwilling to provide for such participation, the Secretary shall waive such requirements and shall arrange for the provision of training consistent with State goals and content standards for such teachers and administrators. Such waivers shall be subject to consultation, withholding, notice, and judicial review in accordance with section 1017 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

SEC. 311. WAIVERS OF STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) GENERAL.—(1) Except as provided in subsection (c), the Secretary may waive any requirement of any statute listed in subsection (b) or of the regulations issued under such statute for a State educational agency, local educational agency, or school that requests such a waiver—

(A) if, and only to the extent that, the Secretary determines that such requirement impedes the ability of the State, or of a local educational agency or school in the State, to carry out the State or local education improvement plan;

(B) if the State educational agency has waived, or agrees to waive, similar requirements of State law; and

(C) if, in the case of a Statewide waiver, the State educational agency—

(i) provides all local educational agencies and parent organizations in the State with notice and an opportunity to comment on the proposal of the State educational agency to seek a waiver; and

(ii) submits the comments of such agencies to the Secretary.

(2) To request a waiver, a State educational agency, local educational agency, or school that receives funds under this Act or a local educational agency that does not receive funds under this Act but is undertaking school reform efforts that meet the objectives of the State plan, shall submit an application to the Secretary that includes—

(A) the identification of statutory or regulatory requirements that are requested to be waived and the goals that the State local educational agency or school intends to achieve;

(B) a description of the action that the State has undertaken to remove State statutory or regulatory barriers identified in the applications of local educational agencies;

(C) a description of the goals of the waiver and the expected programmatic outcomes if the request is granted;

(D) the numbers and types of students to be impacted by such waiver;

(E) a timetable for implementing a waiver; and

(F) the process the State will use to monitor, on a biannual basis, the progress in implementing a waiver.

(3) The Secretary shall act promptly on a waiver request and state in writing the reasons for granting or denying such request. If a waiver is granted, the Secretary must also include the expected outcome of granting such waiver.

(4) The Secretary's decision shall be—

(A) published in the Federal Register; and

(B) disseminated by the State educational agency to interested parties, including educators, parents, students, advocacy and civil rights organizations, other interested parties, and the public.

(5) Each such waiver shall be for a period not to exceed three years. The Secretary may extend such period if the Secretary determines that the waiver has been effective in enabling the State or affected local educational agencies to carry out reform plans.

(b) INCLUDED PROGRAMS.—The statutes subject to the waiver authority of this section are as follows:

(1) Chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(2) Part A of chapter 2 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(3) The Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act (part A of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965).

(4) The Emergency Immigrant Education Act of 1984 (part D of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965).

(5) The Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1986 (title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965).

(6) The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act.

(c) WAIVERS NOT AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may not waive any statutory or regulatory requirement of the programs listed in subsection (b) relating to—

(1) maintenance of effort;

(2) comparability of services;

(3) the equitable participation of students and professional staff in private schools;

(4) parental participation and involvement; or

(5) the distribution of funds to State or to local educational agencies.

(d) TERMINATION OF WAIVERS.—The Secretary shall periodically review the performance of any State, local educational agency, or school for which the Secretary has granted a waiver and shall terminate the waiver if the performance of the State, the local educational agency, or the school in the area affected by the waiver has been inadequate to justify a continuation of the waiver.

SEC. 312. PROGRESS REPORTS.

(a) STATE REPORTS TO THE SECRETARY.—Each State educational agency that receives funds under this title shall annually report to the Secretary regarding—

(1) progress in meeting State goals and plans;

(2) proposed State activities for the succeeding year; and

(3) in summary form, the progress of local educational agencies in meeting local goals and plans and increasing student learning.

(b) SECRETARY'S REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—By April 30, 1996, and every two years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate describing the activities and outcomes of grants under—

(1) section 220 of this Act, including—

(A) a description of the purpose, uses, and technical merit of assessments evaluated with funds under such section; and

(B) an analysis of the impact of such assessments on the performance of all students, particularly students of different racial, gender, ethnic, language groups, or individuals with disabilities; and

(2) this title, including a description of the effect of waivers granted under section 311.

SEC. 313. NATIONAL LEADERSHIP.

(a) ACTIVITIES AUTHORIZED.—From funds reserved each year under section 304(a)(2)(A), the Secretary shall, through the Office of Educational Research and Improvement in accordance with the provisions of sections 405 and 406 of the General Education Provisions Act, directly or through grants or contracts—

(1) provide technical assistance to States and local educational agencies developing or implementing school improvement plans, in a manner that ensures that each such State has access to such assistance;

(2) gather data on, conduct research on, and evaluate systemic education improvement, including the programs authorized by this title;

(3) disseminate research findings and other information on systemic education improvement and how it affects student learning;

(4) provide grants to tribal divisions of education for coordination efforts between school reform plans developed for schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and public schools described in section 306(g)(5), including tribal activities in support of plans; and

(5) support national demonstration projects that unite local and State educational agencies, institutions of higher education, government, business, and labor in collaborative arrangements in order to make educational improvements systemwide.

(b) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—(1) The Secretary shall use at least 50 percent of the funds reserved each year under section 304(a)(2)(A) to make grants, consistent with the provisions of section 309(a) that the Secretary finds appropriate, and provide technical and other assistance to urban and rural local educational agencies with large numbers or concentrations of students who are economically disadvantaged or who have limited English proficiency, to assist such agencies in developing and implementing local school improvement plans.

(2) The Secretary shall use not less than $1,000,000 of the funds reserved the first year under section 304(a)(2)(A) to survey coordinated services programs that have been found to be successful in helping students and families and improving student outcomes, and shall disseminate information about such programs to schools that plan to develop coordinated services programs.

SEC. 314. ASSISTANCE TO THE OUTLYING AREAS AND TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

(a) OUTLYING AREAS.—(1) Funds reserved for outlying areas under section 304(a)(1)(A) shall be distributed among such areas by the Secretary according to relative need.

(2) The provisions of Public Law 95–134, permitting the consolidation of grants to the insular areas, shall not apply to funds received by such areas under this title.

(b) SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The funds reserved to the Secretary of the Interior under section 304 shall be made in a payment which shall be pursuant to an agreement between the Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior containing such assurances and terms as the Secretary determines shall best achieve the provisions of this section and this Act. The agreement shall, at a minimum, contain assurances that—

(A) a panel, as set forth in paragraph (4) of this subsection, shall be established;

(B) a reform and improvement plan, designed to increase student learning and assist students in meeting the National Education Goals, meeting the requirements pertaining to State improvement plans required in section 306 and providing for the fundamental restructuring and improvement of elementary and secondary education in schools funded by the Bureau, shall be developed by such panel; and

(C) the provisions and activities required under State improvement plans, including the requirements for timetables for opportunity-to-learn standards, shall be carried out in the same time frames and under the same conditions stipulated for the States in sections 305 and 306, provided that for these purposes, the term 'local educational agencies' shall be interpreted to mean 'schools funded by the Bureau'.

(2) VOLUNTARY SUBMISSION.—The provisions applicable to the States in section 213 of this Act shall apply to the Bureau plan with regard to voluntary submission of standards and assessment systems to the National Education Standards and Improvement Council for review and certification.

(3) PLAN SPECIFICS.—The reform and improvement plan shall include, in addition to the requirements referenced above, specific provisions for—

(A) opportunity to learn standards pertaining to residential programs and transportation costs associated with programs located on or near reservations or serving students in off-reservation residential boarding schools;

(B) review and incorporation of the National Education Goals and the voluntary national content, student performance, and opportunity-to-learn standards developed under part B of title II of this Act, provided that such review shall include the issues of cultural and language differences; and

(C) provision for coordination of the efforts of the Bureau with the efforts for school improvement of the States and local educational agencies in which the schools funded by the Bureau are located, to include, but not be limited to, the development of the partnerships outlined in section 306(g)(5) of the Act.

(4) PANEL.—To carry out the provisions of this section, and to develop the plan for system-wide reform and improvement required under the agreement required under paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Interior shall establish a panel coordinated by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs. Such panel shall consist of—

(A) the Director of the Office of Indian Education Programs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and two heads of other divisions of such Bureau as the Assistant Secretary shall designate;

(B) a designee of the Secretary of Education; and

(C) a representative nominated by each of the following:

(i) The organization representing the majority of teachers and professional personnel in schools operated by the Bureau.

(ii) The organization representing the majority of nonteaching personnel in schools operated by the Bureau, if not the same organization as in clause (i).

(iii) School administrators of schools operated by the Bureau.

(iv) Education line officers located in Bureau area or agency offices serving schools funded by the Bureau.

(v) The organization representing the majority of contract or grant schools funded by the Bureau not serving students on the Navajo reservation.

(vi) The organization representing the majority of contract or grant schools funded by the Bureau serving students on the Navajo reservation.

(vii) The organization representing the school boards required by statute for schools operated by the Bureau not serving students on the Navajo reservation.

(viii) The organization representing the school boards required by statute for schools funded by the Bureau serving students on the Navajo reservation.

Including the additional members required by paragraph (5), a majority of the members of such panel shall be from the entities designated under subparagraph (C).

(5) ADDITIONAL MEMBERS.—In addition, the members of the panel stipulated above shall designate for full membership four additional members—

(A) one of whom shall be a representative of a national organization which represents primarily national Indian education concerns; and

(B) three of whom shall be chairpersons (or their designees) of Indian tribes with schools funded by the Bureau on their reservations (other than those specifically represented by organizations referred to in paragraph (4)), provided that preference for no less than two of these members shall be given to Indian tribes with a significant number of schools

funded by the Bureau on their reservations, or with a significant percentage of their children enrolled in schools funded by the Bureau.

(c) BIA COST ANALYSIS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) The Secretary of the Interior shall reserve from the first allotment made to the Department of the Interior pursuant to section 304 an amount not to exceed $500,000 to provide, through the National Academy of Sciences, for an analysis of the costs associated with meeting the academic and home-living/residential standards of the Bureau of Indian Affairs for each school funded by such Bureau. The purpose of such analysis shall be to provide the Bureau and the Panel with baseline data regarding the current state of operations funded by the Bureau and to provide a framework for addressing the implementation of opportunity-to-learn standards.

(B) The results of such analysis shall be reported, in aggregate and school specific form, to the chairpersons and ranking minority members of the Committees on Education and Labor and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Indian Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and to the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Education (who shall transmit the report to the proper entities under this Act), and the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs, not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) CONTENT.—Such analysis shall evaluate the costs of providing a program in each school for the next succeeding academic year and shall be based on—

(A) the standards either published in the Federal Register as having effect in schools operated by the Bureau on the date of enactment of this Act or the standards incorporated into each grant or contract in effect on such date with a tribally controlled school funded under section 1128 of Public Law 95-561 (as amended);

(B) the best projections of student counts and demographics, as provided by the Bureau and as independently reviewed by the Academy; and

(C) the pay and benefit schedules and other personnel requirements for each school operated by the Bureau, as existing on the date of enactment.

(d) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Defense to ensure that, to the extent practicable, the purposes of this title are applied to the Department of Defense schools.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL SKILL STANDARDS BOARD

SEC. 401. PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this title to establish a National Board to serve as a catalyst in stimulating the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skill standards and certification that will serve as a cornerstone of the national strategy to enhance workforce skills, and that can be used, consistent with Federal civil rights laws—

(1) by the Nation, to ensure the development of a high skills, high quality, high performance workforce, including the most skilled front-line workforce in the world, and that will result in increased productivity, economic growth and American economic competitiveness;

(2) by industries, as a vehicle for informing training providers and prospective employees of skills necessary for employment;

(3) by employers, to assist in evaluating the skill levels of prospective employees and to assist in the training of current employees;

(4) by labor organizations, to enhance the employment security of workers by providing portable credentials and skills;

(5) by workers, to obtain certifications of their skills to protect against dislocation, to pursue career advancement, and to enhance their ability to reenter the workforce;

(6) by students and entry level workers, to determine the skill levels and competencies needed to be obtained in order to compete effectively for high wage jobs;

(7) by training providers and educators, to determine appropriate training services to offer;

(8) by Government, to evaluate whether publicly-funded training assists participants to meet skill standards where they exist and thereby protect the integrity of public expenditures;

(9) to facilitate the transition to high performance work organizations;

(10) to increase opportunities for minorities and women, including removing barriers to the entry of women in non-traditional employment; and

(11) to facilitate linkages between other components of the workforce investment strategy, including school-to-work transition, secondary and postsecondary vocational-technical education, and job training programs.

SEC. 402. ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL BOARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established a National Skill Standards Board (in this title referred to as the "National Board").

(b) COMPOSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The National Board shall be composed of 28 members, appointed in accordance with paragraph (3), of whom—

(A) one member shall be the Secretary of Labor;

(B) one member shall be the Secretary of Education;

(C) one member shall be the Secretary of Commerce;

(D) one member shall be the Chairperson of the National Education Standards and Improvement Council established pursuant to section 212(a);

(E) eight members shall be representatives of small and large business and industry selected from among individuals recommended by recognized national business organizations and trade associations;

(F) eight members shall be representatives of organized labor selected from among individuals recommended by recognized national labor federations; and

(G) eight members shall be representatives from the following groups, with at least one member from each group:

(i) Educational institutions.

(ii) Community-based organizations.

(iii) State and local governments.

(iv) Nongovernmental organizations with a demonstrated history of successfully protecting the rights of racial, ethnic and religious minorities, women, persons with disabilities or older persons.

(2) DIVERSITY REQUIREMENTS.—The members described in subparagraph (G) of paragraph (1) shall have expertise in the area of education and training. The members described in subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) of paragraph (1) shall—

(A) in the aggregate, represent a broad cross-section of occupations and industries; and

(B) to the extent feasible, be geographically representative of the United States and reflect the racial, ethnic and gender diversity of the United States.

(3) APPOINTMENT.—The membership of the National Board shall be appointed as follows:

(A) Twelve members (four from each class of members described in subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) of paragraph (1)) shall be appointed by the President.

(B) Six members (two from each class of members described in subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) of paragraph (1)) shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, of whom three members (one from each class of members described in subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) of paragraph (1)) shall be selected from recommendations made by the Majority Leader of the House of Representatives and three members (one from each class of members described in subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) of paragraph (1)) shall be selected from recommendations made by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(C) Six members (two from each class of members described in subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) of paragraph (1)) shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, of whom three members (one from each class of members described in subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) of paragraph (1)) shall be selected from recommendations made by the Majority Leader of the Senate and three members (one from each class of members described in subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) of paragraph (1)) shall be selected from recommendations made by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(4) TERM.—Each member of the National Board appointed under subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) of paragraph (1) shall be appointed for a term of 4 years, except that of the initial members of the Board appointed under such paragraph—

(A) twelve members shall be appointed for a term of 3 years (four from each class of members described in subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) of paragraph (1)), of whom—

(i) two from each class shall be appointed in accordance with paragraph (3)(A);

(ii) one from each such class shall be appointed in accordance with paragraph (3)(B); and

(iii) 1 from each such class shall be appointed in accordance with paragraph (3)(C); and

(B) twelve members shall be appointed for a term of 4 years (four from each class of members described in subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) of paragraph (1)), of whom—

(i) two from each such class shall be appointed in accordance with paragraph (3)(A);

(ii) one from each such class shall be appointed in accordance with paragraph (3)(B); and

(iii) one from each such class shall be appointed in accordance with paragraph (3)(C).

(c) CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSONS.—

(1) CHAIRPERSON.—The National Board shall biennially elect a Chairperson from among the members of the National Board by a majority vote of such members.

(2) VICE CHAIRPERSONS.—The National Board shall annually elect 3 Vice Chairpersons (each representing a different class of the classes of members described in subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) of subsection (b)(1)) from among its members appointed under subsection (b)(3) by a majority vote of such members, each of whom shall serve for a term of 1 year.

(d) COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES.—

(1) COMPENSATION.—Members of the National Board who are not regular full-time employees or officers of the Federal Government shall serve without compensation.

(2) EXPENSES.—The members of the National Board shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in

accordance with subchapter I of chapter 57, title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the National Board.

(e) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND STAFF.—The Chairperson of the National Board shall appoint an Executive Director, who shall be compensated at a rate determined by the National Board that shall not exceed the rate of pay for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, and who shall appoint such staff as is necessary in accordance with title 5, United States Code. Such staff shall include at least one individual with expertise in measurement and assessment.

(f) AGENCY SUPPORT.—

(1) USE OF FACILITIES.—The National Board may use the research, equipment, services and facilities of any agency or instrumentality of the United States with the consent of such agency or instrumentality.

(2) STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon the request of the National Board, the head of any department or agency of the United States may detail to the National Board, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such department or agency to assist the National Board in carrying out this title.

(g) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—An individual who has served as a member of the National Board may not have any financial interest in an assessment and certification system developed or endorsed under this title for a period of three years after the termination of service of such individual from the National Board.

SEC. 403. FUNCTIONS OF THE NATIONAL BOARD.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the National Board, after extensive public review and comment and study of the national labor market, shall identify broad clusters of major occupations that involve one or more than one industry in the United States.

(2) PROCEDURES FOR IDENTIFICATION.—Prior to identifying broad clusters of major occupations under paragraph (1), the National Board shall—

(A) develop procedures for the identification of such clusters;

(B) publish such procedures in the Federal Register; and

(C) allow for extensive public review of and comment on such procedures.

(b) VOLUNTARY PARTNERSHIPS TO DEVELOP STANDARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For each of the occupational clusters identified pursuant to subsection (a), the National Board shall encourage and facilitate the establishment of voluntary partnerships to develop a skill standards system in accordance with subsection (d).

(2) REPRESENTATIVES.—Such voluntary partnerships shall include the full and balanced participation of—

(A) representatives of business and industry who have expertise in the area of workforce skill requirements, including representatives of large and small employers, recommended by national business organizations and trade associations representing employers in the occupation or industry for which a standard is being developed, and representatives of trade associations that have received demonstration grants from the Department of Labor or the Department of Education to establish skill standards prior to the enactment of this title;

(B) employee representatives who have expertise in the area of workforce skill requirements and who shall be—

(i) individuals recommended by recognized national labor organizations representing employees in the occupation or industry for which a standard is being developed; and

(ii) such other individuals who are nonmanagerial employees with significant experience and tenure in such occupation or industry as are appropriate given the nature and structure of employment in the occupation or industry;

(C) representatives of—

(i) educational institutions;

(ii) community-based organizations;

(iii) State and local agencies with administrative control or direction over education, vocational-technical education, or employment and training;

(iv) other policy development organizations with expertise in the area of workforce skill requirements; and

(v) non-governmental organizations with a demonstrated history of successfully protecting the rights of racial, ethnic, and religious minorities, women, individuals with disabilities, and older persons; and

(D) individuals with expertise in measurement and assessment, including relevant experience in designing unbiased assessments and performance-based assessments.

(3) EXPERTS.—The partnerships described in paragraph (1) may also include such other individuals who are independent, qualified experts in their fields.

(c) RESEARCH, DISSEMINATION, AND COORDINATION.—In order to support the development of a skill standards system in accordance with subsection (d), the National Board shall—

(1) conduct workforce research relating to skill standards (including research relating to how to use skill standards in compliance with civil rights laws) and make such research available to the public, including the partnerships described in subsection (b);

(2) identify and maintain a catalog of skill standards used by other countries and by States and leading firms and industries in the United States;

(3) serve as a clearinghouse to facilitate the sharing of information on the development of skill standards and other relevant information among representatives of occupations and industries identified pursuant to subsection (a), the voluntary partnerships recognized pursuant to subsection (b), and among education and training providers through such mechanisms as the Capacity Building and Information and Dissemination Network established under section 453(b) of the Job Training Partnership Act;

(4) develop a common nomenclature relating to skill standards;

(5) encourage the development and adoption of curricula and training materials for attaining the skill standards developed pursuant to subsection (d) that include structured work experiences and related study programs leading to progressive levels of professional and technical certification and postsecondary education;

(6) provide appropriate technical assistance; and

(7) facilitate coordination among voluntary partnerships that meet the requirements of subsection (b) to promote the development of a coherent national system of voluntary skill standards.

(d) ENDORSEMENT OF SKILL STANDARDS SYSTEMS.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF ENDORSEMENT CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The National Board, after extensive public consultation, shall develop objective criteria for endorsing skills standards systems relating to the occupational clusters identified pursuant to subsection (a). Such criteria shall, at a minimum, include the components of a skill standards system described in subparagraph (B). The endorsement criteria shall be published in the Federal Register, and updated as appropriate.

(B) COMPONENTS OF SYSTEM.—The components of a skill standards systems shall include the following:

(i) Voluntary skill standards, which at a minimum—

(I) meet or exceed, to the extent practicable, the highest standards used in other countries and the highest international standards;

(II) take into account content and performance standards certified pursuant to title II;

(III) take into account the requirements of high performance work organizations;

(IV) are in a form that allows for regular updating to take into account advances in technology or other developments within the occupational cluster;

(V) are formulated in such a manner that promotes the portability of credentials and facilitates worker mobility within an occupational cluster or industry and among industries; and

(VI) are not discriminatory with respect to race, color, gender, age, religion, ethnicity, disability, or national origin, consistent with Federal civil rights laws.

(ii) A voluntary assessment system and certification of the attainment of skill standards developed pursuant to subparagraph (A), which at a minimum—

(I) takes into account, to the extent practicable, methods of assessment and certification used in other countries;

(II) utilizes a variety of evaluation techniques, including, where appropriate, oral and written evaluations, portfolio assessments and performance tests; and

(III) includes methods for establishing that the assessment and certification system is not discriminatory with respect to race, color, gender, age, religion, ethnicity, disability, or national origin, consistent with Federal civil rights laws.

(iii) A system to promote the use of and to disseminate information relating to skill standards, and assessment and certification systems developed pursuant to this paragraph (including dissemination of information relating to civil rights laws relevant to the use of such standards and systems) to entities such as institutions of postsecondary education offering professional and technical education, labor organizations, trade associations, employers providing formalized training and other organizations likely to benefit from such systems.

(iv) A system to evaluate the implementation of the skill standards, and assessment and certification systems developed pursuant to this paragraph, and the effectiveness of the information disseminated pursuant to subparagraph (C) for informing the users of such standards and systems of the requirements of relevant civil rights laws.

(v) A system to periodically revise and update the skill standards, and assessment and certification systems developed pursuant to this paragraph, which will take into account changes in standards in other countries.

(2) ENDORSEMENT.—The National Board, after extensive public review and comment, shall endorse those skill standards systems relating to the occupational clusters identified pursuant to subsection (a) that—

(A) meet the objective endorsement criteria that are developed pursuant to paragraph (1); and

(B) are submitted by partnerships that meet the representation requirements of subsection (b)(2).

(e) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the National Board shall not carry out the requirements of subsection (b) or (d) with respect to an occupation or trade within an industry for which national apprenticeship standards—

(i) have been jointly developed by labor and management representatives,

(ii) are registered pursuant to the National Apprenticeship Act,

(iii) are being actively used on a national basis for training workers in such occupation or trade,

(iv) are in a form that allows for regular updating to take into account advances in technology, the highest standards used in other countries, and the highest international standards, and

(v) are not discriminatory with respect to race, color, gender, age, religion, ethnicity, disability, or national origin, consistent with Federal civil rights laws,

unless labor and management representatives of such occupation or trade within such industry and representatives of registered apprenticeship programs for such occupation or trade within such industry jointly request the assistance of the National Board.

(B) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (A), the National Board may carry out the requirements of subsections (b) and (d) with respect to any occupational cluster if the skill standards system to be developed or endorsed for such occupational cluster is not designed specifically for the particular occupation or trade within the particular industry for which apprenticeship standards meeting the requirements of subparagraph (A) are applicable.

(2) RELATIONSHIP WITH ANTIDISCRIMINATION LAWS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to modify or affect any Federal or State law prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, religion, color, ethnicity, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

(B) EVIDENCE.—The endorsement or absence of an endorsement by the Board of a skill standard or assessment and certification system under subsection (d) shall not be used in any action or proceeding to establish that the skill standard or assessment and certification system conforms or does not conform to the requirements of civil rights laws.

(f) COORDINATION WITH EDUCATION STANDARDS.—The National Board shall establish cooperative arrangements with the National Education Standards and Improvement Council to promote the coordination of the development of skill standards under this title with the development of content and performance standards under title II.

(g) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—From funds appropriated pursuant to section 406(a), the Secretary of Labor may award grants (including grants to the voluntary partnerships in accordance with paragraph (2)) and enter into contracts and cooperative arrangements that are requested by the National Board for the purposes of carrying out this title.

(2) GRANT PROGRAMS FOR VOLUNTARY PARTNERSHIPS.—

(A) ELIGIBILITY AND APPLICATION.—Voluntary partnerships that meet the requirements of subsection (b) shall be eligible to apply for a grant under this subsection. Each such voluntary partnership desiring a grant shall submit an application to the National Board at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the National Board may reasonably require.

(B) REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION.—The National Board shall review each application submitted pursuant to subparagraph (A) in accordance with the objective criteria published pursuant to subparagraph (C) and shall forward each such application to the Secretary of Labor accompanied by a recommendation for the approval or disapproval of each such application by the Secretary.

(C) CRITERIA FOR REVIEW.—Prior to each fiscal year, the National Board shall publish objective criteria to be used by the Board in reviewing applications under subparagraph (B).

(3) LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not more than 20 percent of the funds appropriated under section 406(a) for each fiscal year shall be used by the National Board for the costs of administration.

(B) COSTS OF ADMINISTRATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term "costs of administration" means costs relating to staff, supplies, equipment, space, travel and per diem, costs of conducting meetings and conferences, and other related costs.

SEC. 404. DEADLINES.

Not later than December 31, 1996, the National Board shall—

(1) identify occupational clusters pursuant to section 403(a) representing a substantial portion of the workforce; and

(2) promote the development of an initial set of skill standards in accordance with section 403(d) for such clusters.

SEC. 405. REPORTS.

The National Board shall submit to the President and the Congress in each fiscal year a report on the activities conducted under this title, including the extent to which skill standards have been adopted by employers, training providers, and other entities and the effectiveness of such standards in accomplishing the purposes described in section 401.

SEC. 406. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1998 to carry out this title.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 407. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title, the following definitions apply:

(1) COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS.—The term "community-based organizations" means such organizations as defined in section 4(5) of the Job Training Partnership Act.

(2) EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term "educational institution" means a high school, a vocational school, and an institution of higher education.

(3) SKILL STANDARD.—The term "skill standard" means the level of knowledge and competence required to successfully perform work-related functions within an occupational cluster.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 501. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the terms "all students" and "all children" mean students or children from a broad range of backgrounds and circumstances, including disadvantaged students, students with diverse racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds, American Indians, Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, students with disabilities, students with limited-English proficiency, migrant children, school-aged children who have dropped out, migrant children, and academically talented students;

(2) the term "assessment system" means measures of student performance which include at least 1 test, and may include other measures of student performance, for a specific purpose and use which are intended to evaluate the progress of all students in the State toward learning the material in State content standards in 1 or more subject areas;

(3) the terms "community", "public", and "advocacy group" are to be interpreted to include representatives of organizations advocating for the education of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian children and Indian tribes;

(4) the term "content standards" means broad descriptions of the knowledge and skills students should acquire in a particular subject area;

(5) the term "Governor" means the chief executive of the State;

(6) the terms "local educational agency" and "State educational agency" have the meaning given those terms in section 1471 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(7) the term "opportunity-to-learn standards" means the criteria for, and the basis of, assessing the sufficiency or quality of the resources, practices, and conditions necessary at each level of the education system (schools, local educational agencies, and States) to provide all students with an opportunity to learn the material in national or State content standards.

(8) the term "outlying areas" means Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and Palau (until the effective date of the Compact of Free Association with the Government of Palau);

(9) the term "performance standards" means concrete examples and explicit definitions of what students have to know and be able to do to demonstrate that they are proficient in the skills and knowledge framed by content standards;

(10) the term "related services" has the same meaning given such term under section 602(17) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act;

(11) the term "school" means a school that is under the authority of the State educational agency and a local educational agency or, for the purpose of carrying out section 314(b), a school that is operated or funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

(12) the term "Secretary", except where used in title IV, means the Secretary of Education; and

(13) except as otherwise provided, the term "State" means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and each of the outlying areas.

SEC. 502. LIMITATIONS.

(a) ASSESSMENTS.—No funds provided under titles II or III of this Act shall be used to undertake assessments that will be used to make decisions regarding the graduation, grade promotion, or retention of students for five years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) PUBLIC SCHOOL.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the use of funds under title III (except as provided in

section 310) to directly or indirectly benefit any school other than a public school.

SEC. 503. ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS ACTIVITIES.

Section 421(h) of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2421(h)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(h)"; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following:

"(2)(A) Notwithstanding any provision of section 406 of the General Education Provisions Act, the Commissioner of Education Statistics may authorize a State educational agency or a consortium of such agencies to use items and data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress for the purpose of evaluating a course of study related to vocational education, if the Commissioner has determined, in writing, that such use will not—

"(i) result in the identification of characteristics or performance of individual students or schools;

"(ii) result in the ranking or comparing of schools or local educational agencies;

"(iii) be used to evaluate the performance of teachers, principals, or other local educators for the purpose of dispensing rewards or punishments; or

"(iv) corrupt or harm the use and value of data collected for the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

"(B) Not later than 60 days after making an authorization under subsection (a), the Commissioner shall submit to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate, a report which contains—

"(i) a copy of the request for such authorization;

"(ii) a copy of the written determination under subsection (a); and

"(iii) a description of the details and duration of such authorization.

"(C) The Commissioner may not grant more than one such authorization in any fiscal year and shall ensure that the authorized use of items or data from the National Assessment is evaluated for technical merit and for its affect on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. The results of such evaluations shall be promptly reported to the committees specified in subparagraph (B).".

TITLE VI—PARENTAL INFORMATION AND RESOURCE CENTERS

SEC. 601. PARENTAL INFORMATION AND RESOURCE CENTERS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of Education is authorized to make grants each year to private, nonprofit organizations for the purpose of providing training and information to parents of children enrolled in participating schools and to individuals who work with such parents to encourage a more effective working relationship with professionals in meeting the educational needs of children enrolled in participating schools.

(b) GRANTS.—Such grants shall—

(1) be designed to meet the unique training and information needs of parents of children enrolled in participating schools, particularly parents who are severely disadvantaged educationally or economically;

(2) be distributed geographically to the greatest extent possible throughout all the States and give priority to grants which serve areas with high concentrations of low-income families;

(3) be targeted to parents of children enrolled in participating schools in rural, suburban, and urban areas;

(4) serve parents of low-income and minority children enrolled in participating schools, including limited-English-proficient children; and

(5) be funded at a sufficient size, scope, and quality to ensure that the program is adequate to serve the parents in the area.

SEC. 602. ELIGIBILITY.

(a) REPRESENTATION.—To receive a grant under section 601, a private, nonprofit organization shall meet the following requirements:

(1) Be governed by a board of directors in which the membership includes, or be an organization that represents the interests of, parents and establish a special governing committee in which the membership includes—

(A) a majority of parents of children enrolled in participating schools; and

(B) representation of education professionals with expertise in improving services for disadvantaged children.

(2) Provide that the parent and professional membership of the board or special governing committee is broadly representative of minority, low-income, and other individuals and groups that have an interest in compensatory education and family literacy.

(3) Demonstrate the capacity and expertise to conduct effective training and information activities for which a grant may be made.

(4) Network with clearinghouses, other organizations and agencies, and with other established national, State, and local parent groups representing the full range of parents of children enrolled in participating schools, especially parents of low-income and minority children.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The Board of Directors or special governing committee of an organization receiving a grant under this title shall meet at least once each calendar quarter to review the parent training and information activities for which the grant is made.

(c) GRANT RENEWAL.—Whenever an organization requests the renewal of a grant under section 601 for a fiscal year, the Board of Directors or the special governing committee shall submit to the Secretary a written review of the parent training and information program conducted by such organization during the preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 603. USES OF FUNDS.

Grants received under this title may be used—

(1) for parent training and information programs that assist parents to—

(A) better understand their children's educational needs;

(B) provide follow up support for their children's educational achievement;

(C) communicate more effectively with teachers, counselors, administrators, and other professional educators and support staff;

(D) participate in the design and provision of assistance to students who are not making adequate progress;

(E) obtain information about the range of options, programs, services, and resources available at the national, State, and local levels to assist children enrolled in participating schools and their parents;

(F) seek technical assistance regarding compliance with the requirements of this Act and of other Federal programs relevant to achieving the goals of this Act;

(G) participate in State and local decision-making; and

(H) train other parents;

(2) to include State or local educational personnel where such participation would further an objective of the program assisted by the grant; and

(3) to establish a parent training and information center to carry out the activities in paragraphs (1) and (2) and to represent parent interests at the State level, including participation in the design of the public outreach process described in section 306(b)(6), submitting recommendations concerning State standards and plans, and commenting on proposed waivers under this Act.

SEC. 604. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

The Secretary shall provide technical assistance, by grant or contract, for the establishment, development, and coordination of parent training and information programs and centers.

SEC. 605. EXPERIMENTAL CENTERS.

After the establishment in each State of a parent training and information center, the Secretary shall provide for the establishment of 5 additional experimental centers, 3 to be located in urban areas and 2 in rural areas where there are large concentrations of poverty.

SEC. 606. REPORTS.

Not later than June 30, 1995, and not later than June 30 each succeeding year, the Secretary shall obtain data concerning programs and centers assisted under this title, including—

(1) the number of parents, including the number of minority and limited-English-proficient parents, who receive information and training;

(2) the types and modes of information or training provided; and

(3) the strategies used to reach and serve parents of minority and limited-English-proficient children and parents with limited literacy skills.

SEC. 607. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 1998.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is in order except those amendments printed in House Report 103–288 and amendments en bloc described in section 2 of House Resolution 274.

Except as specified in section 2 of House Resolution 274, each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, except that pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate may be offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

Debate time on each amendment will be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, or a designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in House Report 103–288 or germane modifications thereof. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, except that modifications shall be reported.

Amendments en bloc shall be debatable for 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee

on Education and Labor, shall not be subject to amendment and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The original proponent of an amendment included in amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately before disposition of the amendments en bloc.

The Chair will announce the number of the amendment made in order by the rule and the name of its sponsor in order to give notice to the Committee of the Whole as to the order of recognition.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Madam Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, it is my understanding that if amendments are offered en bloc before final passage of that vote, we would not be permitted to divide the question, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, would that also hold true once we get to the full House, that if the amendment en bloc is adopted, when we get to the full House and once there are separate votes on amendments, would that also have to occur on the en bloc amendment, or would they be subject to division at that point?

The CHAIRMAN. The en bloc amendment itself would be subject to a vote, but would not be divisible.

Mr. WALKER. In the full House they would not be divisible?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 103-288.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLING

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODLING: Page 75, after line 21, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent subsections accordingly):

(m) PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL MANDATES, DIRECTION, AND CONTROL.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize an officer or employee of the Federal Government to mandate, direct, or control a State, local educational agency, or school's curriculum, program of instruction, or allocation of State and local resources.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

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

Madam Chairman, as I indicated in my remarks during general debate, there were some contradictory provisions in the bill relating to how prescriptive the Federal Government will be in requiring States to enforce their standards. Some of us, including Mr. CONDIT and myself, feel that this lack of clarity in the bill could be interpreted to be a mandate on States to meet standards required by the act, even though Federal funds will never come close to covering it.

I believe that ours is really a clarifying amendment in that the committee report clearly states that there was no intention to create such an unfunded mandate on States. The President in a letter to me on H.R. 1804 stated that it was not his intention to influence State fiscal priorities with this legislation. The Governors and chief State school officers support the intentions of this amendment.

Further, there have been some concerns raised about the effects of this bill on State and local control of curriculum and instructional practice. Our amendment clarifies the intent of Congress in this regard as well.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Chairman, several of us from both sides of the aisle over the last few months had been working diligently to try to address a concern that has been a growing concern I think of many of us in this Congress, and certainly across the country, and that concern is that unfunded mandates by Congress must end. The Federal Government, if they cannot pony up the bucks, should not expect the States to do it.

On nothing do we get more complaints from our local legislators, our county commissioners, and our school board members than these unfunded mandates. That is a concept that we should be including in every single piece of legislation which produces a program which could potentially have mandates in it down the line, and every one of those pieces of legislation should have an amendment like this in it. And this bill, as I said in general debate, really does have the potential if someone down the line decides that the States are not going along with our great idea here, it has the potential for producing a nightmare of mandates.

So I rise in strong support of this amendment. I think the bill is made much better by the presence of this amendment as a part of it.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], the cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. CONDIT. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment that I am offering with my colleague, Congressman BILL GOODLING.

As many in this body know, there are few issues that I feel more strongly about than unfunded Federal mandates. I believe that it is wrong for us on the Federal level to pass legislation but shift the costs of implementation and compliance to our State and local governments. In order to locate a bipartisan solution to this enormous problem, I have founded the congressional caucus on unfunded mandates. Over 70 Members of the House are currently members of the caucus.

Before explaining why I believe that our amendment is important and needs to be included in the bill, I would like to thank a number of people who have been involved in this effort. First, I would like to thank BILL GOODLING for his cooperation and guidance on this issue. Second, Secretary Riley, Chairman FORD and subcommittee Chairman KILDEE have been extremely patient and gracious to me. They have kept me abreast of developments with this legislation, and they have assured me that H.R. 1804 is not intended to become another unfunded Federal mandate.

I got involved in H.R. 1804, Goals 2000: Educate America Act, because I felt that the legislation had the potential to become an enormous unfunded mandate upon our States. I came to this conclusion because of an amendment that was added to the Goals 2000 bill in the Education and Labor Committee. This amendment would require States to ensure that all schools meet opportunity to learn standards required by the bill. It should be noted that the bill does not provide the States with funds necessary to even begin to satisfy this requirement.

After carefully analyzing the bill, I came to the conclusion that States had three options at their disposal when confronting this requirement: First, they could take the requirement seriously and end up with a multimillion-dollar unfunded Federal mandate; second, they could lower their standards so that all schools can meet them; or third, they could just simply refuse to participate in the program. This was not the original intent of the administration and it turns the whole spirit of the legislation on its head.

For these reasons, I, along with Congressman GOODLING, am offering an amendment that clarifies that nothing in this legislation will mandate how a State or local education agency should organize itself or spend its own money. This amendment is important and needs to be incorporated into the bill. By adding this language, we are trying to preserve the fundamental principle of the school reform movement—that education decisions should be made by those closest to the classroom.

Before proceeding, I want to acknowledge those who have told me that this bill is not an unfunded mandate. Those individuals have based their arguments on two points. Thus, the bill

is not a mandate. While true that States can avoid the requirement by not applying for the program, I believe that we should encourage States to pursue education reform, instead of relying upon them to not participate. Second, they cited the committee report on H.R. 1804, which emphasizes that the bill is not intended to impose a Federal mandate. While I am pleased that this message appears in the committee report, having the language in the report is not good enough—this language needs to be in the bill. And, the Condit-Goodling amendment does just this.

In closing, Madam Chairman, our amendment is not a controversial amendment. It merely clarifies what the committee and the bill's sponsors have been saying all along—that this legislation is not an unfunded Federal mandate. The President supports our approach, the Governors support our approach and the Department of Education supports our approach. Therefore, I would urge all of my colleagues to support the Condit-Goodling amendment to H.R. 1804.

□ 1540

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, we accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and appreciate his offering it.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the chairman.

Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLMOR].

Mr. GILLMOR. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Goodling/Condit amendment.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Goodling-Condit amendment to the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. This amendment will eliminate the unfunded Federal mandate portion of the Reed amendment dealing with opportunity to learn standards. As it stands now, the Reed amendment would require States to list corrective actions to be taken against schools that do not meet the opportunity to learn standards.

These standards are a fatally flawed policy initiative because they seek to standardize curricula and equalize education funding through a national standards board. This to me is not reform, but yet another example of the Federal Government's attitude that it knows what's best for schools in every State and locality across the country.

Even more disturbing than the policy flaws in these standards, is the fact that Congress would provide no funding to help States comply. Once again Congress is attempting to set forth high-minded policy goals and leaving the States to pay the bill.

It is about time that Congress started taking responsibility for its own policy actions. Unfunded Federal mandates are putting an ever increasing strain on State budgets. Mandates have become yet another mechanism for Congress to shirk its responsibility for the budget deficit. As Congress has come under increasing pressure to cut Federal spending, there has been a subsequent rise in the number of unfunded mandates. Congress still wants to push its policy agenda only now it wants the States to pay for it.

Unfortunately States are responsible for those duties that are most important to the American people. Law enforcement and firefighting are just a few State-funded services that are being cut because Federal mandates force States to spend money in other areas.

While we all realize the importance of education reform, States and localities are much better equipped to set education funding priorities than the Federal Government. Real reform would give States and localities the flexibility to respond to their own diverse education needs. Take some responsibility and do not set standards unless you intend to pay for them. Support the Goodling-Condit amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member rise in opposition to the amendment?

If not, the Chair will put the question on the amendment.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Chairman, it was my understanding that setting the time on the amendments put the control of the time on that side in the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and on this side in me. Is that correct? The chairman just asked if there was anybody around who would like to come over and get into the fight on our side. We would rather pick the people.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, 5 minutes was allotted for the proponent and 5 minutes for an opponent.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I thought the rule read that——

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman wishes, a Member who is in support of the amendment may claim the time reserved for opposition, if there is no objection.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I am not asking unanimous consent to do anything. I am asking for a clarification of the rule. Do we have a hybrid situation here? Do we have 5 minutes of controlled debate on each side?

This is governed by the rule for this bill, not the House rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The rule with respect to time is that it be equally divided between proponent and opponent.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Well, Madam Chairman, I would claim the time and yield it back. We do not have anything more to say about this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the question on the amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 420, noes 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 493]

AYES—420

Abercrombie	de Lugo (VI)	Hilliard
Allard	Deal	Hinchey
Andrews (ME)	DeFazio	Hoagland
Andrews (NJ)	DeLauro	Hobson
Andrews (TX)	DeLay	Hochbrueckner
Applegate	Derrick	Hoekstra
Archer	Deutsch	Hoke
Armey	Diaz-Balart	Holden
Bacchus (FL)	Dickey	Horn
Bachus (AL)	Dicks	Houghton
Baesler	Dingell	Hoyer
Baker (CA)	Dixon	Huffington
Baker (LA)	Dooley	Hughes
Ballenger	Doolittle	Hunter
Barca	Dornan	Hutchinson
Barcia	Dreier	Hutto
Barlow	Duncan	Hyde
Barrett (NE)	Dunn	Inglis
Barrett (WI)	Durbin	Inhofe
Bartlett	Edwards (CA)	Inslee
Barton	Edwards (TX)	Istook
Bateman	Emerson	Jacobs
Becerra	Engel	Jefferson
Beilenson	English (AZ)	Johnson (CT)
Bentley	English (OK)	Johnson (GA)
Bereuter	Eshoo	Johnson (SD)
Berman	Evans	Johnson, E.B.
Bevill	Everett	Johnson, Sam
Bilbray	Ewing	Johnston
Bilirakis	Faleomavaega (AS)	Kanjorski
Bishop	Farr	Kaptur
Blackwell	Fazio	Kasich
Bliley	Fields (LA)	Kennedy
Blute	Fields (TX)	Kennelly
Boehlert	Filner	Kildee
Boehner	Fingerhut	Kim
Bonilla	Fish	King
Bonior	Flake	Kingston
Borski	Foglietta	Kleczka
Boucher	Ford (MI)	Klein
Brewster	Ford (TN)	Klink
Brooks	Fowler	Klug
Browder	Frank (MA)	Knollenberg
Brown (FL)	Franks (CT)	Kolbe
Brown (OH)	Franks (NJ)	Kopetski
Bryant	Frost	Kreidler
Bunning	Furse	Kyl
Burton	Gallegly	LaFalce
Buyer	Gallo	Lambert
Byrne	Gejdenson	Lancaster
Callahan	Gekas	Lantos
Calvert	Gephardt	LaRocco
Camp	Geren	Laughlin
Canady	Gibbons	Lazio
Cantwell	Gilchrest	Leach
Cardin	Gillmor	Lehman
Carr	Gilman	Levin
Castle	Gingrich	Levy
Chapman	Glickman	Lewis (CA)
Clay	Gonzalez	Lewis (FL)
Clayton	Goodlatte	Lewis (GA)
Clement	Goodling	Lightfoot
Clinger	Gordon	Linder
Clyburn	Goss	Lipinski
Coble	Grams	Livingston
Coleman	Grandy	Lloyd
Collins (GA)	Green	Long
Collins (IL)	Greenwood	Lowey
Collins (MI)	Gunderson	Machtley
Combest	Gutierrez	Maloney
Condit	Hall (TX)	Mann
Cooper	Hamburg	Manton
Coppersmith	Hamilton	Manzullo
Costello	Hancock	Margolies-Mezvinsky
Cox	Hansen	Markey
Coyne	Harman	Martinez
Cramer	Hastert	Matsui
Crane	Hastings	Mazzoli
Crapo	Hayes	McCandless
Cunningham	Hefley	McCloskey
Danner	Hefner	McCollum
Darden	Herger	McCrery
de la Garza		

McCurdy	Quillen	Spratt
McDermott	Quinn	Stark
McHale	Rahall	Stearns
McHugh	Ramstad	Stenholm
McInnis	Ravenel	Stokes
McKeon	Reed	Strickland
McMillan	Regula	Studds
McNulty	Reynolds	Stump
Meehan	Richardson	Stupak
Menendez	Ridge	Sundquist
Meyers	Roberts	Swett
Mica	Roemer	Swift
Michel	Rogers	Synar
Miller (CA)	Rohrabacher	Talent
Miller (FL)	Romero-Barcelo (PR)	Tanner
Mineta	Ros-Lehtinen	Tauzin
Minge	Rose	Taylor (MS)
Mink	Rostenkowski	Taylor (NC)
Moakley	Roth	Tejeda
Molinari	Roukema	Thomas (CA)
Mollohan	Rowland	Thomas (WY)
Montgomery	Roybal-Allard	Thompson
Moorhead	Royce	Thornton
Moran	Rush	Thurman
Morella	Sabo	Torkildsen
Murphy	Sanders	Torres
Myers	Sangmeister	Torricelli
Nadler	Santorum	Towns
Natcher	Sarpalius	Traficant
Neal (MA)	Sawyer	Tucker
Norton (DC)	Saxton	Underwood (GU)
Nussle	Schaefer	Unsoeld
Oberstar	Schenk	Upton
Obey	Schiff	Valentine
Olver	Schroeder	Velazquez
Ortiz	Schumer	Vento
Orton	Scott	Visclosky
Oxley	Sensenbrenner	Volkmer
Packard	Serrano	Vucanovich
Pallone	Sharp	Walker
Parker	Shaw	Walsh
Pastor	Shays	Watt
Paxon	Shepherd	Waxman
Payne (VA)	Shuster	Weldon
Pelosi	Sisisky	Wheat
Penny	Skeen	Whitten
Peterson (FL)	Skelton	Williams
Peterson (MN)	Slattery	Wilson
Petri	Slaughter	Wise
Pickett	Smith (IA)	Wolf
Pickle	Smith (MI)	Woolsey
Pombo	Smith (NJ)	Wyden
Pomeroy	Smith (OR)	Wynn
Porter	Smith (TX)	Yates
Portman	Snowe	Young (AK)
Poshard	Solomon	Young (FL)
Price (NC)	Spence	Zeliff
Pryce (OH)		Zimmer

NOT VOTING—18

Ackerman	McDade	Owens
Brown (CA)	McKinney	Payne (NJ)
Conyers	Meek	Rangel
Dellums	Mfume	Skaggs
Fawell	Murtha	Washington
Hall (OH)	Neal (NC)	Waters

□ 1606

Mrs. SCHROEDER changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 493, I ask that I be recorded as having voted "aye," if I were present. I was unavoidably detained at the White House during that time and missed that vote. Had I been here, I would have been in support of it.

EN BLOC AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, pursuant to section 2 of the rule and as designee of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], I offer amendments en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

The text of the amendments en bloc is as follows:

En bloc amendments offered by Mr. KILDEE:

Amendment offered by Mr. KILDEE: Page 122, after line 2, insert the following:

(II) meet or exceed the highest applicable standards used in the United States, including apprenticeship standards registered under the National Apprenticeship Act;

Page 122, line 3, strike "(II)" and insert "(III)".

Page 122, line 6, strike "(III)" and insert "(IV)".

Page 122, line 9, strike "(IV)" and insert "(V)".

Page 122, line 14, strike "(V)" and insert "(VI)".

Page 122, line 20, strike "(VI)" and insert "(VII)".

Page 125, strike line 12 and all that follows through line 25 on page 126.

Page 127, strike lines 1 and 2 and insert the following:

(e) RELATIONSHIP WITH ANTIDISCRIMINATION LAWS.—

Page 127, line 3, strike "(A)" and insert "(1)" and move the provisions of the paragraph two ems to the left.

Page 127, line 8, strike "(B)" and insert "(2)" and move the provisions of the paragraph two ems to the left.

Amendment offered by Mr. MCCURDY:

Page 11, after line 25, insert the following:

(8) SCHOOL AND HOME PARTNERSHIP.—(A) By the year 2000, every school and home will engage in partnerships that will increase parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional, and academic growth of children.

(B) The objectives for this Goal are that—

(1) every State will develop policies to assist local schools and local educational agencies to establish programs for increasing partnerships that respond to the varying needs of parents and the home, including parents of children who are disadvantaged, bilingual, or disabled;

(2) every school will actively engage parents and families in a partnership which supports the academic work of children at home and shared educational decision making at school;

(3) every home will be responsible for creating an environment of respect for education and providing the physical and emotional support needed for learning; and

(4) parents and families will help to ensure that schools are adequately supported and will hold schools and teachers to high standards of accountability.

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

Page 135, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 504. COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.

No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1993 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

SEC. 505. SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the head of each Federal agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 506. PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS.

If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

Amendment offered by Mr. WHEAT: Page 136, line 2, strike "RESOURCE CENTERS" and insert "RESOURCES".

Page 136, line 7, strike "private,".

Page 136, line 9, before "enrolled" insert ", aged birth to 5 years, and children".

Page 136, beginning on line 12, before "enrolled" insert ", aged birth to 5 years, and children".

Page 136, 16, before "enrolled" insert ", aged birth to 5 years, and children".

Page 136, line 23, before "enrolled" insert ", aged birth to 5 years, and children".

Page 137, line 2 before "enrolled" insert ", aged birth to 5 years, and children".

Page 137, line 3, strike "and" after the semicolon.

Page 137, line 6, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 137, after line 6, insert the following:

(6) include funds to establish, expand, and operate Teachers as Parents programs.

Page 137, line 9, strike "private,".

Page 137, line 14, strike "governing" and insert "advisory".

Page 137, line 16, strike "A majority of parents of children" and insert "parents of children, aged birth to 5 years, and children"

Page 137, line 22, strike "governing" and insert "advisory".

Page 138, line 9, before "enrolled" insert ", aged birth to 5 years and children".

Page 138, line 19 strike "governing" and insert "advisory".

Page 139, line 16, strike "children enrolled in participating schools" and insert "parents of children, aged birth to 5 years, and children enrolled in participating schools".

Amendment offered by Mr. WATT: Page 139, line 23, strike "and".

Page 139, line 24, insert "and" after the semicolon.

Page 139, after line 24, insert the following:

(I) plan, implement, and fund activities that coordinate the education of their children with other Federal programs that serve such children or their families;

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of California: Page 9, line 5, insert ", including the metric system of measurement," after "education".

Page 9, line 9, insert ", including the metric system of measurement," after "science".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

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

Madam Chairman, this bloc includes:

A Kildee-Gunderson amendment which clarifies certain provisions in title IV of the bill to ensure that the skill standards developed under Goals 2000 are the highest in the world;

A McCurdy amendment which amends title I of the bill to add a new national education goal relating to increased parental participation;

A Traficant amendment which requires that funds under this bill must be expended consistent with the Buy American Act;

A Wheat amendment which expands the eligibility of title VI grants to ensure the inclusion of parents as teachers programs;

A Watt amendment which authorizes title VI funds to be used for planning and implementation of activities to coordinate title VI services with those under other Federal programs; and

A Brown amendment which includes metric measurement in the objectives under national education goal No. 5, relating to mathematics and science.

I want to take a moment to briefly describe the Kildee-Gunderson amendment to title IV of Goals 2000.

This amendment clarifies that, in those instances where there are existing skill standards that apply to an occupation or industry, any new standards proposed under title IV must meet or exceed the existing standards.

This ensures that the skill standards developed under this act are the highest in the world.

I urge the adoption of these amendments en bloc.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1610

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I would indicate that I have reviewed the amendments and have no problems with them. I hope we will, as I said before in conference, not get beyond six goals; that somehow or another we can wind them all in so we keep everybody concentrating on the six goals they have been thinking about for the last 4 years, or however many years it has been.

Madam Chairman, I have no problems with the amendments.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT. Madam Chairman, the Watt part of this amendment is not controversial and, as the chairman indicated, it is supported by the Education Committee. I thank the chairman and the committee for their support.

My amendment would allow the parental information and resource grants authorized in title VI to be used for activities that assist parents in coordinating the education of their children with other, existing Federal programs that already serve them.

H.R. 3210 acknowledges an important fact: Educating our children involves more than just reading, writing and arithmetic. Education entails making sure our children are properly fed, so they can concentrate in class; making sure they are properly immunized, so they won't get sick and miss valuable school time; and ensuring they are safe from violence in and around their schools. My amendment will allow parental information and resource grants to be used for programs that help parents—and by extension, the Federal Government—better coordinate their children's education with existing Federal programs in areas like health, nutrition, and crime prevention.

In Congress and in my district, I repeatedly hear the same refrain: Federal programs could be more effective if they were aimed at addressing the overall needs of the people they serve. This amendment will permit private nonprofit organizations to encourage Federal agencies to work together to address overall needs in this fashion.

This is sound policy and a common sense approach to government. To truly guarantee American children the opportunity to be educated and to achieve the goals set out in this bill, we should make it easier for children to benefit from the many Government programs which affect their education and their life.

I thank the chairman and urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

Mr. GUNDERSON. Madam Chairman, I want to not only join with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] in talking about a particular part of this amendment, but I want to commend the gentleman for his work in bringing this amendment up as a part of the en bloc amendments. I am obviously referring to that section which deals with title IV, because this is very, very important.

Madam Chairman, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, we were about to create a situation, where we were going to create voluntary national skill standards, but we were going to exempt literally 250 occupations from those skill standards. That just was not going to work.

A number of us raised those concerns. And I have to tell you, I think we ought to give some credit here to organized labor for coming forward and saying they wanted to work this out, because they are the ones that, after hearing the debate in committee, came forward and said they wanted to see if we could work out some kind of a compromise. We have done that. Where on the one hand we have eliminated any exemption for the 250-some occupations covered by apprenticeship programs, on the other hand we have required that the skill standards endorsed by the National Board now must meet or exceed the highest applicable standards used in the United States or in any other country, including standards used in existing apprenticeship programs.

Should we not do just that? Is that not our intent? Because if the purpose of the skill standards is to provide voluntary guidelines for school-to-work transition and other workforce preparation programs in every State, you have to have guidelines that are of the highest possible standards, so when States develop their programs, they are going to be able to empower that young person with skills that are portable skills from one State to another State.

So I endorse the amendment. I commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] and all who have been a part of this, especially the Department of Labor, which worked in bringing organized labor, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], myself, and others together to agree on this. I think we have arrived at a good consensus and we ought to go with it.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time. I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], our chairman, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], for their leadership on this issue in bringing this matter to the floor.

Madam Chairman, I rise both in support of the en bloc amendments and also in support of the bill because I believe it is a key step in the right direction for Federal education policy.

This bill does four things I think are crucial: First, it sets real goals for American education to meet by the year 2000, and it puts them in a results-oriented framework. Also, for the first time at the Federal level, this bill helps fund systemic State education reform to further those goals.

In addition, that State-by-State process encourages coordination of health and social services with education, an incredibly important link in this day and age.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, H.R. 1804 allows the Secretary to waive requirements of various Federal laws, including chapter 1, that could impede State and local school reforms.

By giving States and school districts greater flexibility, H.R. 1804 is setting the stage for what I believe should be the future of Federal education aid. When the House considers the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

later in this Congress, many of us who are not on the Committee on Education and Labor are looking forward to working with Chairmen FORD and KILDEE and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] as well as with the administration, on a bill that will be built around far-reaching flexibility and results-oriented accountability.

I believe that a waiver program doesn't go far enough; nothing short of a fundamental restructuring of our Federal education aid programs will do what needs to be done at this point. And we will have a chance to make those urgently needed changes when we consider ESEA.

Madam Chairman, I again want to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and all of those members of the committee on bringing this legislation to the floor. This is important policy for America's future. I am pleased to support this bill.

□ 1620

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, first of all, let me say that I am pleased with the manner in which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT] worked this in to this particular legislation and want to work with him when we reauthorize the ESEA and many of the Even Start Programs throughout the country. Perhaps a third of them use PAT so I am very familiar with it.

Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

Mr. CALLAHAN. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. While I have some reservations about some sections of this bill I would like to express my support for the gentleman from Missouri's amendment. He and I have worked on this issue for some time and I commend his efforts today. I completely agree with this statements that a child's education begins long before that child enters school. Parents provide a learning arena that is critical to the child's educational development. This amendment expands the area of coverage to include those who serve the parents of infants and preschoolers. I cannot think of a better way to enhance a child's education than through increasing parental involvement.

The parents as teachers program is very successful in Alabama and in my home district as well. This program, that begins with prenatal education before the child is born and continues to the age three, features extra benefits that can undoubtedly assist the child in its learning processes. Also, the program is specialized as to the particular family's needs, and let me specify—it is strictly voluntary. This program has helped families all over the Nation, from big cities to small towns. As stated, studies have proven the validity and success of the program.

Children that participate in this program read better, write better, and score higher on aptitude tests. And this not only benefits the student, but the parent as well. They tend to get involved with the child's school after the program they participated in is finished. Madam Chairman, I am pro-family—this program is pro-family. Please know of my support for the parents as teachers program as it seeks to provide these important educational services to families all over the Nation.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Ms. LAMBERT].

Ms. LAMBERT. Madam Chairman, no one will do better until we all do better. And the answer to most of the questions facing our society is usually one word: education. For that reason, I am a strong proponent of our public school system. As a product of the public schools and the public education system from rural Arkansas in the midst of desegregation, I am well aware of the benefits of getting parents and communities involved in our schools. In Helena, AR, where I was raised, there was a potentially volatile situation during the desegregation that was ordered, but because parents like mine got involved in all aspects of school activities, my peers and I enjoyed a well-rounded childhood education.

One generation later, my cousin in Jackson, MS, along with several others, is the original cofounder of a group called Parents for Public Schools that has recently gone national. They are a group of parents that has gathered together and recognized the benefits the entire community can receive from parents involved in the public school system. They literally have become recruiters or salesman for the public schools. For example, when potential students visit their campuses, these parents provide thorough tours, showing the schools' academic strengths, extracurricular activities, and sports programs.

Therefore, I am pleased to rise in support of an amendment sponsored by my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY]. I share the belief of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY] that establishing a school/home partnership is the key to our children's success, not only in school but in their entire life.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of the en bloc amendments to add the goal of parental involvement to the list of Goals 2000.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT]

Mr. WHEAT. Madam Chairman, I would like to first commend Chairman KILDEE and Chairman FORD for their hard work and their demonstrated commitment to improving our Nation's schools.

All of us owe these gentlemen a debt of gratitude for their leadership in crafting legislation to help respond to the concerns and the challenges facing American children and American families today.

The Goals 2000 initiative is an important effort to provide a national framework and guidance for educational reform. I want to thank the chairmen for accepting my amendment as part of the committee's en bloc and I would like to take this opportunity to explain to my colleagues what my amendment seeks to accomplish.

Madam Chairman, goal No. 1 of the National Educational Goals states: "By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn."

While the education of our school-age children is obviously of critical importance, this goal—goal No. 1—recognizes that a child's education begins long before they enter school.

It recognizes that, as infants and toddlers, children learn primarily from their first and most influential teachers—their parents.

Title VI of today's bill addresses the importance of parental information and involvement in a child's education. My amendment would expand the coverage of the programs under this title to include those which serve the parents of infants and preschoolers.

Expanding parental involvement for children of the youngest age stands out as one of the most important investments that we can make in a child's long-term education and development.

I know because my State of Missouri developed what is, in my view, the country's most important model for parental involvement in a young child's development.

The Parents as Teachers Program began in my State of Missouri slightly over a decade ago. Since then it has spread to 42 States and 1,000 communities across the Nation. It enjoys bipartisan support in both Chambers of Congress.

The Parents as Teachers Program begins with prenatal information before a child is born and continues until that child reaches the age of three. It features individualized home visits by trained and certified child specialists, health screenings for children, and group visits among parents where they share their experiences and offer solutions to any difficulties they may be encountering.

The program is specialized, individualized, and uniquely designed with a family's particular needs in mind. Contrary to some claims, this program is strictly voluntary.

Parents as Teachers has improved communication and nurtured the bonds between parents and children, parents

and teachers, and among parents themselves.

It has helped parents and children in big cities and small towns around the Nation to learn together and to stay together. It has helped families move up the ladder of opportunity to achieve the most for themselves and society as a whole.

Study after study validates the success of the program. Children enrolled in Parents as Teachers have consistently been shown to read better, understand more, listen more attentively, and score higher on intellectual aptitude tests.

Equally important, the parents who choose to participate in PAT have been more involved in their children's schooling well after the end of the program. In fact, PAT promotes home-school partnerships which can have lasting benefits for children.

Madam Chairman, I appreciate your recognition that Parents as Teachers deserves a place at the table in our national discussion about ways to ready our children for school.

This is a pro-family initiative, and I look forward to continuing to work with the committee to look for further opportunities to ensure that Parents as Teachers receives Federal support as it seeks to broaden the important services it provides to countless families and communities.

Mr. BROWN of California. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the en bloc amendment and to explain my amendment which is incorporated in it.

My amendment is primarily clarifying in nature. It brings Goals 2000 into conformity with section 5164 of Public Law 100–418, which states that it is the declared policy of the United States to designate the metric system of measurement as the preferred system of weights and measures for U.S. trade and commerce, and to seek out ways to increase understanding of the metric system of measurement through educational information and guidance and in Government publications.

One of the administration's Goals 2000 states that "By the year 2000, United States students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement." This will not happen unless U.S. students are literate in metric since the SI metric system of measurement has been and will continue to be the worldwide measurement system on which science and advanced mathematics is based.

Furthermore, over the past quarter century, the SI metric system of measurement has also become the predominant system of measurement outside the United States for engineering and business. The United States is the last of the world's trading partners to begin the conversion of its economy to metric and has put itself in a competitive disadvantage in some markets.

With each passing year, more of the world's commerce is measured in metric. In the near future, we expect some of our trading partners to start banning the importation of products with nonstandard—that is nonmetric—measurements. Those who cannot understand metric will then, by definition, be noncompetitive both in science and technology and therefore less employable.

Therefore, if U.S. students are to be first in the world in mathematics and science education, they must be able to work in the same measurement language as the rest of the world; metric education must be included in any comprehensive national math and science educational improvement plan. My amendment addresses that need by including in the objectives for this goal that math and science education, including the metric system of measurement, will be strengthened throughout the system, especially in the early grades. And that the number of teachers with a substantive background in mathematics and science, including the metric system of measurement, will increase by 50 percent.

This is a simple clarification, but one that must occur if we are to reach our math and science goal. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

The amendments en bloc were agreed to.

□ 1630

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 103–288.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PAYNE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Payne of New Jersey:

Page 7, after line 10, insert the following:

"(iv) all students will have access to physical education and health education to ensure they are healthy and fit;".

Page 7, line 11, strike "(iv)" and insert "(v)".

Page 7, line 14, strike "(v)" and insert "(vi)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed to the amendment will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to speak on behalf of this amendment offered by myself and my colleague, Mr. MACHTLEY from Rhode Island.

A complete education must address the whole child. Health education and physical education provide basic skills and knowledge that support all other learning and total well-being. Moreover, a school setting is the only place where all children have the opportunity to learn these essential skills and knowledge.

Just last week on Child Health Day, the American Health Foundation gave children and adolescents in the United States a C− for their overall health. Among the many problems cited for poor health were lack of daily physical activity. Only 42 percent of children in grades 9–12 participate in daily school physical education programs. About one-fourth of U.S. children are overweight.

As the health care debate continues in Congress, we need to keep a few things in mind:

Poor health practices ultimately contribute to the spiraling medical costs in our country. Approximately $300 billion annually is spent on various diseases that involve among other things, diet and lack of exercise.

If we are going to have a vision for the 21st century, we must include physical education as one of our objectives in Goals 2000 and use this as a model for which we can strive toward. Let me reiterate that our amendment does not add to the goals—it simply adds fair objectives. Lack of physical activity has been established as a significant risk factor for serious disease. Active lifestyle patterns must be established early.

The current physical activity patterns of children are inadequate to protect against the onset of obesity. Our schools should encourage programs that contribute to developing patterns of physical activity that support health-related fitness. A healthy lifestyle is a prerequisite for all learning and a foundation for responsible citizenship, community service, and personal responsibility.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to take the time that was not taken by anyone in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member rise in opposition to the amendment?

Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] may proceed for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Madam Chairman, I rise to join my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE], in what I think is a very important issue. As this Nation begins its health debate trying to determine how we are going to deliver health care, we must recognize that health care is a life process. Our amendment simply tries to add physical education and health education as objectives under goal 3 of this act, the goals of student achievement and citizenship.

As a father and as a husband of a nurse who is a school nurse, I am painfully aware of the process in which our

school departments and our States in this country begin to eliminate positions which really are going to help the overall health of our Nation.

If we have learned one thing from the debate on health care, it should be that each of us needs to take personal responsibility for our own health. We need to understand that there is a relationship between what we eat and our future health.

We understand that health care delivery in this Nation, approximately 70 percent of which is delivered from situation- or self-induced behavior, can be avoided if we begin to teach fundamental aspects of health in school. Our youth, the future, the future consumers of our resources in health care, need to have this training as part of their educational goals.

Because factors like poverty, injury, violence, and substance abuse are depriving many of our youth of a productive future, we need to make sure we are establishing goals early in their educational lives.

Fifteen percent of adolescents have no health insurance. The results of these statistics cost us enormous amounts of dollars. Adolescents who live in poverty miss 1½ times more school than children who have adequate resources at home. Today injury and violence account for three out of every four adolescent deaths. We can change the course of health in this Nation by making sure that we have health and physical education as an important objective. People who are overweight often as adults try and develop a new life pattern, and it is often too painful and impossible for them to achieve. Part of the problem is they never learned early in youth, when muscles and bodies are willing and more able to develop healthy and athletic practices, how to take care of themselves.

In 1990 a CDC national survey reported that 36 percent of our high school students use tobacco. As we are trying to develop a health care plan, it is important that we develop healthful student programs in school, to help them develop programs away from alcohol and away from tobacco. In addition to tobacco, we find that 37 percent of students today have five or more drinks on one occasion in any given week. These numbers are overwhelming and speak to the need to have health and physical education as an important objective of the Education 2000 Goals.

Madam Chairman, our population is in fact sedentary. As indicated by my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, we have rated ourselves a C-when it comes to physical activity. As adults, we do not exercise enough. Few of us will be Michael Jordan on the basketball field, or few of us will be able to win a World Series pennant, so we can all learn basic educational exercises which can help us to remain productive adults.

If we do not teach these in school, I am afraid they will never be taught in our society. In the current climate of health care, let us make sure that we emphasize at an early age education and health in our schools. It is absolutely essential that this be an objective for our students, be an objective for our schools, and be an objective for our future generations.

One of the chief healthy people 2000 objectives is to increase to at least 75 percent the proportion of the Nation's elementary and secondary schools that provide quality school health education. Let us make sure this is part of our goal in education as well as health.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, we have looked over the amendment. We think it is a good amendment, and we support it.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Madam Chairman, this side has looked at the amendment as well. We have no objections, and we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 103-288.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PORTER

Mr. PORTER. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PORTER:

Page 107, after line 20, insert the following:

SEC. 315. PROHIBITION ON FUNDS.

None of the funds provided under this title may be used to fund programs established by local educational agencies that serve more than 250,000 students.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed to the amendment will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] will be recognized for 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Madam Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funding under title III of the bill for any local educational agency that serves over 250,000 students. In effect, the amendment would exclude the Nation's largest school districts from receiving any portion of the $393 million authorized for State and local reform grants under this legislation.

The purpose of the amendment is to encourage these extremely large school districts to dissolve into smaller, more manageable, and more accountable school districts.

Madam Chairman, I have served on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services for the last 13 years. During that period, the country has undergone a revolution in the way it understands and evaluates education systems.

As early as 1984, Secretary of Education Terrence Bell told my subcommittee that parent involvement and individual school autonomy are critical factors in determining the success of students and schools. None of the succeeding Secretaries of Education—William Bennett, Lauro Cavazos, Ted Sanders, Lamar Alexander, or Richard Riley—has questioned the importance of these factors in educational success.

School districts which serve hundreds of thousands of students simply cannot permit or encourage parental involvement and school autonomy in the way that smaller districts can.

In large school districts, the sheer magnitude of bureaucracy frustrates parent influence and dramatically inhibits individual school autonomy which is necessary to successfully adapt to local circumstances to promote student achievement.

In our Nation's largest districts, school boards often serve as political fiefdoms that jealously guard jurisdiction and dispense political patronage rather than promoting educational success and facilitate student achievement.

Madam Chairman, Secretary Bennett often referred to the Chicago school system as the "Chicago blob"—a bureaucracy so unwieldy that it routinely inhibited reforms that could have improved educational achievement.

I believe that large school districts should be broken up or decentralized to encourage greater school autonomy, parental involvement, and local influence over elementary and secondary education. Only by providing parents a real voice in the management of their children's schools can these districts begin to improve educational achievement.

Madam Chairman, funding is not the greatest issue facing our Nation's schools. In 1991, this country spent $425 billion on education—7.5 percent of GDP as compared to 5 percent for defense and 12 percent for health care. The percentage of GDP dedicated to education in the United States is average among members of the OECD. In

fact, the United States spends a greater percentage of GDP on education than Japan, Germany, or Great Britain. Further, according to the Department of Education, the percentage of public funds dedicated to education in the United States is very high among OECD nations, and per pupil expenditures are exceeded only by Luxembourg, Sweden, and Switzerland. Governments at all levels have dramatically increased education funding over the last decade including increases in education funding of 50 percent in constant dollars over the last decade.

I believe that dramatic structural reforms are needed to improve student performance in this country. Before we pump more funding into extremely large school systems that are structurally incapable of permitting meaningful parental involvement and school autonomy, we ought to encourage them to make reasonable structural reforms that are prerequisites to improved student achievement.

My amendment addresses one such structural impediment at a very small number of school districts. Of the 15,350 public school districts in our country, only 4 have student enrollments of over 250,000. Yet these four school districts by themselves educate 5 percent of all students nationwide. My amendment would encourage these school districts—New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Dade County, Florida—to subdivide into districts of more manageable size before they would be eligible to receive funding under title III of the act. While funding could continue to be drawn from existing sources and divided among the new, smaller districts accordingly, management decisions could be moved downward to the level of the new school districts.

Madam Chairman, I understand that Chicago and New York have undertaken efforts to decentralize their management structures and to place more emphasis on school-based management. Unfortunately, both have encountered legal challenges and internal setbacks that place the success of these efforts in question.

Nevertheless, should these systems succeed, they will have achieved in spite of their great size and political nature, not because of it.

Madam Chairman, I understand that my amendment has caught many Members by surprise. While this bill deals simply with the new Goals 2000 school reform program, my concerns are more general—I believe we should not provide any Federal education funding to any school district which is structurally incapable of providing the reforms that are necessary to improve student achievement.

As I said earlier during debate on the rule, obviously, the funding in this measure is not sufficient to move these districts to reforms that have not yet been accomplished locally or through their State governments. In addition, the school reauthorization legislation scheduled for next year, which contains almost all Federal educational programs is a more appropriate and timely venue to raise this issue. I hope that the Committee on Rules will be willing to allow a similar amendment when that legislation is made in order.

I therefore will ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment with the understanding that I will continue to work with the chairman and the ranking member on the committee to ensure that the elementary and secondary education reauthorization reflects those concerns I have enumerated today.

□ 1640

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], chairman of the full committee.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]. He has worked with us on this, as he has on other issues in the past, and I sympathize with the objective he seeks to accomplish.

Unfortunately, the amendment he has before us is not likely to even be a first step in that direction. I just wanted to take this time, and I expect the gentleman is going to withdraw the amendment, to make the record clear that we asked the Library of Congress to research the numbers for us and tell us which school districts would be blocked out of this program if the amendment were adopted. They are New York City, Chicago, IL, Los Angeles, CA, Dade County, FL, the State of Hawaii, which is a single unified school district statewide, and the Republic of Puerto Rico, which is in a similar position. And while we sympathize with the gentleman, we are very appreciative that he is going to withdraw the amendment at this time.

Mr. PORTER. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I, too, appreciate the gentleman bringing this to our attention. As an educator, I fought consolidation although I was told over and over again that this would mean better science, better math, and better everything. I kept saying it would mean bigger football teams, bigger basketball teams, bigger bands, bigger courses, bigger transportation bills and less participation by families, and that is what happened.

Mr. PORTER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Michigan, I might say that we have drawn the amendment with an understanding that it did not apply to the State of Hawaii or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and we would not intend that educational systems that are statewide or commonwealth-wide in the case of Puerto Rico would be affected by this. The intention is to aim at those very large, monolithic systems in major cities or larger metropolitan areas that really ought to be broken up into smaller districts so that you can get greater parental involvement and greater school autonomy.

Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is considered withdrawn.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 103-288.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. ARMEY

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. ARMEY:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Parent and Student Empowerment Act".

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) parents must have a greater stake in their children's schools if American education is to improve;

(2) the reforms in education prompted by the 1983 "Nation at Risk" report have achieved good results in some places, but have failed to reverse a 30-year nationwide decline in student academic achievement scores;

(3) reform should come from the bottom up, from parents, teachers, and business and community leaders, and not down from Federal or State governments;

(4) the Federal Government should give States and local communities maximum flexibility to achieve national education goals; and

(5) reform should emphasize results, not more spending.

TITLE I—NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS

SEC. 101. PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this title to recognize six national education goals.

SEC. 102. INTERPRETATION.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize or encourage Federal control over, involvement in, or regulation of public, private, religious, or home schools, or any curricular framework, instructional material, examination, or assessment system during the 5-year authorization of this Act or at any future time.

SEC. 103. NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS.

The Congress declares that the national education goals are the following:

(1) SCHOOL READINESS.—(A) By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn.

(B) The objectives for this goal are that—

(i) all disadvantaged and disabled children will have access to high-quality and developmentally appropriate preschool programs that help prepare children for school;

(ii) every parent in America will be a child's first teacher and devote time each day to helping his or her preschool child learn, and parents will have access to the training and support they need; and

(iii) children will receive the nutrition and health care needed to arrive at school with healthy minds and bodies, and the number of low-birthweight babies will be significantly reduced through enhanced prenatal health systems.

(2) SCHOOL COMPLETION.—(A) By the year 2000, the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.

(B) The objectives for this goal are that—

(i) the Nation must dramatically reduce its dropout rate, and 75 percent of students who do drop out will successfully complete a high school degree or its equivalent; and

(ii) the gap in high school graduation rates between American students from minority backgrounds and their non-minority counterparts will be eliminated.

(3) STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND CITIZENSHIP.—(A) By the year 2000, American students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, history, and geography, and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy.

(B) The objectives for this goal are that—

(i) the academic performance of elementary and secondary students will increase significantly in every quartile, and the distribution of minority students in each level will more closely reflect the student population as a whole;

(ii) the percentage of students who demonstrate the ability to reason, solve problems, apply knowledge, and write and communicate effectively will increase substantially;

(iii) all students will be involved in activities that promote and demonstrate good citizenship, community service, and personal responsibility;

(iv) the percentage of students who are competent in more than one language will substantially increase; and

(v) all students will be knowledgeable about the diverse cultural heritage of this Nation and about the world community.

(4) MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE.—(A) By the year 2000, United States students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement.

(B) The objectives for this goal are that—

(i) math and science education will be strengthened throughout the system, especially in the early grades;

(ii) the number of teachers with a substantive background in mathematics and science will increase by 50 percent; and

(iii) the number of United States undergraduate and graduate students, especially women and minorities, who complete degrees in mathematics, science, and engineering will increase significantly.

(5) ADULT LITERACY AND LIFELONG LEARNING.—(A) By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

(B) The objectives for this goal are that—

(i) every major American business will be involved in strengthening the connection between education and work;

(ii) all workers will have the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills, from basic to highly technical, needed to adapt to emerging new technologies, work methods, and markets through public and private educational, vocational, technical, workplace, or other programs;

(iii) the number of quality programs, including those at libraries, that are designed to serve more effectively the needs of the growing number of part-time and midcareer students will increase substantially;

(iv) the proportion of those qualified students, especially minorities, who enter college, who complete at least two years, and who complete their degree programs will increase substantially; and

(v) the proportion of college graduates who demonstrate an advanced ability to think critically, communicate effectively, and solve problems will increase substantially.

(6) SAFE, DISCIPLINED, AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS.—(A) By the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.

(B) The objectives for this goal are that—

(i) every school will implement a firm and fair policy on use, possession, and distribution of drugs and alcohol;

(ii) parents, businesses, and community organizations will work together to ensure that the schools are a safe haven for all children; and

(iii) every school district will develop a comprehensive K-12 drug and alcohol prevention education program. Drug and alcohol curriculum should be taught as an integral part of health education. In addition, community-based teams should be organized to provide students and teachers with needed support.

TITLE II—SCHOOL REFORM AND PARENT EMPOWERMENT

SEC. 201. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to raise the quality of education for all American students by spurring a 5-year effort to promote dramatic and effective changes in the system of elementary and secondary education throughout the Nation.

SEC. 202. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

The Secretary is authorized, in accordance with the provisions of this title, to make grants to State educational agencies to enable States and local educational agencies to reform and improve the quality of education. Such grants shall be used to develop and implement innovative educational reform plans.

SEC. 203. APPLICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If a State desires to receive assistance under this title, the State educational agency shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such additional information as the Secretary may reasonably require. Such application shall cover a 5-year period.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS.—Each such application shall—

(1) contain satisfactory evidence that the State educational agency has or will have authority, by legislation if necessary, to implement the State reform plan required under section 204;

(2) provide an assurance that the State has a strategy for ensuring broad participation in the planning process, including parents, students, teachers, business leaders, and other community leaders;

(3) provide an assurance that the State will notify the public through print and electronic media and all local educational agencies through actual notice—

(A) that the State has made application for funds under this title;

(B) of the purposes for which the funds will be used; and

(C) that the State is developing a reform plan under section 204;

(4) provide an assurance that all students shall have equal access to the curricular frameworks and instructional materials developed as part of the State reform plan;

(5) describe actions taken and resources identified or committed to meet the requirements of this title;

(6) provide an assurance that the applicant shall prepare and submit to the Secretary annual evaluations of and reports concerning the State reform plan; and

(7) provide an assurance that the State shall carry out the provisions of section 204.

(c) APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall approve an application and any amendment to the application if the application or the amendment to such application meets the requirements of this section and is of sufficient quality to effect substantial reform of elementary and secondary education in the State. The Secretary shall not finally disapprove an application or amendment, except after giving reasonable notice, technical assistance, and an opportunity for a hearing.

SEC. 204. DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVAL OF STATE PLAN.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF STATE REFORM PANEL.—Each State educational agency assisted under this title shall establish a temporary ad hoc panel to develop a statewide reform plan. Such panel shall consist of—

(1) a chairman, who shall be the chief executive of the State (or designee);

(2) the presiding officer and the minority leader of each house of the State legislature (or designees);

(3) the chief State school officer;

(4) the head of the office that coordinates higher education programs in the State or, if there is no such office, the head of the office designated under section 2008 of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2988) (or designee); and

(5) individuals selected by the chief executive of the State, including representatives from the following groups and organizations:

(A) Parents.

(B) Teachers.

(C) Principals.

(D) Local school boards.

(E) Small businesses.

(F) Large businesses.

(b) ADDITIONAL MEMBERS.—(1) The first meeting of the State reform panel shall be convened by the chief executive of the State. At such meeting, the panel members designated or selected under subsection (a) may select additional panel members.

(2) The membership of the panel shall not exceed 25 in number.

(3) The chief executive of the State shall serve as the chairman of the panel and determine a meeting schedule.

(c) DEVELOPMENT OF STATE PLAN.—The State reform panel shall develop a State reform plan that—

(1) stresses that all students are to demonstrate substantial improvement in academic achievement and cognitive skills;

(2) emphasizes quantifiable measures of the improvement of students' cognitive skills

rather than prescribing how State and local educational agencies should achieve such improvements;

(3) describes strategies for how the State will encourage parents and the public to support and become involved in implementing the State and local reform plans;

(4) establishes State goals to maximize academic achievement by each student;

(5) establishes academically rigorous curricular frameworks;

(6) provides for the development of instructional materials based upon the curricular frameworks;

(7) provides for the development of valid, reliable, and procedurally fair assessment systems based upon the curricular frameworks that are capable of accurately measuring the basic cognitive skills and knowledge required to meet the State's education goals;

(8) establishes a process for reviewing Federal, State, and local laws and regulations and for recommending changes in such laws and regulations to further state-wide reform;

(9) provides a process for selecting local educational agencies to receive subgrants under section 206;

(10) provides for the development of objective criteria and measures against which the success of local reform plans can be evaluated; and

(11) provides for the evaluation of the effectiveness of the State reform plan in helping low-achieving students to improve their performance, using academic achievement and such other measures as attendance, grade retention, and dropout rates.

(e) PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.—Following the development of the State reform plan, the State reform panel shall seek public comment by—

(1) publishing the plan with a comment period of at least 60 days, and

(2) notifying the public through electronic and print media and conducting regional hearings.

After providing the public with an opportunity to comment on the plan, the panel shall consider the public's comments and make appropriate changes.

(f) APPROVAL OF STATE PLAN.—(1) The State reform plan shall be submitted to the State for review by the State educational agency, which may make recommendations to the panel for changes to such plan. The State educational agency shall then implement the plan after such agency has submitted the plan to, and received approval of the plan by, the Secretary.

(2) The Secretary shall approve a State reform plan if the plan meets the requirements of this section.

(3) The Secretary shall not finally disapprove a plan or an amendment to such plan, except after giving reasonable notice, technical assistance, and an opportunity for a hearing.

(g) REVIEW OF STATE PLAN.—The State reform panel and the State educational agency shall review on a continuing basis the implementation of the State reform plan for the period during which the State receives Federal funding under this title. The results of such review shall be prepared in writing by the State reform panel and be included by the State in its annual report to the Secretary under section 213(a).

SEC. 205. STATE USES OF FUNDS.

(a) USES OF FUNDS.—Funds allotted by the Secretary under paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 211 and State and private funds contributed to make up the total cost of a State reform plan under section 211(c) shall be used by a State with an approved application for the following purposes:

(1) To develop and implement the State reform plan (with not more than 10 percent of the Federal funds shall be used for this purpose).

(2) To support the activities of the State reform panel (including the travel expenses of the members of such panel).

(3) To make subgrants to local educational agencies as provided in section 206.

(4) To provide technical assistance (including dissemination of information) to local educational agencies to assist in developing and carrying out local reform plans.

(5) To undertake evaluation, reporting, and data collection.

(b) SUBGRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—In the first year that a State receives a Federal allotment under this title, from not less than 75 percent of the total cost of a State's reform plan, the State educational agency shall make subgrants to local educational agencies for the purpose of developing and implementing local reform plans as provided in section 206. In the second and succeeding years, from not less than 90 percent of the total cost of a State's reform plan, the State educational agency shall make subgrants to local educational agencies to fulfill the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 206. DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVAL OF LOCAL PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As described in the State reform plan, and based upon the recommendations of the State reform panel established under section 204, the State shall make subgrants to local educational agencies based upon local reform plans consistent with the State reform plan and developed by temporary ad hoc local reform panels.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF LOCAL REFORM PANEL.—Each local educational agency assisted under this title shall establish a temporary ad hoc local reform panel to develop a district-wide reform plan consistent with the State reform plan. Such panel shall consist of—

(1) a chairman, who shall be the highest-ranking elected chief executive in the local jurisdiction most closely approximating the boundaries of the school district (or designee), and who is not also a member of any other local educational reform panel;

(2) the chief district-wide school officer; and

(3) individuals selected by the chairman of the local reform panel, including representatives from the following groups and organizations:

(A) Parents.

(B) Teachers.

(C) The local school board.

(D) Small businesses.

(E) Large businesses.

(c) ADDITIONAL MEMBERS.—(1) The panel members designated or selected in subsection (b) may select additional panel members from community organizations.

(2) The membership of the panel shall not exceed 11 in number.

(3) The chairman of the panel shall determine a meeting schedule.

(d) APPROVAL OF LOCAL REFORM PLAN.—The local educational agency shall implement the local reform plan after the local reform panel has submitted its plan to the Secretary and received written confirmation from the Secretary that its plan is consistent with the State reform plan.

SEC. 207. LOCAL USES OF FUNDS.

A local educational agency which receives a subgrant under this title shall use the funds for the purpose of district-wide reform, consistent with the State and local reform plans. Authorized activities shall include one or more of the following:

(1) Model schools, including charter schools, which reflect the best available knowledge regarding teaching and learning, which use the highest quality instructional materials and technologies, and which are designed to meet State and local education goals as well as the particular needs of their students and communities.

(2) Merit school systems which reward schools with students who, as a group, demonstrate improved performance on curriculum-related outcome measures that assess only basic cognitive skills.

(3) Choice programs which permit parents to select the school their children will attend.

(4) Decentralized management which permits maximum decision making at the individual school level, involves parents, and emphasizes alternative certification.

SEC. 208. PROHIBITED USES OF FUNDS.

No State educational agency, local educational agency, or school that receives funds under this Act shall—

(1) adopt outcome measures that assess affective skills; or

(2) engage in programs that coordinate access to health care or other social services.

SEC. 209. PARENTAL CONSENT.

(a) PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING.—No funds under this title shall be made available to any State educational agency, local educational agency, or school in which psychiatric or psychological examination, testing, or treatment, or any project that involves surveying, analyzing, or evaluating the personal values, attitudes, beliefs, or sexual behavior of the student, take place, without the prior, written consent of the student (if the student is an adult or an emancipated minor), or in the case of an unemancipated minor, without the prior, written consent of a parent or guardian who has been first informed of the purpose of such examination, test, treatment, or information sought to be obtained.

(b) PRIVACY.—No funds under this title shall be made available to any State educational agency, local educational agency, or school that lacks a written policy to protect the right of parents (or student, if the student is an adult or an emancipated minor) to—

(1) inspect or review at any time any and all official records directly related to such student, including all written or electronically recorded material that is incorporated into the student's cumulative record folder, identifying data, academic work completed, grades, standardized achievement test scores, attendance data, scores on standardized intelligence, aptitude, or psychological tests, interest inventory results, health data, medical records, family background information, teacher or counselor ratings and observations, and verified reports of serious or recurrent behavior patterns; and

(2) forbid the release of such student's official records, without the parents' (or student's, if the student is an adult or an emancipated minor) prior written consent, to anyone other than—

(A) school officials within the student's school or local educational agency who have a legitimate educational interest;

(B) officials of other schools or school systems in which the student intends to enroll, upon condition that the student's parents (or the student, if the student is an adult or an emancipated minor) be notified of the transfer, receive a copy of the record if desired, and have an opportunity for a hearing to challenge and correct the content of the record; or

(C) in connection with a student's application for, or receipt of, financial aid.

(c) OPT-OUT RIGHT.—No funds under this title shall be made available to any State educational agency, local educational agency, or school that lacks a written policy to protect the right of parents (or student, if the student is an adult or emancipated minor) to withdraw the student from participation in any activity carried out as part of the State or local reform plan when the parents (or student, if the student is an adult or an emancipated minor) consider such activity to be detrimental to the student's education.

(d) GRACE PERIOD.—Any State educational agency, local educational agency, or school that receives funds under this title shall have a grace period not to exceed 6 months from the date that such funds are first made available to write the parental consent policies required under subsections (b) and (c).

SEC. 210. WAIVERS OF STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To fulfill the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may waive any requirement of any Federal statute listed in subsection (g) or of the regulations issued under such statute for a State educational agency, local educational agency, or school that requests such a waiver.

(b) PROMPTNESS OF RESPONSE TO WAIVER REQUEST.—The Secretary shall act on any such waiver request not later than 180 days after receipt or the waiver shall be considered granted.

(c) WAIVER PERIOD.—Each such waiver shall be for a period not to exceed 3 years. The Secretary may extend such period if the Secretary determines that the waiver has been effective in enabling the State or local educational agency to fulfill the purposes of this Act.

(d) WAIVER REVIEW.—The Secretary shall periodically review the performance of any State educational agency, local educational agency, or school for which the Secretary has granted a waiver and shall terminate the waiver if the Secretary determines that such performance has been inadequate to justify the waiver's continuation.

(e) EXCEPTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the waiver of section 438 or 439 of the General Education Provisions Act.

(f) SPECIAL PROVISION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the waiver of any provision of this Act.

(g) PROGRAMS SUBJECT TO WAIVER.—The statutes subject to the waiver authority of this section are as follows:

(1) Chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(2) Part A of chapter 2 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(3) The Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act (part A of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965).

(4) The Emergency Immigrant Education Act of 1984 (part D of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965).

(5) The Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1986 (title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965).

(6) The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act.

(h) WAIVERS NOT AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may not waive any statutory or regulatory requirement of the programs listed in subsection (g) relating to—

(1) maintenance of effort;

(2) comparability of services;

(3) the equitable participation of students and professional staff in private schools;

(4) parental participation and involvement; or

(5) the distribution of funds to State or to local educational agencies.

SEC. 211. ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS.

(a) TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—From funds appropriated under section 218, the Secretary shall allot to the Secretary of the Interior for each fiscal year an amount equal to ½ of 1 percent of the funds appropriated, not to exceed $600,000 in any fiscal year, to benefit Indian students enrolled in schools funded by the Department of the Interior for Indian students. The provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to payments made under this paragraph.

(b) TO THE STATES.—From the remaining amount appropriated under section 218, the Secretary shall make annual grants to States with approved applications.

(c) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—(1) Of the total cost of a State reform plan, during the following years for which a State receives funds under this title, the Federal share under this title may not exceed—

(A) 100 percent the first year;

(B) 85 percent the second year;

(C) 60 percent the third year;

(D) 45 percent the fourth year; and

(E) 33 percent the fifth and any succeeding year.

(2) The non-Federal share under this title shall be paid by the State from State funds and may include contributions from private sources.

(3) The non-Federal share under this title may be in cash or in kind fairly evaluated.

(4) The matching requirements of this subsection shall not apply to the Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or Pacific outlying areas.

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—From its annual Federal allotment, a State may reserve for administration (not to include the activities of the State reform panel) an amount not to exceed 4 percent or $250,000, whichever is greater.

(e) SPECIAL PROVISION.—Not less than 25 percent of the amounts made available to local educational agencies under this title shall be used for choice programs.

SEC. 212. AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION TO NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Proportionate to the number of children in a State or in a local educational agency who are enrolled in private elementary or secondary schools, a State educational agency or local educational agency that uses funds under this title to develop curricular frameworks, instructional materials, examinations, or assessment systems shall, upon request, make information related to such frameworks, materials, examinations, or assessment systems available to private schools and private school accrediting organizations.

SEC. 213. ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTS; TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—A State which receives funds under this title shall annually report to the Secretary—

(1) regarding such State's progress in meeting its State reform goals and plan;

(2) describing proposed activities for the succeeding year; and

(3) describing Federal regulations which may impede reform activities under this title as described in local reform plans approved by the Secretary.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance, either directly by grant or by contract, to the States to assist them in complying with the requirements of this section. The Secretary may reserve up to ½ of 1 percent of the appropriations for this title to carry out this section.

SEC. 214. EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION.

(a) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate a representative sample of State and local reform efforts over the course of the 5-year authorization in order to assess the effectiveness of such plans and activities in improving the education performance of all students. The Secretary may reserve up to ½ of 1 percent of the appropriations for this title to carry out this section.

(b) DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary shall, annually and upon request, disseminate to the States information on reform approaches and materials developed under this title or through related efforts.

SEC. 215. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

The Secretary shall submit annually to the Members of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate a report that contains—

(1) a description of the progress that States receiving funds under this title have made in developing and implementing their plans; and

(2) information from State and local reports regarding requirements in Federal law or regulation which have been identified by State or local educational agencies or State or local reform panels as impeding the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 216. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

Nothing in this title shall—

(1) be construed to exempt a State or local educational agency that receives funds under this title from the requirements of section 438 or 439 of the General Education Provisions Act;

(2) be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the Federal Government to—

(A) exercise any control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system; or

(B) prescribe the use of a particular examination or standards; or

(3) be construed to authorize or encourage Federal control over, involvement in, or regulation of private, religious, or home schools during the 5-year authorization of this Act or at any future time.

SEC. 217. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title:

(1) The term "affective skills" means, but is not limited to meaning, the emotions, opinions, values, attitudes, beliefs, or sexual behavior of a student.

(2) The term "assessment system" means a system for measuring the cognitive skills and academic achievement of students that is based upon a set of curricular frameworks.

(3) The term "cognitive skills" means abilities to perform discrete academic tasks that demonstrate understanding of such basic subjects as reading, writing, mathematics, science, history, and geography, and that may be readily assessed, measured, and compared in objective and numerically quantifiable terms, but does not mean affective skills.

(4) The term "community organizations" means, but is not limited to meaning, fraternal or religious organizations, but does not mean organizations created for the purpose of, or having as their primary effect, the influencing of education or education policy.

(5) The term "curricular framework" means a specific, detailed description, in a particular subject matter area, of the knowledge and cognitive skills children should acquire at each grade level.

(6) The term "legitimate educational interest" means an interest in a student's cognitive skills and academic progress, but does not mean an interest in a student's affective skills, psychology, family, or other nonacademic matter.

(7) The term "Pacific outlying area" means American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Republic of Palau (until such time as the compact of Free Association is ratified).

(8) The term "private school" means nonpublic or religious education.

(9) The term "school" means public, private, or religious education.

(10) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Education.

(11) The term "State" means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(12) The terms "State educational agency" and "local educational agency" have the meaning given such terms in section 1471 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

SEC. 218. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

For the purpose of carrying out this title, there are authorized to be appropriated $400,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry. Has no one requested the time in opposition?

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I ask for the time in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer a genuine school reform bill. I rise to offer America's families a true choice in education.

Along with my colleagues Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. HOEKSTRA, I have worked to draft a true education reform bill that empowers parents, not bureaucracies. We call our amendment the Parent and Student Empowerment Act because we believe the solution to our Nation's educational ills is more, not less, parental control of what goes on in the classroom.

Former Education Secretaries William Bennett and Lamar Alexander strongly support our amendment. So do such concerned organizations as Citizens for Educational Excellence, Citizens for Educational Freedom, Empower America, Christian Coalition, the American Legislative Exchange Council, Christian Action Network, the Family Research Council, the American Association of Christian Schools, Eagle Forum, Concerned Women for America, Association of Christian Schools International, and the Traditional Values Coalition. We represent a broad coalition of parents across America.

Madam Chairman, I will insert letters of endorsement from these organizations immediately following my remarks.

Let me just add a personal note here. I am not offering this amendment today for DICK ARMEY. I am not offering it for the Republican Party or for the people of Texas or even for parents. I am offering this amendment for the children of our country.

This amendment is for Guadalupe and Vanessa Gutierrez, two young sisters attending Coronodo-Escobar Elementary School in San Antonio. These little girls' public school district is failing so badly that their family has reluctantly filed suit to ask that they be allowed to reclaim their own tax dollars to use at a private school of their choosing. Like all parents, the Gutierrez family takes its sacred obligation as parents seriously.

This amendment is for 11-year-old Joe Reyes, whose public school is so violent and so poorly managed that his parents have been forced to seek alternatives. Luckily, Joe's parents have been able to acquire assistance from the CEO Foundation in San Antonio, a private group that gives low-income families true educational choice. Joe writes: "My friend got stabbed in the fourth period so I am thankful I have a C.E.O. scholarship and can go to my new school."

This amendment is for the 57 percent of Hispanic-Americans and the 88 percent of African-Americans who support letting parents choose their children's education.

Madam Chairman, rich people already have school choice. They can afford it. It is the poor who are trapped in failing schools. Yet the opponents of school choice are so scared of letting parents choose, they would rather keep children trapped than loosen the grip of the education bureaucracy on our schools.

Well, these scare tactics are falling flat. In those communities where school choice is already permitted—from the public school choice programs of East Harlem and Milwaukee to the privately funded choice programs in Indianapolis and San Antonio—the public schools are doing just fine. And low-income parents are delighted.

As with the growing tide of freedom around the globe, this movement is unstoppable. California is about to vote on a historic school-choice ballot initiative. Michigan is about to give every parent a voucher to let parents choose among public schools.

And right now, citizen groups are forming to provide privately funded school-choice vouchers in Austin, Atlanta, Little Rock, Denver, Dallas, Houston, Phoenix, Orlando, Miami, Boston, Albany, and yes, Washington, DC.

Monopoly public schooling is the Berlin Wall of education. It's going to fall. That is inevitable. The only question is which side are we going to be on—on the side of government, or on the side of freedom?

Let me clarify one important point. The Armey substitute does not mandate private school choice. It permits private school choice, at local community option. We believe local communities should be left free to craft their own school reform plans and to decide what is best suited to their particular circumstances.

We oppose a national curriculum devised by what amounts to a national school board, as contained in the Goals 2000 bill.

We want to shift the focus from how much money school districts spend to what is best for children.

And with all due respect to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. GOODLING, Goals 2000 is a top-down, bureaucratic solution that relies on spending more money. It pours more money into all the same old bureaucracies and the same old programs that have failed to reverse a 30-year decline in national academic achievement scores.

Madam Chairman, more money is not the answer. We spent 33 percent more in 1990 than in 1980, after inflation, and yet scores are still falling.

School-based clinics are not the answer. They do not work, and they do not educate.

Putting welfare offices in the schools is not the answer.

Mandating politically correct gender-equitable and multicultural instructional materials is not the answer.

Meddling in the home by teachers—the so-called parents-as-teachers concept, which should really be called teachers as parents—is not the answer.

Race-norming of tests is not the answer—and yes, Mr. Chairman, despite the other side's assertions to the contrary, Goals 2000 contains the seeds of race-norming.

Nor will we do any good by embracing educational fads like outcome-based education that focus on changing values and beliefs rather than on instilling basic academic knowledge.

Madam Chairman, if you agree that Guadalupe and Vanessa Gutierrez should not have to go to court to get a decent education, if you agree that little Joe Reyes should not fear for his life in school—then vote for change.

Vote for true reform.

Vote for parental choice and local control.

Vote for the Parent and Student Empowerment Act.

[Letters follow]:

AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE EXCHANGE COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, July 16, 1993.

U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are at a point in American history which is presenting us with the challenge of giving today's young people the opportunity to rise above the problems and the inequities which have manifested themselves in the streets of our cities. The violence that we have witnessed represents a loud cry for equality and opportunity from those individuals so eager to have a chance to pursue the dreams taken for granted by so many Americans. School choice gives young people this chance to obtain a quality education, to achieve the American Dream, and to excel in areas which were previously unattainable due to the poor quality of their designated schools.

We at ALEC are dedicated to the fight to empower all Americans; to give each and every individual the opportunity to pursue the American Dream. The American Legislative Exchange Council is the nation's largest bipartisan, individual membership organization of state legislators. ALEC has approximately 2,500 state legislators as members, nearly one-third who hold leadership positions in their legislatures.

We are delighted to learn that lawmakers have the opportunity to vote for an amendment, the Armey amendment, that is pro-active educational reform. We strongly urge you to support the Armey amendment, which provides for school choice and abandons the status quo of increased spending and bureaucratic control.

Why is school choice so important? School choice will bring competitive incentives to the public school system, ensure educational equity for students from all income levels, provide a means to directly involve parents in the educational process, and expand individual liberty. Most important perhaps, Americans deserve choice in education as much as they deserve and enjoy choice in their decisions about where to live and work, where to shop, and for whom to vote.

You have the power to make school choice and real educational reform a reality. We stand with you on this vital issue and strongly urge you to give the Armey amendment your enthusiastic support.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL A. BRUNELLI,
Executive Director.

CITIZENS FOR EDUCATIONAL FREEDOM,
Arlington, VA, July 19, 1993

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: On behalf of nonpublic school parents and friends, National Citizens for Educational Freedom urges you to vote against the HR 1804, President Clinton's "Goals 2000 School-Reform" Bill. Instead, CEF recommends that you support the Armey Amendment which promotes full school choice and the empowerment of both parents and students.

Parents will take greater responsibility for their children's education.

Students will be in those schools where their individual needs will be met more effectively.

Public, private, and parochial schools will be challenged to improve their delivery systems.

Consumers will have a greater stake in their success because they have chosen their schools.

The corporate community will benefit from a more competent work force.

Strong new partnerships will develop as parents, schools, and businesses exert a concerted effort to improve education.

This country will take its place among international leaders, creating a model for others to emulate.

Please give all students a chance to learn in an environment which is safe, educationally stimulating and disciplined; where students, teachers, and parents are respected; where all take responsibility for learning. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

JAMES J. CONDIT,
President, National CEF.

CHRISTIAN ACTION NETWORK,
Forest, VA, July 19, 1993.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: There are many pieces of legislation this Congress which will adversely impact the future of the American family. Few will be felt more than HR 1804, the "Goals 2000: Educate America Act." The Christian Action Network opposes this legislation.

The last thing that American education needs is more centralization. Many education bureaucrats and social elites are attempting to refashion how this nation views education. Today, we are told, requires a citizenry educated and trained for the marketplace of tomorrow, and that a centralized system of school boards, curricula, and testing among other things is essential to fine tune our great economic machine.

Such a visionary assessment, neatly packaged in HR 1804, is nothing more than new world order nonsense. The paramount tradition of education in America is to educate for liberty. Liberty is the singular national interest in education. No clearer contrary evidence of this exists than the positive correlation between the growth of public education and the growth of the federal government. The more our educational system has become enslaved by those who would think for the rest of us, so too do we as a nation become enslaved.

A modest attempt to correct some of the wrongs perpetrated against American education is Congressman Dick Armey's substitute to HR 1804, the "Parent and Student Empowerment Act." The key to giving kids an excellent education is in protecting parents in their right and responsibility to provide the kind of education they deem correct. HR 1804 takes control from the hands of parents. The Armey substitute puts control back in parental hands.

John Gatto, New York State Teacher of the Year for 1991, eloquently argues in his book "Dumbing Us Down": "Whatever an education is, it should make you a unique individual, not a conformist; it should furnish you with an original spirit with which to tackle the big challenges; it should allow you to find values which will be your road map through life; it should make you spiritually rich, a person who lives whatever you are doing, wherever you are, whomever you are with; it should teach you what is important, how to live and how to die."

Does this description sound like anything resembling a project of the federal government? If not, then what makes us think that HR 1804 will be helpful? The Christian Action Network urges your opposition to HR 1804 and your support of the Armey substitute.

Sincerely,

PAUL T. MERO,
Legislative Director.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS,
Independence, MO, July 21, 1993.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The American Association of Christian Schools firmly believes that the education, discipline, and medical and physical care of all children are the God-given responsibility of parents and not of any government, agency, or social group. With this in mind, we strongly support Representative Dick Armey's "Parent and Student Empowerment Act" as an alternative to H.R. 1804. Your vote in support of Armey's amendment would be a strong vote establishing parental rights and control over their children's educational destiny. Currently, public education offers little hope for parents and their children.

The Parent and Student Empowerment Act recognizes the parents' right to determine who can view their children's school records (a basic right to privacy). It also reinforces parents' inalienable right to opt out of programs they consider detrimental to their children's education. This act also requires schools to acquire prior written parental consent before children are subjected to sex surveys and psychological testing. These are important objectives which Goals 2000 will not deliver to parents.

Additionally, the Armey substitute will prohibit the use of funds for outcome-based education or school-based clinics. This act does not increase the federal beaucracy or spending. It also allows for local communities to determine effective means for school reform. Lastly, it provides for school choice, a concept which a broad majority of the Supreme Court embraced in the recent "Zobrest" decision.

Furthermore, we believe that top-down reform, as offered in "Goals 2000," is nothing more than the federal government bearing down its foot upon the weakened body of parents and local community leaders. In this manner reform is slow and hard to come by. Conversely, the Parent and Student Empowerment Act gives accountability, authority, power, and responsibility to parents and local community leaders to reform the process and educate their children effectively. This is real reform, from the bottom-up, with measurable results, less increased spending. In conclusion, the Armey substitute will more effectively accomplish what Goals 2000 would like to achieve with the pitfalls and snares which will hinder it (H.R. 1804).

We strongly urge you to vote for the Armey Amendment known as the "Parent and Student Empowerment Act."

Sincerely,

MARTIN I. HOYT, II.

EAGLE FORUM,
Alton, IL, July 21, 1993.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: President Clinton's "Education Reform" bill, H.R. 1804, "Goals 2000: Educate America Act" is making its way through Congress. It is a business-as-usual bill that increases Federal education bureaucracy and imposes more Federal mandates on states. The bill also contains provisions designed to impede legitimate reform, such as "opportunity to learn standards" (a school-funding equalization scheme) and "national workforce skills standards" as well as federal grants to "coordinate health, education, and social service delivery", which can be used to distribute contraceptives in schools. For these, and many other reasons, this bill offer little hope for any real change.

The components of "Goals 2000" are as follows: Title I establishes seven (not the original six) National Education Goals to be met

by the year 2000. These goals broaden the scope of education to cover almost everyone from prenatal babies and preschool children to parents and adults in the labor force.

The goals are: One, all children in America will start school ready to learn. It specifies that children will have access to "high-quality" pre-school programs, parents will have access to training and support, and children will have the health care and nutrition they need; two, the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent, with assurances that the graduation rates between minority and non-minority students be the same; three, all students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated sufficient competency over subject matter including foreign languages and art, history and geography and involvement in community service and knowledge about the "diverse cultural heritage"; four, access to continued education program for teachers. This receives major emphasis in the bill and relies on a national school board to implement these delivery standards; five, United States students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement with special emphasis added to increase the number of women and minorities with a background in math; six, every adult American will be literate and will posses the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights of citizenship; and seven, every school in American will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment.

These goals are to be implemented by three new layers of bureaucracy with money provided for grants to states that follow the guidelines set out for them.

Title II establishes two of the three new layers of bureaucracy, the National Education Goals Panel, and a new National Education Standards and Improvement Council. It authorizes an "opportunity-to-learn" development grant, assessment development and evaluation grants, and an evaluation of work of the Goals Panel and the Council.

I am very concerned about the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC) which will act as a national school board that develops certification criteria, certify voluntary national content, student performance, opportunity-to-learn standards, and certify assessment systems submitted by the states if they meet the criteria.

Most of the money in Goals 2000 goes to grants to states and local education agencies for "school reform." Money is made available for grants to states for developing, field testing, and evaluation of systems of assessment. Their idea of reform is clearly demonstrated with the requirements for grantees to give special attention to how an assessment treats all students, especially with regard to the race, gender, ethnicity, disability, and language proficiency. Many parents see this as a method for states to use more money for outcome based education (OBE). Parents oppose OBE because it teaches and tests attitudes and outcomes rather than cognitive skills.

Title III authorizes grants to the states to support reform plans that support national activities including: (1) development or adoption of content, student performance, and opportunity to learn standards, (2) improvement and coordination of staff development, curriculum, and state assessment system, (3) coordination of health and social services. However, Committee Report language emphasizes that the use of federal funds is not restricted to the academic area. Critics point out that the majority of the money will be used for teachers and educational bureaucrats rather than students.

Title IV sets up the third layer of bureaucracy, a National Standards Board to stimulate the development of a national system of skill standards used in industry hiring. A purpose of this board is to "assist in evaluating the skill levels of prospective employees * * * to increase the opportunities for minorities and women, including removing barriers to the entry of women in non-traditional employment and to be used by labor organizations, to enhance the employment security of workers by providing portable credentials and skills * * *"

Dissenters from the Committee report express concerns over serious civil rights issues. They point out that if the process produces minimally demanding, ineffective standards, employers will likely use different standards. This may in turn give plaintiffs room for attack on the differences, contending that employers must justify any deviation from a broad-approved standard.

Title VI authorizes money for grants to organizations to provide information and training for parents to encourage better working relationships between parents and schools. Conservatives fear this will be used to set up "parents as teachers" programs that will interfere with family relations.

H.R. 1804 sets out radical change which can hardly be called reform. It incorporates the education establishment in all aspects of life from conception until after one enters the work force. It paves the way for a national school board, national curriculum, national testing, funding of school-based clinics, outcome-based education, the so-called Robin Hood plan which could force states to equalize funding between school districts, and a national "parents as teachers" type program. It creates three new bureaucracies to set up national standards by using the "carrot and stick" approach of tying funding to adoption of standards. It explicitly rejects school choice and relies heavily on the education establishment and federal government.

We encourage you to vote against Clinton's "Goals 2000" and instead support Congressman Dick Armey's "Parent and Student Empowerment Act" which offers real education reform with an emphasis on local control. It incorporates the goals for education that were originally agreed to by state governors and includes the following provisions: Emphasizes bottom-up reform and measurable results, not increased spending; emphasizes school choice; recognizes parents' inalienable right to opt out of programs they consider detrimental to their children's education; requires schools to acquire informed, prior, written parental consent before subjecting children to intrusive psychological testing or sex surveys; recognizes parents' right to determine who can view their children's school records; and prohibits use of funds for school-based clinics and "outcome based education."

"Parent and Student Empowerment Act" offers a legitimate plan for reform in education by emphasizing measurable results, not simply increased spending. Because of the incredible importance of education reform and the merit of this bill, I encourage you to support the "Parent and Student Empowerment Act" as a substitute to Clinton's "Goals 2000" bill.

Faithfully,

PHYLLIS SCHLAFLY.

CONCERNED WOMEN FOR AMERICA,
Washington, DC, July 22, 1993.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: Concerned Women for America (CWA) has been tirelessly seeking reform for our nation's educational system; however, we cannot support the direction of H.R. 1804, "Goals 2000: Educate America Act." CWA is also troubled by the general direction of the national education goals.

H.R. 1804 offers no flexibility, no choice, and no accountability. As the bill is written, it provides funding to those institutions which have held a vested interest in preventing genuine reform. H.R. 1804 sets into motion a dangerous trend towards national standards, national curriculum and a national school board. Although the word "voluntary" is repeatedly used throughout the bill, a national curriculum is right around the corner if this so-called "reform" bill is passed.

However, a vote for the Armey Substitute, "The Parent and Student Empowerment Act," would allow local educational agencies to embark on genuine reform. The Armey Substitute would limit the list of activities eligible for funding to those showing real reform. The Substitute would prohibit the use of funds for sex clinics and the controversial "outcome based education." Most importantly, the Armey Substitute reinforces parental authority in the educational development of their own children. It allows parents to retain the right to remove their children from participating in objectionable exercises, enhances parents' rights to protect their children from intrusive psychological testing and sex surveys, and ensures parents have the exclusive right to decide who can view their children's school records. CWA agrees with Congressman Armey that the role of the parent is vital to educational reform.

A vote for the Armey Substitute is a vote for real reform and will enhance parental involvement in education. CWA will be informing our members about the outcome of this important vote.

Sincerely,

BEVERLY LAHAYE,
President.

ASSOCIATION OF CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS INTERNATIONAL,
Washington, DC, July 26, 1993.

Hon. RICHARD K. ARMEY,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ARMEY: The Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) is the largest association of evangelical Christian schools in the nation with over 3,000 member schools, including 115 member colleges.

Why does President Clinton send his daughter to a religious school?

Why do 22% of the National Education Association teachers send their children to private and religious schools [Forbes, 6/7/93]?

Why do the ACSI students average 12 months ahead of the public school norms on the Stanford Achievement test [The Psychological Corporation]?

Why? Because the educational bureaucracy is not doing its job and it is heavily invested in failed methods, reaffirmed in Goals 2000. American parents and tax payers deserve relief from the augmentation of institutionalized failure, so painfully evident in the schools and reflected in the nostrums of the educational bureaucracy found in H.R. 1804. Citizens long to see competition, spurred by success-linked reforms, such as model schools, merit schools, decentralized management and educational choice. The Armey

amendment emphasizing such better approaches can begin to restrain the flow of money down the drain.

Among the misdirections in Goals 2000 are the provisions for a new national school board called the "National Educational Standards and Improvement Council," and the redirection of the private National Education Goals Panel toward a federal bureaucracy. The Armey bill avoids these mistakes. ACSI urges that federal subsidies be directed toward the encouragement of true reform; a reform process under the oversight of local elected officials who can be held accountable, like the Armey approach.

Will you vote for the Parent and Student Empowerment Act, the Armey substitute?

Respectfully yours,

JOHN C. HOLMES, Ed.D.

CHRISTIAN COALITION,
Washington, DC, October 4, 1993.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The House will soon consider legislation, H.R. 1804, supported by the Administration that purportedly promotes educational reform. However, this measure fails the true test of genuine educational reform.

Rather than reform, this measure offers more funding for bureaucratic control over education. Instead of returning power to communities and parents, the bill creates new agencies that will only encourage bureaucracy.

We urge you to reject the Administration's bogus "education reform" bill, H.R. 1804, and support the substitute that will be offered by Congressman Dick Armey, "The Parent and Student Empowerment Act."

Key components of "The Parent and Student Empowerment Act" include:

Reform activities such as school choice, merit schools, and model schools;

Parental rights safeguards from psychological testing, sex surveys, etc.; and provides

Parents an "opt out" right as well as the exclusive right to determine who examines their children's school records.

Genuine education reform is long overdue. We urge you to reject H.R. 1804 and support the Armey substitute. The Christian Coalition will include the vote on the Armey substitute in its Congressional Scorecard which is distributed annually to five million people throughout the United States. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

MARSHALL WITTMANN,
Director, Legislative Affairs.
HEIDI SCANLON,
Director, Governmental Affairs.

EMPOWER AMERICA,
Washington, DC, October 5, 1993.

U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: I am writing in strong support of Representative Dick Armey's "Parent and Student Empowerment Act" as an alternative to H.R. 1804.

Representative Armey's proposal is a genuine education reform bill; it favors accountability provisions, decentralization, parental consent and parental choice for public, private or religious schools. The "Parent and Student Empowerment Act" will shift money and power away from the special interests and give power back to the American people. These are precisely the kind of measures I supported when I was President Reagan's Secretary of Education.

H.R. 1804, on the other hand, is typical of the kind of legislation endorsed by the education establishment: no reform, no accountability, no real standards and large increases in spending.

The education establishment—and in particular, the National Education Association—has done tremendous damage to American education. Their "remedies" have not worked. Under their stewardship education is not getting better; it is only getting a lot more expensive.

It's time to change all that. Representative Armey's proposal is one important way to do that and to improve American education.

I urge you to vote for the Armey amendment.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. BENNETT,
Co-Director.

FAMILY RESEARCH COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, October 5, 1993.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: Congressman Dick Armey intends to offer a substitute to the Clinton administration's school reform plan. The Armey plan is designed to empower the family, whereas Goals 2000 does little more than create a whole new set of bureaucracies.

Mr. Armey's measure contains many of the reforms that are urgently needed to help American schools meet the challenges of the Twenty-first Century. He recognizes that real change in education must come from empowering parents and students to achieve excellence.

I am especially pleased to commend to you the parental consent provisions of the Armey substitute. This reform will recognize the right of parents to exempt their children from psychological and psychiatric testing and from projects which violate family privacy. It will be a strong re-affirmation of the Supreme Court's ringing declaration in *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters* that "the child is not the mere creature of the state."

I am also pleased to endorse the specific requirements of the Armey substitute that federal funding of education reform efforts must include parental choice. So long as the federal government attempts to impose unrealistic and untried experiments on local communities, we will see resistance at the grassroots level. But genuine reform—the kind championed by Rep. Polly Williams in Milwaukee, by Mary Cummins in New York and by the parents and business leaders of California's ABC—Yes on 174 Coalition—will create a ground swell of popular sentiment for excellence in education.

Mr. Armey is to be congratulated for his leadership and his dedication to the parents and students of America. I hope you will vote for the Armey substitute.

Sincerely yours,

GARY L. BAUER,
President.

TRADITIONAL VALUES COALITION,
Washington, DC, October 5, 1993.

STOP THE EDUCATION BUREAUCRACY FEEDING FRENZY AT THE PUBLIC TROUGH; SUPPORT THE ARMEY SUBSTITUTE

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: This week the House will consider H.R. 1804, "Goals 2000: Educate America Act." The President's initiative "Goals 2000" fails to address our nation's education ills. Instead, it pours more money into failing school bureaucracies without fundamental reforms.

Congressman Dick Armey plans to offer a substitute which is imperative to putting our educational system back on the road to recovery. "The Parent and Student Empowerment Act" offered by Mr. Armey will:

Explicitly allow for private, parochial, and public school choice and earmark 25% of program funds for school choice;

Give Governors the ultimate authority over state panels and the federal grant money;

Grant parents the exclusive right to govern access to their children's academic records and protect their children from intrusive psychological tests and sex surveys;

Limit the list of authorized activities to school choice, site-based management, model schools, and merit testing on which the $400 million federal grant can be spent.

It will soon be up to you to decide whether the children of this great nation will receive the quality of education necessary to compete in the 21st century. True educational reform must include choice. If President Clinton's daughter can go to the school of his choice, why should not every American parent have the same option?

Traditional Values Coalition (TVC) and its 25,000 member churches support genuine educational reform not increased spending and a new bureaucracy. To that end, we urge you to oppose H.R. 1804 and support the Armey substitute. TVC considers this a key pro-family vote and will report your vote to our member churches in your district.

Sincerely,

REV. LOUIS P. SHELDON,
Chairman.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes, and I thank my colleague from Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, who I know must certainly rise reluctantly to oppose this amendment.

□ 1650

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]. Madam Chairman, this amendment purports to support systemwide education reform. However, a number of its provisions will make this very, very, very difficult. My friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], says that reform should come from the bottom up, not from the Federal or State government, and yet in the section on local uses of funds it is the Federal Government telling local communities that they must pick from only four types of reform activities. H.R. 1804 envisions that there will be many types of reform emerging from the wisdom that lies out there in the States and local school districts.

Second, the Armey amendment prohibits local school districts from using funds to support the coordination of health and social services with education.

Madam Chairman, I taught school for 10 years, and I have taken this long sabbatical in politics. But I do know that the amendment ignores the fact that the children must be ready to learn each and every school day. A child comes into the front door of that

school carrying with himself or herself educational needs, educational problems and, very often, other problems, medical, dental, emotional problems, social problems. We have to address those problems in some meaningful way because it is the same child coming into that door. This coordination of services is something that would be worked out by local people on the local level as they wish to do it and if they wish to do it. It is a means, however, to provide those services to that child. I can recall many a young person coming into the school where I taught, where I had to be both teacher, social worker, doctor. I was glad to do that, but this is a tremendous burden to put on those who are trained to be teachers.

In some schools in this country you find a massive number of students who suffer from those problems, and we would permit the coordination of services in this bill so we could address that need.

We are doing that in my hometown of Flint, MI, and it is really reaching children who otherwise might not be reached by that medical service, by that social service, by that mental health service. It does work there.

I think we should let people decide whether they want to use that in their local school district where that may be needed.

Third, Madam Chairman, the Armey amendment places the State reform panel under the exclusive leadership of the Governors. Now, you know, education in this country is, as I mentioned before, a local function, a State responsibility, and a Federal concern. It varies from State to State who has prime responsibility as the chief education officer of that State. In some States it is the Governor. That tends to be more the case in the Southern States. But very often, as in my State, for example, the superintendent of schools is the chief school officer in that State which has still strong local control.

So I do not think we should impose a Federal pattern upon the States. I believe very much in State's rights, as I am sure the gentleman from Texas does.

Fourth, Madam Chairman, the Armey amendment contains provisions relating to psychological testing and privacy of student records; these provisions, as noble as they are unnecessary. These important provisions which he seeks to put in this bill have been addressed in the law since 1974, when the Congress adopted the Buckley-Hatch amendments. He is trying to provide a remedy already covered by the Buckley-Hatch amendments in 1974.

For all these reasons I urge the defeat of the amendment.

You know, just as an aside, about a year ago during the consideration of the Neighborhood Schools Improvement bill, the gentleman from Texas offered a similar amendment. While I know this is a new Congress and we have had an intervening election, I wish to call to mind that at that time last year the Armey substitute was defeated by a vote of 328 to 80.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding this time to me.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Armey substitute to Goals 2000. In an American civilization that has developed from personal strength, a strong free enterprise system, and a truly entrepreneurial and inventive spirit, the Armey substitute takes us back to our roots. It takes us back to what made the United States the envy of the rest of the world.

The Armey substitute provides funding for reform efforts which will allow parents to choose which school their children will attend. This is what we need today; the opportunity for more parents to become involved in the process. By providing them with choices and options, we are empowering them at the very beginning of the process. We must trust parents to make these decisions. Government bureaucrats do not know what is best for our children.

The Armey substitute also provides for incorporating into education elements of our free enterprise system. It allows and encourages the development of alternative educational models and delivery systems. It will encourage, lest we forget the term, competition. Schools are currently given a lump sum to educate each child. It makes no difference whether the child is getting his or her money's worth. A child may graduate from a school system unable to read, and yet the school will continue to be paid for the substandard services they are providing. In the business world such a system would be ludicrous. And yet when it comes to providing for our children, we are content to accept low standards and the poor delivery of services as inevitable. By providing choices to parents, we will encourage healthy competition which will reward the schools that are providing the best educational opportunities for our children.

As we incorporate choice and competition, we should also be opening a third avenue of educational growth; innovation and inventiveness. In an educational system that is graduating students who cannot read their diplomas, the answer is not the development of more bureaucratic standards. It requires the unleashing of the creative potential of our teachers, local school boards, and other business enterprises, to attack the issue of learning. Does Goals 2000 allow for small, innovative businesses to become involved in the process of learning? Does it encourage innovation and creativity? It does not look like it to me.

We have two choices before us today: We can put more bureaucratic programs into place by adopting Goals 2000, or we can open new avenues of learning by fostering experimentation and results-oriented programs. We can accomplish this by allowing parents to have a voice in the process, by introducing elements of our entrepreneurial system into education, and by fostering the spirit of innovation and invention. We need to establish new paradigms for learning, not prop up the old ones that are failing. Our students demand the best that our country can offer. That will be achieved by building on what made this country great, not by building on those structures that are weakening it from the inside. Let us build on those principles that made America unique and strong. The paternalistic, bureaucratic state is failing our children. It is time to open it up and really make a difference in education. I, therefore, urge you to support the Armey substitute.

□ 1700

Once, just once, let us look to parents for the solution to our Nation's problems, not another government bureaucracy.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]. His legislation is very well put together. As a matter of fact, if he left page 30 off, it would be an acceptable amendment.

I do want to appeal to the parents who are out there who send their children to private and parochial schools. Please do not allow the Congress of the United States to do you a favor. I will guarantee you, I do not care how you write it, the minute you get the Federal Government involved, the Federal Government is going to determine what you do in your schools. Then you are going to have no purpose for being. Your purpose will be taken away from you.

Do not provide the Federal Government with an opportunity to get involved in determining who comes to your school, who you must keep in your school, or anything else. Stay the way you are at the present time.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to take the advice of my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and suggest that maybe we ought to do away with the Department of Education and heed his good advice, and I thank the gentleman for the recommendation.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend and colleague, the

distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Madam Chairman, talking to teachers, I find a high level of frustration over a conflict that seems to be a common thread in the fabric of teaching. The teacher knows his or her students on a personal level and from this vantage point, they also know what turns their individual students on to wanting to learn; to what motivates them. Federal, State or even the local education bureaucracies do not have this ability because there is no interpersonal activity present, or possible.

Teachers tell me it is not more money they need to give their students the best chance to learn, their cry is, "give me more flexibility in the classroom" to work with my students to bring them up to their highest level of achievement. Students are not statistics nor do they fit neatly into specific categories. Every student has a personality, and no one but the teacher knows what motivates that personality to achieve.

This reality states the case for the Armey substitute. A new Washington-based council or a board as established in Goals 2000 to move reform along takes the focus and resources away from where we really need to begin meaningful reform. We need to listen to the teachers. We need to listen to the local school boards. We need to listen to the parents.

Parents want reform and choice. President Clinton and his wife should be congratulated for their decision to send their daughter to a private school. The District of Columbia school system is a shambles, and they were faced with no alternative. My only hope is that their choice will underscore the dilemma facing low income, inner city parents around the country and serve as a catalyst for adoption of school choice plans. The Armey substitute provides for the implementation of school choice plans—the same choice that the First Family was able to exercise on behalf of their daughter. Goals 2000 is silent on this option for parents. The Armey substitute offers a positive response to the need for bottom-up reforms. No new layers of bureaucracy to contend with, the Armey substitute goes straight to where we need to start the reform movement. The emphasis is on local needs.

Listen to local school boards.

Listen to the parents.

Listen to the teachers.

Support the Armey amendment.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment. This substitute is a makeshift, jerry-built, oversimplified substitute for a carefully crafted proposal which is the product of a long process of deliberation by a cross section of people involved in education, not just at the top.

It is true that Governors were involved very much, also teachers and students have been involved in the long deliberations that have produced Goals 2000. Goals 2000 is a very cautious approach. It does not go far enough in my opinion, but it is very deliberative, very cautious. It begins to set a framework for the improvement of education in America, a modern framework, not a framework or a set of proposals based on commonsense reasoning, based on wanting to turn back the clock and ignore scientific progress.

In many endeavors, in many areas we have applied scientific principles, we have proceeded by using the Federal Government to do the things which nobody else could do. Research and development, for example, advancing the front line enhancement for every endeavor has been led by the Federal Government, starting with agriculture.

You know, we are the best fed Nation in the world. Our farmers, our agricultural system produces food at the cheapest possible cost. There is no nation anywhere close to us. That is because a long, long time ago we decided to have some top-down involvement with the farmers from the bottom up. The farmers meet us halfway in terms of experimentation that came out of the universities, was transferred to experimental stations and county agents, that the farmers had access to the very best resource that was being done, and as a result of the combination of their practical good sense with the best that science could offer, we are now the best fed Nation in the world, and on it goes.

With defense, we did not leave defense up to a few soldiers tinkering around somewhere about how to make war. That is what the Poles did. In World War II, the Poles said that a good army has to have a cavalry. Cavalry means guys riding on beautiful horses. So they sent cavalry on horses out to meet Hitler's tanks, and you know what happened to the cavalry when they met Hitler's tanks.

We are going to try to create a world-class educational system which can be competitive economically and can provide leadership for the whole world, as well as, most important, keep our own Nation moving, not just economically, but in an area of social education which allows the society to function properly.

In a number of areas, we are failing. If we are failing, why not turn to a centralized approach where we can gain enough critical mass? Why not have the States have some access to a research and development setup? Why not have access to a set of standards that are set for the Nation that does give flexibility and allow them to experiment, so that from one State to another they are trying to do pretty much the same thing, but they can always improve upon it and exchange information? Why not have an assessment system which is a first-class assessment system, because only the Federal Government has the money to develop that kind of system. It has the critical mass to do that.

Every industrialized nation, except this one, has some central direction for education. Some of them overdo it. I am not saying we should replicate what Japan does or what Great Britain does or what Germany does.

□ 1710

But we go to the other extreme. We have this romantic notion that only having local school boards in control of education is the best way to go. No, it is not. We are falling rapidly behind. Our students are not performing well in international competitions, and they are not meeting the standards of industry in our own Nation.

So, we should understand that there is a necessity to take the advice of all the Governors, Republican and Democrat, who came up with this idea that we should start by setting goals, we should then set standards, we should set assessment ways, ways to assess what is being done to meet those standards. That was the great debate among the Governors, and they came up with this plan, and in the committee, the Committee on Education and Labor, we added another standard which is very important. It has already been discussed here to some degree. But I want to just reiterate the opportunities-to-learn standards were added in the Committee on Education and Labor after great debate.

Opportunities-to-learn standards mean that in addition to telling us what the proper content is, what our children need in order to be educated in a way which is consistent with the needs of the modern world, and in addition to telling us how to test and assess whether they are learning those things, gives us some guidance, and direction and support in providing the delivery system, a way for them to teach the youngsters and enable them to get what is necessary, to get the kind of teaching and whatever else is necessary.

So, the combination of the standards, the goals, then the standards, and the assessments, and then the opportunity-to-learn standards, which is simply to say, if you want a youngster to learn in science, you have got to provide him with a laboratory which will allow him to make experiments. If you want a youngster to learn, you have got to provide an adequate library that doesn't have books which are 30 or 40 years old. If you want your youngsters to learn, you have to have teachers who are trained. You can't have teachers as we have in New York City in the

Latino and black areas. All the junior high school teachers are teaching science and math, didn't major in science and math in college.

So, we need some help from a central source. We need some help from the Federal Government. As my colleagues know, if we raise the percentage of the Federal involvement of each school district to 25 percent, if we were 25 percent involved in setting standards and doing anything else, even providing funds, there is still the other 75 percent of local control. As my colleagues know, local control is not threatened at all, and this substitute is trying to throw back the clock, and we cannot, as a modern nation, afford to go back to the old school system with no Federal support and no approach that is relevant to the modern era.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] to speak on behalf of the freedom and autonomy of the people of New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Chairman, I hope you will be as lenient with me as you were with the previous speaker, and let me say to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS], since I'm from New York, too, the United States already spends more on education per student than any other country in the world.

In specific I will tell the gentleman that in our State of New York we spend $8,500 per pupil, the second highest percentage per pupil in the entire Nation, and yet the State only ranks 22d in the quality of education received. Clearly more money and more bureaucracy does not mean more quality education.

Madam Chairman, the Armey substitute enacts true reform in a variety of ways. First of all, it explicitly allows for private, parochial and public school choice programs all at the local communities' discretion. Let me say to my colleagues, that's what is needed.

The Armey substitute grants the parents, not the government bureaucrats, the exclusive rights to govern access to the children's academic records. As a father of five and the grandfather of two, Madam Chairman, that means everything to me.

Lastly, this substitute sticks to the original five subjects that the gentleman and I grew up on. It established under George Bush's bill to be mastered by the year 2000: math, English, science, history, and geography. That is what we are here for, Madam Chairman.

As my colleagues know, the 18th century statesman, Edmund Burke, once said that bad laws are the worst form of tyranny. Goals 2000 is a bad law, and it should be defeated on this floor today.

In contrast, the Armey substitute is pro-family, it is pro-student, it is pro-reform.

Madam Chairman, today we have the opportunity to choose between grassroots reform and government control. We are sick of it. Let us give the American family the resources to rebuild the backbone of this Nation.

Support the Armey substitute. It is good for our families, it is good for our Nation, and, most of all, it is good for our children.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Madam Chairman, the gentleman from New York State must know that in some school districts in New York State they spend $17,000 per pupil and some element of the school has recently shown that New York City, they are spending $3,000 per pupil. So, as my colleagues know, if they want to know why we are doing so badly in this country, that kind of disparity is part of the reason.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Armey substitute bill.

Ironically, Madam Chairman, this bill restricts the range of choice which a State will have in this reform effort. It restricts it to four elements: Merit schools, model schools, school choice programs, and decentralized management, and it also mandates that 25 percent of the resources be devoted to school choice, and indeed that is really the core of the Armey substitute, school choice.

Public school choice is no novelty at all. Most systems have magnet schools. Most systems have choice programs. What is here though is an attempt, I think, to insert a strong private school choice program in the United States, and we could dress it up with all kinds of economic jargon, but ultimately what I think it means is the further segmentation of our society, first by income as we subsidize the affluent to leave public school systems, and then by sectarian belief, as we encourage a wide range of specific views to coalesce around schools. Ultimately, if this pass moves forward inexorably, it will lead to a separate and decidedly unequal society where those which are disadvantaged, who lack the mobility, who lack the opportunity to access private schools are left behind, and the affluent and those with the chance through proximity, or other reasons, to have private education go off. This separate, but unequal society is something that we should not countenance in this Congress.

Public education is an important aspect of our history. It was, in fact, one of the reasons why this country was the melting pot for thousands, and thousands, and thousands of immigrants who came here. It was the element that brought us together, not tore us apart as this proposal, I fear, will do.

Public schools are rightly criticized. They do not work as well as we want. They do not work given the great demands that international competition places on schools today. But the stark reality is that for all too many communities in this country they are the only social institutions that work at all. They are the only place that 5 days a week a child can find some shelter from very mean streets, and, rather than abandoning those schools, we must reform them. That is what Goals 2000 proposes to do, and that is what we must do.

Private education is an important aspect of our country, and those parents who send their children for private education want more for their kids. But I do not believe they want anything less for their country and for the other children in this society. I do not believe that they want to see public schools slowly inexorably extinguished. I do not think they want to see our system of public education abandoned.

Madam Chairman, we must, I think, stand up strongly and ask for reform of public education, not abandon it.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of Congressman ARMEY's Parent and Student Empowerment Act.

While a great number of issues have been raised with regard to the negative impact H.R. 1804 will have on local efforts to reform our system of education, I would like to focus on two issues that really concern me.

The first is the fact that when Bill Clinton was campaigning for the Presidency, he made it very clear that he supports public school choice, as the majority of American parents do. However, now that he is President, he has buckled under pressure from the National Education Association and the Democrats in Congress who hypocritically argue that allowing parents to choose where their children go to school will harm children. As a result, there are no provisions for school choice, public or otherwise, in this bill.

How can allowing families to exercise their right to select an education which best suits their needs and lifestyle harm children? It seems to me that the NEA is more concerned with the very real possibility that school choice will infringe on its power base by giving parents a greater say in their children's education, rather than being concerned about our children's welfare.

The Armey amendment explicitly lists school choice programs—entirely designed by local communities to fit into their individual reform efforts—as an allowable activity and establishes a minimum earmark of 25 percent of funding for such programs. This is not, as critics have claimed, a subsidy for private and parochial schools. It is an empowerment of parents—in particular low-income parents who do not have the funds, and therefore the option, to choose where their children go to school like wealthy families do.

The second issue I would like to focus on is the ever-growing education bureaucracy. According to the American Legislative Exchange Council's recently released "Report Card on American Education," while the number of teachers has increased 17 percent, the number of nonteaching staff—bureaucrats—has grown 40 percent, more than twice as fast.

This is outrageous. Children do not need endless numbers of counselors, administrators, and advisers—they need teachers, books, and up-to-date materials. H.R. 1804, instead of streamlining the bureaucracy, creates three new panels—a National Education Goals Panel, a National Education Standards and Improvement Council, and a National Skills Standards Board. These will cost taxpayers $21 million in fiscal year 1994 and such sums thereafter, and will come up with reams upon reams of standards and recommendations to impose from above on local schools. Whatever happened to the much-vaunted reinventing Government plan?

The Armey amendment, on the other hand, establishes no new bureaucracies. It maintains the current private board established by President Bush and the Nation's Governors, rather than creating a Federal National Education Goals Panel—paid for by taxpayers—to chart the Nation's progress toward meeting the six educational goals.

The focus of educational reform must be on the child in the classroom, not on bureaucrats. I urge a "yes" vote on the Armey amendment, the Parent and Student Empowerment Act, and a "no" vote on H.R. 1804, the Bureaucrat and Status Quo Enhancement Act.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], a distinguished member of the committee and a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Chairman, today, we stand at a crossroads. One road is the status quo which has brought us a public education system ranking near the bottom in every category, providing our kids with an environment filled with more bullets and condoms than books, and allowing education bureaucrats to spend more and more money while getting less and less accomplished.

The other road is one that offers a change. A change which gives the power of choice to parents to select the best schools for their children. A change which trusts families and local communities to make America's education system better.

This Nation was conceived as a free and democratic society. Yet, the Government tells parents where they must send their child to school. It does not matter whether that school is failing, whether that school is unsafe or whether that school is falling down, their child still has to go there, simply because the Government says so.

The only group that can escape this Government dictate are those who are fortunate enough to have the financial means to send their child to the school of their choice. I think it's time we change this inequity and give all parents these same rights—the same rights enjoyed by parents such as Bill and Hillary Clinton—the right to pick their child's school.

I have heard all of the arguments against school choice and quite frankly, I do not buy them. This debate is about one issue—who can best determine what is right for their child—is it the parent or is it the Government?

In a country with our tradition and our constitution, I am amazed that there are so many national government leaders who think the answer to this question is the Government—that they and not the parents of America know what is best for this Nation's children.

Madam Chairman, I submit that these leaders are at odds with the American people. The truth is that school choice will become reality whether the education establishment and their proxies in this body want it or not. The American people are going to take back their schools. It may not be today, it may not be tomorrow, but it will be someday soon.

Why do I have this optimism? I have this optimism because the school choice movement is sweeping this Nation. Polls are showing that 70 percent of all Americans support school choice, including 86 percent of all blacks, 84 percent of all Hispanics, and 78 percent of parents with children in school.

And earlier this year, Jersey City, NJ, broke a 75-year tradition and elected a Republican as their mayor. Bret Schundler was elected by an overwhelming two-to-one margin in a city where 60 percent of its residents do not even speak English in the home. And what was the issue that drove these minority and immigrant parents to place their trust in a white, former Wall Street investment banker? It was school choice.

It is in part because of this widespread grassroots movement that we are offering this substitute. We call this amendment the Parent and Student Empowerment Act, because we realize education reform cannot happen without parental involvement, and parents cannot be truly involved unless they are empowered to choose their child's school.

I realize there is always risk in change. But when it comes to this Nation's education system, there is more risk in sticking with the status quo. This is why I encourage my colleagues to vote for this amendment. So, instead of empowering the education establishment, we empower families, parents, and local communities to decide what is best for their children.

□ 1720

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise, Madam Chairman, in vehement opposition to the Armey substitute to this bill, which attempts to answer the frustrations and the agonies of people all across the country.

What our bill does is attempt to try to elaborate to these school systems and to parents that the Federal Government is concerned about the achievement and the performance of their children in the classroom. We do not want to support an idea that says the only solution for the parents and for the children is to get out of these schools because they have lost any opportunity of improvement.

The committee bill is an assertion to the country and to the parents that there is a way to perfect and to improve and to allow our children to achieve in the school systems and in the classrooms that they currently occupy.

Madam Chairman, what value is it to offer some of our children the opportunity to flee out of these schools if we make no provision for the improvement of the schools where the children are retained and have no opportunity to leave? It seems to me that is a cruel and backward kind of approach to public education.

Our responsibility as a Federal legislative body is to give some hope and direction, not to narrow down the options of what our reform is going to enable these local school systems to do; narrow it into four categories, narrow the opportunities of expenditure, narrow the opportunities for initiative and reform.

It is our duty to say to the school systems across this country, here is a license to experiment, to initiate new ideas, to do the things that are important in your areas, and not to have Federal mandates. The very people who offer this substitute have argued day-in and day-out against Federal Government mandates, and yet here they are today with a substitute that does exactly that.

Madam Chairman, I hope the Congress will reject the Armey substitute.

Madam Chairman, I rise to day in strong opposition to the Armey substitute to the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Much of the debate today has centered on the issue of federal mandates and local control. Opponents to Goals 2000 argue that the committee bill limits local control of our education system, when in fact it is the Armey substitute which places mandates and restrictions on Goals 2000 funds.

The Armey substitute limits local control by limiting school reform options under this bill to only four activities—merit schools, model schools, school choice programs, and site-based management. Furthermore the Armey substitute mandates that 25 percent of the funds received at the local level be used for school choice programs.

The Armey substitute deprives local school districts and communities the flexibility to decide for themselves what type of reforms would best address their needs. And it requires school districts to embrace the failed notion of school choice as school reform.

The idea of school choice as a mandatory education reform is a dangerous illusion that diverts public attention away from the real measures needed to improve quality and equity in the public education system.

The illusion is a no-cost, no-benefit, so-called reform which sacrifices our children who truly need the benefits of substantive education reform in our public school system.

Choice forces schools to accept the very best students who can help boost high-test scores and graduation rates, while students in the abandoned urban and rural schools are left to languish as the quality of education continues to deteriorate because of neglect, a decreasing student population, and the loss of Federal funding.

Parents do not want to send their children across town to attend a quality school, they want schools in their own neighborhoods to achieve that same quality. School choice will only serve as another obstacle to achieving this goal.

Furthermore, there is no evidence that school choice programs result in overall educational achievement or improvement of the education system.

According to a 1992 Carnegie Foundation study less than 2 percent of the parents in the 13 States which have choice programs participate in the program.

The study also found that statewide choice programs tend to widen the gap between rich and poor districts; they are expensive; and that at best, their educational impact is ambiguous. None of the 13 States with some type of school choice program has demonstrated significant gains that can be attributed to the new option of school choice.

The problem with our education system is not that parents do not have a choice, the problem is that inequities in our education system continue to exist—that the education a student receives in the disadvantaged areas is not equivalent to the education available in our affluent suburbs. School choice does nothing to solve the glaring inequities that plague our Nation's public schools; it will only exacerbate it.

I urge my colleague to reject this failed notion of school choice as school reform. Reject the Armey substitute and let our local school districts implement the school reform options necessary to address their own specific needs.

Vote "no" on mandated school choice and "yes" for real education reform.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER], a member of the committee, a cosponsor of the bill, and a gentleman that understands that 46 percent of American schoolteachers send their children to private schools.

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Chairman, I have joined Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. HOEKSTRA in offering this amendment because I believe the time has come to apply the principles of economic competition, proven successful in the business world, to education. Competition in schools would take the form of school choice. Building on the best school and forcing the worst to compete or no longer exist. Why keep failure alive? Only our Federal Government keeps failed programs alive.

This amendment allows school choice as one of the reform activities. We all know that wealthy Americans can send their children to the best schools available. The poor do not have that opportunity. They are often locked into the worst and weakest schools, in spite of the fact that parents long for the ability to choose which school their children will attend. I am a supporter of choice in education, because I believe parents should have more options for educating their children. The implementation of school choice for private, parochial, and public schools would ensure the participation of parents and establish an important structure of accountability for those receiving Federal funds. I believe strongly that empowering parents with the ability to choose the school their children will attend, would make our public schools among the finest in the world.

Instead of creating new layers of bureaucracy as Goals 2000 does, and increasing the power of the existing establishment namely the NEA, this substitute establishes a State reform panel to devise the State reform plan, and a local reform panel to devise the local reform plan. Who can better decide. It relies on the knowledge and experience of those people who confront the State and local education problems first hand to devise workable solutions. Instead of giving the power to reform to a nameless, faceless bureaucracy, this substitute places the responsibility for the quality of education with local elected officials, teachers, and parents.

Madam Chairman, it is high time that we learn from our past mistakes and diminish the role of an ineffective bureaucracy. It is time to allow the people who work in the local educational system to solve their own, unique problems and devise ways to meet their needs.

I urge my colleagues to support this truly innovative, and long overdue amendment.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN].

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Armey substitute, because I have exercised my right to a choice. I have two children who attend public schools. One of them graduated and actually tested out of some college courses because I, as the parent, exercised the right to that choice and they attended public schools. I think if we adopted this amendment, we would also go back to the time when we used slates and quills and ink instead of books and computers.

The idea behind Goals 2000 is based on the concept that our Nation's public schools need a coherent strategy and clearly defined goals in order to implement school reform plans. Goals 2000 is designed to free school districts from excessive paperwork and redtape which will in turn free resources to be used for classroom instruction and encourage educational quality.

Mr. ARMEY's substitute would shift a portion of the funds for this bill to private schools. The bill we have before us is designed to reform our public school system and the funds contained within this bill are only a portion of what we need to accomplish this goal. Mr. ARMEY's substitute would redirect funds intended for public schools to privately run schools.

Mr. ARMEY is a consistent advocate for free markets and by offering this amendment he would have us believe that these markets can produce a better education system. He points to the successes of private schools but he fails to tell us that private schools can select which students they educate.

If a private school determines that a student is undesirable it simply dismisses that student. Public schools must provide equal access. They cannot deny access on the basis of race, sex, religion, or financial status. Because private schools have the advantage of selection, they have less discipline problems, smaller classes, and more involved parents. Mr. ARMEY would have us believe that this system can be duplicated only if we provide public funds to private schools.

The end result of this substitute would be the erosion of much needed public funds for education. Private schools today are doing their jobs just fine as, Mr. ARMEY points out, and do not need public funds to continue. I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and in favor of reforming our public school system.

□ 1730

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, as a career teacher and father of 10, I rise in wholehearted support of the Armey substitute which puts the emphasis on bottom-up reform and measurable results, not on increased spending.

This substitute strengthens local and parental control of education. This substitute permits State and local governments to design and implement their own programs without Federal control. This substitute codifies the 6 national education goals agreed to by the 50 Governors in 1989.

This substitute prohibits use of funds for any outcome measure that includes effective skills such as values and beliefs. This is the right prescription for our schools, and it is precisely what the vast majority of our parents want.

It is said that the two biggest lies in America are "the check is in the

mail," and "I am from the government and I am here to help you."

When the Federal Department of Education says they are going to control more and improve a child's education, do not believe it. Support the Armey substitute.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, the Armey substitute to Goals 2000 eliminates coordinated services as part of education reform; which is a mistake. States and schools must be given an opportunity to address the whole child.

Of course, if we want world-class schools we must have top-notch teachers, teaching a high-level curriculum. But there is one other thing we must have—students who are ready to learn. Children who are hungry, who are abused, who are sick, who are spending their mornings, before school, and their afternoons, after school, alone and often times frightened cannot learn from even the most enthusiastic and qualified teacher. And, Mr. Chairman, teachers who are spending most of their time in the classroom, trying to take care of the problems their students bring to school cannot teach, even with the best curriculum.

Goals 2000 encourages schools to coordinate with already existing community health and social service programs to address the needs of the whole child. Coordinated services allows for schools to be schools, teachers to teach, and, most important, students to learn.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Armey substitute.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FRANKS].

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, do we try to improve a system in need of help via old-fashioned competition, or do we allow much of the same to continue? We need school choice.

For those who fear a two-tier educational system, I ask them simply, what do we have today?

We have public schools and private schools. Some say we have the haves and the have-nots. However, I am not going to say that private schools are better than public schools, because such a generalization would be wrong.

I do say, however, that the spirit of competition should prevail. It has helped to make our colleges and universities some of the best in the world. Why can it not be used on the grade and secondary school levels?

The competition between public and private schools must be made as far as possible. For example, public schools have to admit all students, and private schools can be selective. But that mechanical problem, logistics and other problems could be addressed as long as we agree to the basic principle that all parents and children should be able to exercise their right of school choice.

The irony concerning this measure is that those individuals who rationalize their personal right of school choice will not support school choice for others. In other words, "It's good for me but not for you." Why?

I can only surmise that they like our current direction. After all, their children may live in an affluent area where they are satisfied with their neighborhood schools, or they may have the money to send their children to a private school. Or they may reside at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

But what about the poor or middle-class youngster whose parents would yearn for the same educational excellence for their children. Can they have the same right, or should I say privilege?

I say to my colleagues in the Black Caucus and the Hispanic Caucus that polls have reported that 86 percent of African-Americans and 84 percent of Hispanic-Americans support school choice.

I challenge and encourage my colleagues to represent their views on this measure.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of Goals 2000 and to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Armey substitute, the so-called Parent and Student Empowerment Act. The proponents of this amendment seem to believe they are promoting education reform efforts. In reality, these reform efforts are but a rehash of old ideas that haven't worked, and won't work.

Specifically, this substitute would mandate the use of Federal funding for school choice programs. That's educational reform? By diverting tax dollars from our already underfunded public schools to private schools, we further hamper the choices of students who need our help most. Private schools have the choice of accepting or rejecting students. This could leave our public schools disportionately populated by students having educational or behavioral problems, or those coming from dysfunctional families. These students would then be forced to attend schools receiving even lower levels of funding. That isn't my idea of school reform.

Federal funding of private schools also threatens to weaken the constitutional separation of church and state. We all know the Government has no control over the content of the curriculum in private school courses. But who is to say that private schools will not want to use public money to promote their own agenda and their own values? The hypocrisy is that opponents of Goals 2000 claim that legislation would teach values in our public schools, but they seem to want to teach values in our private schools while using public money.

In short, there is nothing in this amendment that promotes true, comprehensive school reform. Vote "no" on the Armey substitute.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS].

□ 1740

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Armey amendment.

Today, we have a clear choice: We can support a bill which does the same old thing of removing control further and further from parents and putting it more and more into the hands of government, or we can support the Armey amendment, which truly begins to reform our education system by putting control back into the hands of parents through school choice.

We can choose to continue dumping our children into a pool of common denominator cultural elitism, or we can begin to bring real diversity and excellence to our education system.

And finally, we can choose between perpetuating the current trend toward political correctness in education, through more government controls and mandates or we can begin to give parents the real choice of educating their children in a way that develops the strong character traits and values they see best.

Mr. Chairman, as a parent and grandparent, I believe strongly that no government body, agency, or board can ever know more or care more about our kids than their parents do. It is that simple, and it is that important.

I urge my colleagues to support the Armey amendment. It is the first step in doing things right for kids.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA]

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, in an effort to address the increasing social, developmental, and educational problems affecting our Nation's youth, I am joining with my colleagues, Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY and Congresswoman NITA LOWEY, in expressing my support for coordinated school services, which are not included in the Armey substitute.

One out of five children entering school last year were living at the poverty level. At least half a million of these incoming children were born to teenage mothers. Many were exposed to drugs and the HIV virus, adding to the already attendant risk affecting the physical and intellectual development of these children. Child and alcohol abuse, fragmentation of the family, and violence also contribute to the unprecedented challenges that face our schoolchildren.

It is essential that schools in conjunction with social service agencies help to combat these problems. We must recognize that in order to assist children to succeed in an academic climate, we must meet the needs of the whole child.

In my Montgomery County, MD, school district, integrated services are already in place. These coordinated services bring together teachers, social workers, health care givers, and other professionals to address the needs of at-risk students. Emphasizing prevention and early intervention through integrated services, professionals from the schools and social service agencies have been able to break the cycle of poverty and abuse that leads to academic failure. I am proud to say that the Montgomery County school system ranks fifth in the Nation, and their success with integrated services should be duplicated nationwide. Providing coordinated services will help the classroom teacher, reduce the dropout rate, and raise the standards of educational excellence necessary to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise to oppose the so-called Armey amendment, because although it is filled with language that talks about giving local government control over its schools and getting rid of Federal mandates, while it does that, it talks, toward the very back of the legislation, tucked away, about requiring, not letting local governments decide, not letting the school districts decide, but requiring that 25 percent of all the moneys be spent on school choice programs. That, to me, is not choice, that is mandated choice. That is coming down from the Federal Government.

Worse than that, if we take a closer look, there is another provision that says not only do we mandate that there be choice, but we also require taxpayer dollars to be used to provide these private schools, these choice schools, with the information that we develop through the public schools; in essence, welfare for these private schools to take advantage of the work done through the public sector.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to Los Angeles, I just want to respond to one of my colleagues who said that Los Angeles' mayor was elected on school choice on the voucher issue. Not true at all. If we take a closer look, we will find that all the requirements under school choice would destroy our public schools and not require any choice for parents, but for the schools themselves.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS].

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Armey substitute as an opportunity for exciting innovation in education. If we want to look at what we can choose between, we can either choose this exciting innovation of educational choice, or we can keep on with the same old-same old.

The same old-same old in South Carolina has rendered very poor results. In 1972 we spent $799 per pupil in South Carolina. In 1982, that was increased to $2,200 per pupil. In 1992, it was increased to $4,600 per pupil. Meanwhile, our average SAT scores declined. In fact, in 1992 we had the lowest SAT scores in the country. In fact, we were 51. I assume the District of Columbia beat us out.

That means that the same old-same old approach did not yield good results. The opportunity is now to provide parents with a stake in the education of their children by allowing them the right to choose the school their children should attend.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. (Mr. HASTINGS). The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am from California, where the teachers' unions are spending about $14 million to defeat a school choice initiative. The Armey substitute would earmark 25 percent of the Federal funds to local governments, to local communities, for school choice. That could just be public school choice, or it could be private school choice as well. It is a very modest reform proposal. Yet, the teachers' unions and their reflexive supporters here in the Congress are opposing it.

In California, our fourth graders just tied with students in Mississippi for the lowest reading scores in the country. Yet we are spending more in California now than ever before on public education. We have doubled spending every 20 years since 1945.

Mr. Chairman, we have more nonteachers than teachers, we are so bureaucratized in the system. The fact is, it does not work. The teachers' unions do not care. They are supporting the status quo. What Forbes magazine calls the NEA's Brezhnev doctrine, socialism in the form of a Government monopoly, can never be rolled back.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the students and parents and for choice, the Armey initiative, not for the teachers unions.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the minority whip, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak strongly in support of the Armey substitute. A decade ago we had the report called "A Nation at Risk." "A Nation at Risk" warned us we were not educating our children, that we were not keeping up with the Japanese and the Germans and others, and that, in particular, in the inner cities we were cheating the poorest children in America.

Then the Chicago Tribune wrote a devastating six-part series. They assigned a team of reporters to actually go into the schools and spend an entire year studying one school. What they reported about the tenure policy, about the unionized work rules, about the regulations was so horrifying that from that point on I concluded that only by having some options for real change would we have a chance.

Inner-city schools today are cheating the poor children of America. They are perpetuating the poverty. They are trapping the poor. They particularly trap black and Hispanic children in poverty. Yet what is done about it? We have more reports, more regulations.

It was so bad in Jersey City that the State government had to take the schools away from the local school board because they were using the money that should go to children to pay for political patronage.

It is a disaster in our inner cities. It is so bad in Washington, DC, that the two best-paid families in public housing both refuse to send their children to public schools. The two best-paid families in public housing both send their children to private schools. They make a choice. But then, they support a monopoly of poverty, of failure, of illiteracy, and of ignorance for the poorest children in America who are largely black and Hispanic.

The Armey amendment, and I went back and double-checked, it does not require school choice. What it does is create the option for the local community to decide that parents are better than bureaucrats, that students are more important than teachers' unions, that learning is more important than regulation if the local community wants to voluntarily make that decision.

What we are faced with is very simple. Bret Schundler, the mayor of Jersey City, a great reform leader, said flatly they spend $9,000 per child through the politicians absorbed by patronage, and they cheat the children of Jersey City. He wants to show the parents of Jersey City they have a choice.

□ 1750

Polly Williams, former welfare mother and State legislator, Jesse Jackson's State campaign coordinator in Wisconsin, says flatly they are cheated in Wisconsin by the teachers union and the

bureaucracies. She simply wants the parents, black parents to have a chance to choose.

And all we are saying is can you not find it in your heart to say yes. If a local community on its own, voluntarily wants to choose, let them try the experiment. Is it not worthwhile in this degradation, and destruction, this illiteracy and ignorance to give these children a little bit of a chance? Do they not deserve some of the chance that the President and Vice President have taken?

I urge Members to vote "yes" on the Armey substitute.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important today that we stop placating the forces of disinformation and in fact real school reform and defeat the Armey amendment. I rise in support of H.R. 1804 and in opposition to the Armey substitute because for the first time in our Nation's history this bill gives the Federal Government a leading role in education policy.

The opponents of H.R. 1804 are offering an alternative that would take America backward. It sounds good. You hear a lot of talk about change. But what we really have to do is enact legislation that will bring change to all of our children, not just a few of our children, but to all of our children. We cannot leave segments of our population behind by failing to ensure that they arrive in school ready to learn.

In addition to establishing voluntary skill and opportunity to learn standards, as are in this bill, the coordination of services, making sure that kids are ready to learn when they get to school, such as substance abuse prevention, child abuse services, juvenile delinquency prevention, immunization, health education, to name a few, are critical to ensuring that our investments in education are not undermined.

By coordinating these services we can truly fill the gaps that are going unmet and eliminate duplication, thereby saving taxpayer dollars.

Oh, yes, the proponents of the Armey substitute will trot out the same old arguments against coordinated services. They say that linking schools with important social services will somehow force schools to offer services that undermine traditional values. Nothing could be further from the truth. Nothing in this bill is mandatory.

The goal of coordination is to enable local schools to concentrate on the business of teaching by ensuring that students are able to focus on academics. The aim is to avoid duplication of services provided in the community.

I hope we all support this bill, which will bring about real change in our educational system.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire, am I correct in understanding that the committee and the majority have the right to close debate?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS). The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ARMEY. And the minority is not to be given that privilege?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me stress that my amendment does not contain vouchers. It does not dictate what form school choice is to take. Local communities have total control under my bill to decide what form choice will take, should they elect a choice option.

Vouchers are only one of many forms of choice, including tax credits, charter schools, magnet schools, et cetera.

Mr. Chairman, let me make it clear, I promise Members that I would never do anything that would harm the children in private religious schools or public schools. Mr. Chairman, I represent the children with this measure.

This is what the question boils down to: Who represents the children?

Mr. Chairman, Al Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, one of the two largest Washington-based unions that oppose this bill, does not represent the children. Mr. Shanker says, "When schoolchildren start paying dues, that's when I'll start representing the interests of schoolchildren." So much for hypocrisy, Mr. Chairman.

The kids matter. The kids count. That is why we have schools, not for union goons in Washington, DC, to get fat off of.

What are we doing here, Mr. Chairman? How ironic are the arguments that are presented in defense of the monopoly control of our schools by their lackeys here in Congress.

We had the gentlewoman from Hawaii say that she worries about the kids left in the public schools. If some parents exercise the school choice to go to private schools, the other children will be left in the rotten, no good, ill-served, monopoly-controlled public schools. But she misses the point. The first, best beneficiary of school choice and the competition it brings is the children in the public schools. School choice is not about competition between public schools and private schools. It is first about public schools and public school choice rewards excellence, and in those particular terms differentiates between dedicated teachers and those who are not, rewards dedicated, effective efforts in the best interests of children, and punishes that which is not.

We had the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREEN] who says because he could afford to choose, and he chose to leave his children in the public schools of suburban Houston, the poor folks in downtown Houston who do not have a right to choose should not have a choice, not even to send their kids to the suburban schools of Houston. They should keep their kids under the control of the National Education Association and the monopoly interests that do not care about the kids.

This is a simple matter, very simple matter. Do you care about union monopoly control over the lives and the future of the children of America more than you care about the rights of parents to do what is best for their children and the ability of children to really, in fact, learn their ABC's instead of how to put a condom on a banana? Give me a break.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself my remaining time.

Mr. Chairman, just to clarify one thing so that we have the record straight, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] announced in his talk that there was no requirement that any money be used for choice. Whatever your position may be on choice, let us have the record straight. On page 25, lines 11 through 13, it says: "Not less than 25 percent of the amounts made available to local education agencies under this title shall be used for choice programs," not less than 25 percent. So whatever your opinion may be, I would suggest Members go back and read the bill.

Let me just say this: The Armey amendment does not call for the high educational standards as proposed both by President Bush and President Clinton. Those standards in this bill were agreed upon both by the last two Presidents. And the Armey amendment does not call for the development of high job skill standards as proposed by both President Bush and President Clinton. And the Armey substitute forbids any coordination of health and special services with school programs, even if a school district wishes to do so.

What we have before us in H.R. 1804 is really a bipartisan bill, the result of many, many years of negotiations and of work and of compromise. I emphasize that, work and compromise, and some sweat and some argument. And I think we have a bill here that meets the test that will address the needs of education in this country as far as the Federal concern for education is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 300, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 494]

AYES—130

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hoekstra
Hoke
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Moorhead
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ravenel
Ridge
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—300

Abercrombie
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—8

Ackerman
Borski
McDade
Murtha
Neal (NC)
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Skelton
Underwood (GU)

□ 1820

Messrs. KOPETSKI, McCLOSKEY, VENTO, PORTER, YOUNG of Alaska, and DARDEN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. LEWIS of California, FIELDS of Texas, and HALL of Texas changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore. (Mr. DURBIN) having assumed the chair, Mrs. CLAYTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1804) to improve learning and teaching by providing a national framework for education reform; to promote the research, consensus building, and systemic changes needed to ensure equitable educational opportunities and high levels of educational achievement for all American students; to provide a framework for reauthorization of all Federal education programs; to promote the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skill standards and certifications, and for the other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 274, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

If not, the Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 75, after line 21, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent subsections accordingly):

(m) PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL MANDATES, DIRECTION, AND CONTROL.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize an officer or employee of the Federal Government to mandate, direct, or control a State, local educational agency, or school's curriculum, program of instruction, or allocation of State and local resources.

Mr. LINDER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 495]

AYES—424

Abercrombie
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson

Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—0

NOT VOTING—9

Ackerman
Borski
Ford (TN)
McDade
Murtha
Neal (NC)
Reynolds
Skelton
Weldon

□ 1840

Mr. DEFAZIO changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 307, noes 118, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 496]

AYES—307

Abercrombie
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Buyer
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—118

Allard	Franks (NJ)	McInnis
Archer	Gallegly	Mica
Armey	Gekas	Michel
Bachus (AL)	Gingrich	Moorhead
Baker (CA)	Goodlatte	Oxley
Baker (LA)	Goss	Packard
Ballenger	Grams	Paxon
Barrett (NE)	Greenwood	Penny
Bartlett	Hancock	Pombo
Barton	Hansen	Porter
Bereuter	Hastert	Portman
Bliley	Hefley	Pryce (OH)
Boehner	Herger	Ridge
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Roberts
Bunning	Hoke	Rohrabacher
Burton	Hunter	Roth
Callahan	Hutchinson	Roukema
Calvert	Hyde	Royce
Camp	Inglis	Santorum
Canady	Inhofe	Schaefer
Coble	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Shays
Combest	Kasich	Shuster
Cox	Kim	Skeen
Crane	King	Smith (NJ)
Crapo	Kingston	Smith (OR)
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
DeLay	Kolbe	Solomon
Dickey	Kyl	Spence
Doolittle	Levy	Stump
Dornan	Lewis (CA)	Talent
Dreier	Lewis (FL)	Taylor (NC)
Dunn	Lightfoot	Thomas (WY)
Emerson	Linder	Vucanovich
Everett	Livingston	Walker
Ewing	Manzullo	Wolf
Fawell	McCandless	Zeliff
Fields (TX)	McCollum	Zimmer
Fingerhut	McCrery	
Fowler	McHugh	

NOT VOTING—8

Ackerman	McDade	Skelton
Borski	Murtha	Weldon
Manton	Neal (NC)	

□ 1858

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

A bill to improve learning and teaching by providing a national framework for education reform; to promote the research, consensus building, and systemic changes needed to ensure equitable educational opportunities and high levels of educational achievement for all students; to provide a framework for reauthorization of all Federal education programs; to promote the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skill standards and certifications; and for other purposes.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1804, GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 1804, the Clerk be authorized to make corrections to section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the action of the House in amending H.R. 1804.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter, on H.R. 1804, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2491, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-289) on the resolution (H. Res. 275) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2491) Making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1900

NATIONAL HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate Joint Resolution (S.J. Res. 21) to designate the week beginning September 19, 1993, as "National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 21

Whereas there are 104 historically black colleges and universities in the United States;

Whereas such colleges and universities provide the quality education so essential to full participation in a complex, highly technological society;

Whereas black colleges and universities have a rich heritage and have played a prominent role in American history;

Whereas such institutions have allowed many underprivileged students to attain their full potential through higher education; and

Whereas the achievements and goals of the historically black colleges and universities are deserving of national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning September 19, 1993, is designated as "National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week" and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups to observe each such week with appropriate ceremonies, activities and programs, thereby demonstrating support for historically black colleges and universities in the United States.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYNN

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WYNN: Page 2, line 3, strike "September 19, 1993" and insert "September 18, 1994".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYNN

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. WYNN: Amend the title so as to read: "Joint Resolution designating the week beginning September 18, 1994, as 'National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week'.".

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DOWN SYNDROME AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 92) to designate the month of October 1993 as "National Down Syndrome Awareness Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object but would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 92

Whereas advancements in education, research, and public awareness are continuing to improve the quality of life for people with Down syndrome;

Whereas approximately 5,000 children are born with Down syndrome annually in the United States;

Whereas as ignorance, prejudices, myths, and stereotypes regarding Down syndrome can be overcome only through increased awareness and education;

Whereas through the efforts of concerned physicians, teachers, parent groups, and the National Down Syndrome Society, programs are being established to educate the parents of individuals with Down syndrome, to include people with Down syndrome in all school programs, to provide vocational training for individuals with Down syndrome in preparation for entering the work force, and to prepare young adults with Down syndrome for independent living in the community;

Whereas the television medium has greatly augmented such efforts by casting actors with Down syndrome and by offering programming that demonstrates to hundreds of thousands of viewers in a positive and educational manner the everyday, personal, and family effects of living with Down syndrome;

Whereas advancements in research are improving health care and offering a brighter outlook for individuals born with Down syndrome; and

Whereas the many people with Down syndrome who attend regular schools, play on Little League teams, work in corporations and businesses both large and small, and volunteer in the community demonstrate daily the success that people with Down syndrome are able to achieve: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the month of October 1993 is designated as "National Down Syndrome Awareness Month." The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe this month with the appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL MAMMOGRAPHY DAY

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 265) to designate October 19, 1993, as "National Mammography Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not object, I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 265

Whereas, according to the American Cancer Society, one hundred eighty-two thousand women will be diagnosed with breast cancer in 1993, and forty-six thousand women will die from this disease;

Whereas, in the decade of the 1990's, it is estimated that about two million women will be diagnosed with breast cancer, resulting in nearly five hundred thousand deaths;

Whereas the risk of breast cancer increases with age, with a woman at age seventy having twice as much of a chance of developing the disease than a woman at age fifty;

Whereas 80 percent of women who get breast cancer have no family history of the disease;

Whereas mammograms, when operated professionally at an accredited facility, can provide a safe and quick diagnosis;

Whereas experts agree that mammography is the best method of early detection of breast cancer, and early detection is the key to saving lives; and

Whereas mammograms can reveal the presence of small cancers up to two years before regular clinical breast examinations or breast self-examinations (BSE), saving as many as a third more lives: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 19, 1993, be designated as "National Mammography Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate programs and activities.

The joint resolution 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.

WORLD FOOD DAY

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 218) designating October 16, 1993, and October 16, 1994, each as World Food Day, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but should simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, as the chief cosponsor, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 218 and thank my colleague, the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Mr. CLAY, and the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. WYNN, for bringing this important resolution to the floor today.

For 13 years, World Food Day has played an important role throughout the world in bringing attention to the critical problem of hunger and malnutrition. In our Nation the National Committee for World Food Day, under the leadership of Patricia Young, has utilized this day to hold seminars and conferences in schools and churches to educate the American people about the hunger problem and ways to resolve it. As a result, millions of people have been educated, galvanizing political awareness to focus on the issue.

This year, the difficulties facing the people of Somalia, Bosnia, and the Sudan are a constant reminder to policy makers of the enormous impact that an image of a hungry child or a starving prisoner can have on national resources and debate. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, we must continue to make certain that the goal of alleviating suffering plays a leading role in our domestic and our foreign policy. World Food Day helps us to further that end.

Accordingly, I thank my colleagues for their cosponsorship of this measure and I urge your vote for House Joint Resolution 218.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 218

Whereas hunger and malnutrition remain daily facts of life for hundreds of millions of people in the world;

Whereas the children of the world suffer the most serious effects of hunger and malnutrition, with millions of children dying each year from hunger-related illness and disease, and many others suffering permanent physical or mental impairment because of vitamin or protein deficiencies;

Whereas the United States has a long tradition of demonstrating humanitarian concern for the hungry and malnourished people of the world;

Whereas there is growing concern in the United States and in other countries for environmental protection and the dangers posed to future food supply from misuse and overuse of land and water, loss of biological diversity and erosion of genetic resources on a global scale;

Whereas the world community increasingly calls upon the United States to resolve food problems stemming from local conflicts and civil unrest—such as in Somalia and the former Yugoslavia—calling for the use of peacekeeping forces as well as the provision of emergency food supplies;

Whereas the United States plays a major role in the development and implementation of interregional food and agricultural trade

standards and practices, and recognizes the positive role that food trade can play in enhancing human nutrition and in the alleviation of hunger;

Whereas although progress has been made in reducing the incidence of hunger and malnutrition in the United States, certain groups, notably Native Americans, migrant workers, the elderly, the homeless, and children, remain vulnerable to malnutrition and related diseases;

Whereas our Government is now preparing a National Plan of Action for nutrition wellbeing in accordance with the commitment made at the recent International Conference on Nutrition;

Whereas the conservation of natural resources, the preservation of biological diversity and strong public and private programs of agricultural research are required for the United States to remain the largest surplus food producer in the world and to continue to aid the hungry and malnourished people of the world;

Whereas the United States is and must remain the world leader in the development of biotechnology aimed at enhancing the improved production, safety and quality of the world food supply;

Whereas the Congress of the United States is aware of and strongly supports plans and preparations for the International Conference on Plant Genetic Resources planned for 1995;

Whereas participation by private voluntary organizations and businesses, working with national governments and the international community, is essential in the search for ways to increase food production in developing countries and improve food distribution to hungry and malnourished people;

Whereas the member nations of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations unanimously designated October 16 of each year as World Food Day because of the need to increase public awareness of world hunger problems;

Whereas past observances of World Food Day have been supported by proclamations by the Congress, the President, the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States, and by programs of the Department of Agriculture, other Federal departments and agencies, and the governments and peoples of more than 150 other nations;

Whereas 450 private voluntary organizations and thousands of community leaders are participating in the planning of World Food Day observances in 1993, and a growing number of these organizations and leaders are using this day as a focal point for year-round programs; and

Whereas the people of the United States can express their concern for the plight of the hungry and malnourished people throughout the world by study and action and by fasting and donating food and money: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 16, 1993, and October 16, 1994, are each designated as "World Food Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe World Food Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities, including worship services, fasting, education endeavors, and the establishment of year-around food and health programs and policies.

The joint resolution 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on Senate Joint Resolution 21, Senate Joint Resolution 92, House Joint Resolution 265, and House Joint Resolution 218, the several joint resolutions just passed.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOMALIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In response to the request made by the House and Senate for certain information on our military operations in Somalia, I am pleased to forward the attached report.

In transmitting this report, I want to reiterate the points that I made on October 6 and to the American people in remarks on October 7. We went to Somalia on a humanitarian mission. We saved approximately a million lives that were at risk of starvation brought on by civil war that had degenerated into anarchy. We acted after 350,000 already had died.

Ours was a gesture of a great nation, carried out by thousands of American citizens, both military and civilian. We did not then, nor do we now plan to stay in that country. The United Nations agreed to assume our military mission and take on the additional political and rehabilitation activities required so that the famine and anarchy do not resume when the international presence departs.

For our part, we agreed with the United Nations to participate militarily with a much smaller U.S. force for a period of time, to help the United Nations create a secure environment in which it could ensure the free flow of humanitarian relief. At the request of the United Nations and the United States, approximately 30 nations deployed over 20,000 troops as we reduced our military presence.

With the recent tragic casualties to American forces in Somalia, the American people want to know why we are there, what we are doing, why we cannot come home immediately, and when we will come home. Although the report answers those questions in detail, I want to repeat concisely my answers:

—We went to Somalia because without us a million people would have died. We, uniquely, were in a position to save them, and other nations were ready to share the burden after our initial action.

—What the United States is doing there is providing, for a limited period of time, logistics support and security so that the humanitarian and political efforts of the United Nations, relief organizations, and others can have a reasonable chance of success. The United Nations, in turn, has a longer term political, security, and relief mission designed to minimize the likelihood that famine and anarchy will return when the United Nations leaves. The U.S. military mission is not now nor was it ever one of "nation building."

—We cannot leave immediately because the United Nations has not had an adequate chance to replace us, nor have the Somalis had a reasonable opportunity to end their strife. We want other nations to assume more of the burden of international peace. To have them do so, they must think that they can rely on our commitments when we make them. Moreover, having been brutally attacked, were American forces to leave now we would send a message to terrorists and other potential adversaries around the world that they can change our policies by killing our people. It would be open season on Americans.

—We will, however, leave no later than March 31, 1994, except for a few hundred support troops. That amount of time will permit the Somali people to make progress toward political reconciliation and allow the United States to fulfill our obligations properly, including the return of any Americans being detained. We went there for the right reasons and we will finish the job in the right way.

While U.S. forces are there, they will be fully protected with appropriate American military capability.

Any Americans detained will be the subject of the most complete and thorough efforts of which this Government is capable, with the unrelenting goal of returning them home and returning them to health.

I want to thank all those who have expressed their support for this approach during the last week. At difficult times such as these, when we

face international challenges, bipartisan unity among our two branches of government is vital.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 13, 1993.*

THE PHILLIP AND SALA BURTON ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOL IN SAN FRANCISCO: AN EDUCATIONAL SUCCESS STORY

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I bring good news to the attention of our colleagues in the wonderful success story of Phillip and Sala Burton Academic High School in San Francisco. At this inner-city school, named for two giants of the Congress, students are treated with respect. They are expected to succeed and they do, academically and otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, minority students make up an overwhelming number of the students at Phillip and Sala Burton High School. Of those students, 97 percent of them go on to college or university. Members who have served with Representatives Phillip and Sala Burton know that they were deeply committed to promoting education and helping inner-city youth in San Francisco as well as in the rest of the country. They know that Phillip and Sala would be proud of the school that bears their names, and which is so strongly supported by their brother assemblyman, John Burton.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD an article from the San Francisco Examiner called "Burton Students Make the Grade," which details the many achievements of the students at the high school. In their achievements, Phillip and Sala Burton live.

BURTON STUDENTS MAKE THE GRADE

(By Dexter Waugh)

It's small. It's very tough. But it's safe. And it sends more graduates to college than any other high school in San Francisco.

That's why the 1,300 students who filed through the doors Wednesday for the first day of classes at Phillip and Sala Burton Academic High School say they appreciate the education they're getting there.

It's "easier to work" at Burton "because there's no violence here," said Paul Robertson, a 15-year-old sophomore who hopes to attend Howard University in Washington, D.C., and become a video engineer. "Everything comes together."

The students at Burton will undergo a much more rigorous four years of study than many of the rest of the San Francisco school district's 64,000 students. And, if past behavior is any gauge, they'll go to college at a greater rate than students from any other school in The City.

The school, located off Silver Avenue in the Bayview District, was set up by a 1982 federal consent decree to provide an academic high school for students in the underserved southeastern part of The City.

Since it opened in the fall of 1984, Burton has consistently led the district in the number of African American seniors who go on to college, said Burton Principal Fredna Howell.

That's because it has more African American students than San Francisco's other two academic, college-preparatory high schools, Lowell and Wallenberg.

Minority students make up the overwhelming majority of Burton students. About 20 percent are African American; of those, about 90 percent go on to college. Overall, about 97 percent of Burton's seniors go on to colleges or universities.

Districtwide, nearly 14 percent of San Francisco students dropped out in 1992, the last year for which figures were available. Of the students who graduate, some 78 percent go on to college, according to district statistics.

At Burton, a bulletin board features scores of pictures of seniors who've been accepted at colleges. Many of the African American students have gone on to historically black colleges in the South; other popular destinations are UCLA, UC-Berkeley, UC-Davis and San Francisco State.

"A lot of kids want to go away but not too far from home, and a lot don't want to leave California," Howell said.

Two African American seniors from last June's graduating class are going to Stanford—one of them on a $12,000 scholarship.

"You come here expecting to go to collage, that's a given," said Howell who is entering her 10th year as Burton's only principal.

At Burton, which uses a lottery system for admissions, students face four years of courses designed to prepare them for college. California requires students to have 220 credits to graduate from high school—Burton requires its students to have 280.

That includes four years of math, four years of science, four years of english, four years of history and three years of a foreign language. Burton has five computer labs, and computer science is also required.

"They and their families opt to come here; they're not assigned here," Howell said. "It's what we do after they get here. We expect they will succeed, so we treat them to that end.

"We try to install in them that college is their answer, and getting this education is the only way up and out to where they want to go.

. . . We offer them a very challenging and rigorous curriculum in a very nurturing and supportive environment."

Students strolling into the building before 8 a.m. Wednesday were full of praise for the teachers and administrators at Burton.

Senor Lloyd Harris, 17, likes Burton because of "the many opportunities to learn that I never got in other schools." He plans to go to S.F. State next year with the goal of becoming a teacher.

The school "has a lot more requirements than other schools, but we can appreciate it more," said Joseph John Dorantes, a 16-year-old senior who wants to go into business management.

"It's a challenge," added freshman Greg Patton, 14, who hopes to become an electrical engineer.

According to MaryAnne Valles, the school's counseling coordinator, Burton has a "small-school feel to it. Kids get a sense of being known to the adults in the building."

Valles and the four other counselors work closely and regularly with student and their parents, helping then select the courses they need.

"Everybody sees one another on a regular basis," Valles said, "More than that, people take the time to know each other. Faces are recognized, names are known."

But it is the students' motivation that leads to success, Valles said. a"They want to go to college," she said. "They want to have a situation that is optimal for getting them there. What happens at other schools, sometimes they get lost, and maybe they don't take all the right requirements.

"That can be a scary thing for parents and (for) a student who many not know what's required as a ninth-or 10th grader. Here, there's a sense that their needs are being taken care of."

□ 1910

REPUBLICANS PLAN MAJOR REFORMS OF CAMPAIGN FINANCING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, one of the messages which came through loud and clear in the 1992 elections was Americans people were tired of politics as usual.

A major issue raised last year by Ross Perot and other was that Congress must reform the way congressional campaigns are financed.

The American people feel that their elected representatives are too heavily influenced by special interests rather than by their constituents.

Well, nearly a year has passed since the election and the House has not voted on any legislation to reform the campaign finance system.

While the Democrats bicker among themselves over such issues as whether the taxpayers should start picking up the tab for campaigns—also known as welfare for politicians—we Republicans have a plan which will make major reforms in the system without taxpayer financing.

The major proposals in the Republican leader's task force on campaign finance plan include: First, elimination of political action committees [PAC's] or, if that is unconstitutional, limit PAC donations to $1,000. This is a major reduction in PAC influence and will make candidates more dependent on small individual donations.

Second, require that a majority of a candidate's funds come from individuals within his or her own district. This is a commonsense proposal which will reduce the influence of special interests.

Third, ban soft money donations from national party organizations, a loophole in the current system which allows candidates to get around financing limits.

Fourth, ban bundling of contributions by PAC's and lobbyists, which allows groups to evade contribution limits by asking their members to make checks out directly to candidates. The

checks are bundled and given to the candidate in one group.

Fifth, various other proposals to reduce the advantages of incumbents in raising money and of wealthy individuals who can spend personal money.

Sixth, most importantly, Mr. Speaker, Republicans want campaign finance reform to take effect before the 1994 elections, unlike the major Democratic proposals who would delay it until 1996. That is real standup attitude on reform, which the American people want, and they want them now.

It is time for the Democrats in control of Congress to get the message the voters sent last fall, they are tired of politics as usual.

A year is too long to wait before Congress even begins debating campaign finance reform.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Democratic leadership to either move quickly to bring forward their package of legislation to reform the way campaigns for Congress are financed, or take up the better Republican legislation. Quit playing politics with this issue and get on with the debate of this issue of campaign finance reform.

MEXICO: THE POWERS THAT BE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to enter into the RECORD an article that was in the September 1993 issue of "U.S.-Latin Trade," and it concerns the people that the U.S. Government is dealing with as we proceed on this proposed North American Free-Trade Agreement. And I hesitate to use the word "free," but that is the title that was put on it by the Bush administration last year.

What is interesting about this article is that it talks about some of the individuals and companies which stand to benefit in Mexico, or have already benefited, and those that will benefit more under a system in which the very wealthy of Mexico control the political party down there that has ruled the country since the early part of this century and will continue to control the rules of trade in operation there.

What is really interesting is to see what has happened with the structure of wealth in Mexico. People tell us that NAFTA will benefit everyone. I do not buy that in the least.

We know over 2,100 United States companies have already moved to Mexico, largely to the northern part of Mexico, since the mid-1980's; over 700,000 of our jobs directly out of America's industrial and agricultural heartland have moved south of our border seeking cheap wages. Who has really benefited? This article is excellent. It states, and the title reads, "Mexico: The Powers That Be." It say, "Mexico now has more billionaires than any country in the world other than the United States, Japan, and Germany," and that their wealth has grown during the term of the Salinas administration.

It goes on to talk about who is really benefiting here.

Twenty-seven men gathered last winter down in Mexico City, men whose riches had compounded since President Carlos Salinas of Mexico took the oath of office in 1988. It talks about a meeting held in a private home on February 23 where these men and those who have the title of rulers of Mexico gathered and essentially were asked to kick into a campaign fund to support the ruling party to the tune of $25 million each and to use that money then to try to lobby this Congress and the people of this country to think this proposed NAFTA agreement is a good deal for all people.

It goes on to say that the close relationship between these big-business representatives and the ruling party has governed Mexico since 1929. Nothing in NAFTA is going to change that.

It talks about how the elite had ruled Mexico for all of this century, and it says that under President Salinas the cozy friendship between the ruling party and these people has gotten closer. Then it goes on to name the individuals. It says that in 1990, a year and a half after he took office, there were 2 billionaires in Mexico; by last year there were 7 billionaires.

Now, according to Forbes magazine July issue, there are 13, at least 8 of whom broke bread with the Mexican president last February.

In the world billionaire sweepstakes, that puts Mexico, a developing nation, in fourth place; quite an accomplishment in less than half a decade, well ahead of nations like France, Switzerland, Hong Kong. I am sure there are even more people who are superrich in Mexico, except they do not have to report their incomes in the same way that we do.

Who are these people, the people who will benefit the most from this agreement? They are people such as Emilio Azcarraga Milmo, who has a lock on the Mexican television industry, and holds a commanding 90 percent of the viewing audience. That is pretty good, 90 percent. Even our NFL games command only about 14 percent of the viewing audience.

What is his job? To tell the bright side of everything which, of course, the PRI Party likes most of all. This company has not bought interest in the United States in various holdings that this article summarizes. What is really interesting, and I want to tell this story because the way this company runs is that its director does not like any dissent. And in fact, the company owns the Mexican soccer team. Hugo Sanchez, perhaps the greatest Mexican soccer player ever, found out exactly how the system works. The state-controlled television monopoly down there controls the Federation of Soccer Players through its ownership of 4 of 24 first-division teams and the 120,000-seat Azteca Stadium, home of Mexico's national team.

Sanchez plays for the Televisa-owned team. But back in June, the soccer superstar was reportedly behind a threatened strike by national team members.

□ 1920

Players said they would boycott the prestigious America's Cup Tournament in Equcador unless the league granted some form of free association and agency. The threat caused consternation in soccer circles and in television stations and it is no surprise that when Mr. Sanchez came home, somehow his contract was pulled. That is how Mexico does business with its own people. That is how it is going to do business with us.

As a Representative of a city that for years has been called the glass center of the world, Toledo OH, it troubles me a great deal that one of these billionaire families owns the monopoly company, Vitro Glass, where they pay their workers one-seventh what ours are paid. It is not right that our companies have to compete with that kind of monopoly power in Mexico. Let's defeat this NAFTA and strike a blow for the people of our continent who aren't billionaires.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the entire article for the RECORD.

[From U.S./Latin Trade, September 1993]

MEXICO: THE POWERS THAT BE

(By Lawrence Kootnikoff)

The 27 men gathered in the dining room of the private home in Polanco, a posh, tree-lined neighborhood of Mexico City, came from old money and new, men who had risen to riches since Carlos Salinas de Gortari became president in 1988. At the head of the table was Salinas himself, whose free-market reforms had allowed those fortunes to be made, or at least increased.

But on this night of February 23, the president's ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party, or PRI, had gathered these men to ask for something in return: a donation of US$25 million each to party coffers, to insure that those policies of reduced government control, fiscal discipline, low inflation and open borders could continue.

The businessmen reportedly agreed.

But when news of the private dinner leaked, criticism poured in. Opposition parties were angry at the PRI for using the president's office to build a partisan $675 million war chest, while progovernment businessmen were upset at the undignified spectacle of the president of Mexico going cap-in-hand to the wealthy for money.

In the face of the outcry the PRI was forced to cancel its plans. But the close relationship between big business and ruling political party, which has governed this country since 1929, was anything but canceled.

MEXICO, INCORPORATED

Mexico's tightly-knit monied elite has been financing the PRI for years. The difficult period of the 1970s and early 1980s,

when the party adopted anti-business policies and pseudo-leftist rhetoric that contributed to the economic crash of 1982, was an aberration.

Now, under President Salinas, that cozy friendship is back on track. The 38-member Mexican Businessmen's Council—also known as "Mexico Inc."—meets with the president once a month to advise him on economic policy. And it seems Salinas has been following their advice.

The proof is in the numbers. In 1990, a year and a half after he took office, there were two billionaires in Mexico. That was just as Salinas' overhaul of the economy was beginning to take effect, taming inflation, selling off hundreds of inefficient state companies and generating a budget surplus. The privatizations set off a boom on the Mexican Stock Exchange, lining the pockets of the new owners, brokers and speculators. People with money started to make more money: corporate profits averaged 15% in 1992 alone.

Last year there were seven billionaires. Now, according to Forbes magazine, there are 13, at least eight of whom broke bread with the Mexican president last February. In the world billionaire sweepstakes, that puts Third-World Mexico in fourth place, after the United States (108), Germany (46) and Japan (35), but well ahead of France, Switzerland and Hong Kong, with nine each.

Actually there are probably more super-rich in Mexico, but not much information is public. Private citizens are only obliged to reveal their incomes to government tax officials. Now you can meet them, (the ones we know about) and it won't cost you $25 million.

THE TIGER OF TELEVISION

When Emilio Azcarraga Milmo was asked to kick in at the dinner, Latin America's wealthiest man offered to do more. "I've made so much money in these past few years that I will undertake to contribute more than that," the Mexican investigative magazine Proceso quotes him as saying.

With an estimated fortune of $5.1 billion (up from $2.8 billion a year ago), Azcarraga can afford to be generous, though "generosity" is not the quality that springs to mind when describing the 62-year-old man known as "El Tigre."

This predatory billionaire (ranked 19th in the world) owns 75% of Grupo Televisa, the world's largest Spanish-language broadcaster. The company (1992 sales of $1.3 billion) has a hammer lock on Mexican television, with some 90% of the viewing audience.

In the tightly controlled world of Mexican media, Azcarraga, a strong PRI supporter, doesn't have to be told by the government to emphasize the bright side of Mexican life. News programs give doting coverage to President Salinas and broadcast long-winded speeches of government officials, virtually ignoring opposition parties and government critics.

The Tiger's reach is growing. Last year Televisa bought Miami-based America Publishing Group Inc. for $130 million, becoming the largest publisher of Spanish-language magazines in the world. The company also has a $200 million half-share in Connecticut-based Pan American Satellite Corp., the only privately owned satellite network in the world, and an interest in U.S.-based Spanish-language broadcaster Univision Holdings Inc.

Televisa has been criticized for poor quality programming and sloppy news coverage and Azcarraga has earned a reputation for arrogance and vindictiveness. "Televisa makes crappy programs for screwed up people," he told a press conference earlier this year. Azcarraga has also made enemies by demanding "exclusivity contracts," preventing advertisers from advertising with, or performers from appearing on, competing networks. Performers who defy the ban are blacklisted.

Azcarraga is a man who doesn't like to be crossed, as Hugo Sánchez, perhaps the greatest Mexican soccer player ever, found out. Televisa controls the Mexican Soccer Federation, through its ownership of four of 20 first-division teams and the 120,000-seat Azteca Stadium, home to the national team. Sánchez, 35, plays for the Televisa-owned team, America.

But back in June, the soccer superstar was reportedly behind a threatened strike by national team members. Players said they would boycott the prestigious American Cup tournament in Ecuador unless the league granted players some form of free-agency. The threat caused consternation in soccer circles and at Televisa, which planned to televise cup matches.

The players eventually relented, and Sánchez led the underrated Mexicans in a surprising run to the cup final, where they lost to Argentina. But after the team returned home to a hero's welcome, Sánchez was dropped from the national squad and his contract with America cancelled. Press reports said the order to rescind Sánchez' contract came straight from "El Tigre."

MEXICO'S OTHER GIANT

Another dinner guest who has directly benefitted from Salinas' reforms was the boss of Mexico's recently privatized telephone monopoly, a man with a fortune estimated at $3.7 billion.

The 53-year-old son of Lebanese immigrants, Carlos Slim Helu led the investors' group that paid $1.75 billion for Telefonos de México, or Telmex, in December 1990. Through his holding company, Grupo Carso, Slim owns 10% of the company.

But Telmex is just the jewel in Slim's crown. Slim and Grupo Carso also own mining companies Industrias Nacobre and Mineria Frisco, tire-maker Euzkadi, cigarette-maker Cigatam, auto parts-manufacturer Grupo Condumex, restaurant-department store chain Sanborn's and the Mexican franchise for Denny's Restaurants.

Business is good: last year Slim's fortune was $2.1 billion. This year Forbes estimated his fortune at $3.7 billion, ranking him 35th among the world's super-rich.

FAMILY VALUES: THE GARZA SADAS

The Monterrey-based Garza-Sada clan controls Mexico's oldest and biggest industrial complex, with interests in steel, glass, petrochemicals, food, soft drinks, beer, banking and insurance. Considered by many to be interrelated families, the clan's combined wealth tips in at $3 billion—$2 billion for the Garza-Sada and Garza-Laguera branch, and $1 billion for the Sadas.

In contrast to the Bolsa-created wealth of some newcomers, this fortune is old money, dating back to a brewery founded in 1890 in the northern city of Monterrey. VISA and FEMSA, which today control more than half of the Mexican beer market and own the world's largest Coca-Cola franchise, are run by Eugenio Garza Laguera, 70, also president of recently privatized Bancomer, Mexico's second-largest bank.

Plastics and petrochemical maker Cydsa is run by Andres M. Sada. Cousin and presidential dinner guest Bernardo Garza Sada, 63, runs steel and chemical giant Alfa. Across town at Vitro, North America's second-largest glass maker, another cousin and guest, Adrian Sada Gonzalez, 49, is president. Sada Gonzalez also led the investors' group that brought Banca Sefin, the country's third-largest bank, run by the family before the 1982 nationalizations. In 1989 Vitro bought troubled Anchor Glass, and joined forces with Corning in a deal worth $300 million.

CEMENTING WEALTH

Marcelo Zambrano, 69, and his nephew Lorenzo, 49, run Cemex, the world's fourth largest cement producer and another Monterrey-based concern. They moved Cemex into fourth place last year by spending $1.8 billion for two Spanish cement makers. Estimated wealth: $2 billion.

RETAILERS FOR THE MASSES

The Gonzalez Nova family runs Comercial Mexicana, Mexico's third largest retail chain. Three sons of the founder—Carlos, 75, Jaime 61, and Guillermo, 60—have built a fortune estimated at $1.5 billion. The company runs Price Club Mexico through a joint venture with San Diego-based Price Co.'s Club unit.

MEGA GROCER

Dinner guest Angel Losada Gómez opened the first Gigante department store in 1962. The chain now runs 182 stores. The 85-year-old Spanish native was also one of the investors that bought Telmex in 1990. Losada's son, Angel Losada Moreno, 38, is on the phone company's board. Gigante also operates Radio Shacks in Mexico through a joint venture with Tandy Corp. Losada is worth some $1.3 billion.

DEPARTMENT STORE KING

Jeronimo Arango, 67, is boss of Cifra, which he founded in 1958. Cifra operates 225 outlets of seven subsidiaries, including department stores Suburbia, retail chain Aurrera. Club Aurrera (a joint venture with Wal-Mart, based on Sam's Club stores), Superama supermarkets, Almacenes Aurrera, Bodegas Aurrera, and restaurant chain Vips. Cifra had 1992 sales of $3.7 billion. Arango, who was also the president's dinner guest, has a fortune of $1.1 billion.

OLD PESOS

Alberto Bailleres is no fast-talking hustler who got rich gambling on the Bolsa. He got his money honestly: he inherited it from his father. Raul Bailleres was at one time considered the country's richest man, with interests in mining and cattle in central and northern Mexico. Alberto, who came to dinner, owns Mexico City-based department stores Palacio de Hierro and 50% of mining company Industrias Penoles. He also has money in ranching, insurance and banking, and is worth about $1.1 billion.

BREAD FROM BREAD

The Servitje Sendra brothers made their dough from bread: Grupo Industrial Bimbo controls 95% of the commercial bread market, though many Mexicans continue to buy from corner bakeries. Bimbo also has a joint venture with Sara Lee to distribute American frozen food in Mexico. Brothers Lorenzo, 74, and Roberto, 65, started Bimbo in 1945. They are now worth an estimated $1.1 billion.

SMOKING

Through his holding company Grupo Pulsar, Alfonso Romo Garza owns 75% of Empresas La Moderna, Mexico's largest cigarette maker. Pulsar also owns Vector Stock Brokerage firm, several restaurant chains, and grows fruits and vegetables for export to U.S. markets. Another Monterrey native,

Romo Garza, 42, is married to Eugenio Garza Lagüera's niece. He is worth more than $1 billion.

BEER MAGNATE

Pablo Aramburuzabala Ocaranza is the son of one of the founders of Cervecería Modelo, the privately held brewery that makes Corona beer. Last March, Anheuser-Busch paid $477 million for 18% of Modelo. He is worth more than $1 billion.

COLA WARRIORS

The Molina Family, led by Enrique Molina, runs Grupo Embotelladora México S.A. de C.V., or Gemex, the world's largest independent Pepsi bottler. Last year Gemex sold 190 million cases of pop from eight plants. Enrique Molina got his start at 24 in Acapulco, when he bought the soft-drink company he was working for. He is president of the 40-company Consorcio Industrial Escorpión, and has also benefited from Salinas' privatizations. He bought four government sugar mills and produces 10% of Mexican sugar, and all he needs for his drinks. The consortium also owns hotels and other property.

THE SITUATION IN HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MANN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to talk a little bit more about the situation in Haiti.

I notice that the administration spokespersons are hard-pressed trying to put as much distance as possible between the loss of face in Haiti and the loss of life in Somalia that has taken place tragically in our foreign affairs in the past week; but there is a common denominator that is out there. It is one we have all got to understand and we have got to address. It is an area of very legitimate congressional oversight. That is, we do not send American military personnel into situations where they are unprotected, where they cannot protect themselves or expect to have reasonable protection from harmful situations, putting them in a position where they have to take casualties that are unnecessary. Putting them in a position where they become targets is intolerable, unacceptable and obviously a very wrong-headed policy that needs immediate correction.

Listening to the spokespersons from the administration trying to defend what is going on in terms of our national security purposes that needs military personnel, about the only thing I have heard so far is to hear the Secretary of State say and some of our leading Members of Congress on the Hill in defense of the administration policy that we will somehow have an invasion coming at us from Haiti, hordes of immigrants landing on the shores of America if we do not keep troops, armed or unarmed, in Haiti.

I suggest that is a very misleading picture. I think it belittles the American sense of compassion, and I think it ill-reflects what actually is going on.

I would point out that our Coast Guard has done a magnificent job of providing a cordon to contain the problem of illegal immigration.

On that subject, I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] who happens to live in a district where I believe most of the people coming from Haiti one way or the other have found their way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me at this point in his remarks.

I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Florida. He is right on point and he speaks with a great deal of authority, in his former life having done government work down in Haiti.

I think being a Representative from the area that stretches from Juno Beach on the north, which is north of Palm Beach, stretches down through Fort Lauderdale and south to the southern part of Miami Beach, my area would be the primary point of entry for these illegal aliens or refugees coming into the United States.

I think this is why it is so important that we strengthen the blockade around Haiti; but there are more important things that I think we also must do.

We must look to returning democracy to Haiti. I think we can do this by training Haitians outside of Haiti.

We also must put a naval blockade actually around Haiti so that we can enforce the sanctions that the President is seeking to be reinstated.

We must also continue the freeze of Haitian assets and stop the elite Haitians from getting visas to go into other countries. This is vitally important. We have got to put the hurt on them, because they seem to have absolutely no regard for the poor in Haiti.

Then I think we need to develop an economic plan once democracy is restored in Haiti to encourage American investment in Haiti.

I think the embarrassment of the earlier part of this week, we can get over that. We have to act affirmatively and authoritatively and we must not allow ourselves to be absolutely ridiculed and dictated to by a small Third World country, such as Haiti.

Mr. Speaker, I will include a letter that I have written to the President detailing my position as I have outlined it here tonight, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 13, 1993.

Hon. BILL CLINTON,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The embarrassing spectacle of American and Canadian troops being prevented from landing in Port-au-Prince earlier this week must not be allowed to recur or go unanswered. Our policy with regard to the restoration of democracy in Haiti needs to be immediately and authoritatively changed.

The Governor's Island Agreement leading to the October 30 deadline for the restoration of President Aristide has clearly been breached by the Haitian military and political elite. The prospects for democracy in Haiti in any reasonable time frame after October 30 appear grim. As my Congressional district has been, and will continue to be, the primary point of entry for Haitian refugees, I and the people I represent have an urgent interest in a skillful and firm resolution of this problem.

I want to stress that the United States' primary national interest with regard to Haiti remains the protection of lives and property here in the U.S. That is why I believe it is critical that the U.S. Navy/Coast Guard cordon designed to return Haitian refugees for in-country processing be maintained and strengthened immediately. It is logical to expect that recent events will incite renewed flight from Haiti, which must not be permitted to overwhelm our repatriation capability.

Beyond this immediate aim, however, the United States has a long-term interest in helping establish the conditions needed for democracy to grow in Haiti. We will never solve the ongoing immigration crisis without the restoration of democracy in Haiti. Hinging Haiti's democratic future solely on the good faith of military dictators and the success of a porous U.N. economic embargo, however, is not the answer. That is why I believe you and your foreign policy advisers should consider taking the following steps to restore democracy in Haiti:

(1) Recruit and train a professional military force composed of Haitians who will establish, by force if necessary, the conditions necessary for the return of democratic rule in Haiti. Such a force could receive U.S. military training offshore at the U.S. Guantanamo Bay Naval Base or another suitable site. We should consult with the U.N., but we should not be deterred if other members do not share our resolve to see democracy swiftly restored in Haiti.

(2) If the U.N. economic embargo of Haiti is restored, ensure its effectiveness through a naval blockade. This will convince the Haitian military and people of the resolve of the U.S. and our allies to bring this episode to a close.

(3) Maintain and expand where practical the worldwide freeze on assets and travel visas for members of Haiti's elite.

(4) Formulate a realistic plan for developing Haiti's economy once order is restored. Possible changes include:

(A) Extending favorable GSP treatment for goods produced in Haiti;

(B) Amending the Caribbean Basin Initiative as it applies to Haiti to promote development;

(C) Providing a limited wage credit for U.S. firms employing Haitian residents;

(D) Making Haiti eligible for the IRC Section "936 Funds," which are currently used to benefit other countries in the Caribbean and Latin America.

I stand ready to support your efforts towards restoring democracy and economic hope in Haiti. It is critical that the United States take positive action to achieve that goal. This action must indicate the United States' resolve to assist in bringing the ongoing tragedy in Haiti to a swift and positive conclusion. Haiti is the poorest country in our hemisphere, and the United States should not be perceived as permitting our legitimate national interests to be dictated by a band of brigands intent on subverting democratic change.

Mr. President, democracy cannot be imposed, it must be earned. The overwhelming majority of Haitians have demonstrated their commitment to democracy. I have no doubt that many would be willing to take up arms in defense of democracy in their homeland. It should be our policy to assist them in making the restoration of democracy a reality.

Sincerely,

E. CLAY SHAW, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I congratulate him for his positive approach.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close this point by saying that Senator BOB GRAHAM from Florida has been in Haiti, along with Congressman ALCEE HASTINGS, and in a conversation that Senator GRAHAM had reportedly with General Raoul Cedras, Cedras said that it is not the armed forces' role in Haiti to protect the American troops that are lightly armed or unarmed.

But I am interested to point out also that the same General Cedras said that he would resign, but only if the peacekeepers that come in leave the M-16's at home.

In other words, what he is saying is American troops can come to Haiti only if they are unarmed, but he cannot guarantee that he can protect them while they are in Haiti.

Now, what kind of nonsense is that to base our foreign policy on?

SAVINGS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. LAROCCO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAROCCO. Mr. Speaker, today I am going to try to make economics interesting—even compelling—by weaving together highlights from several recently published books on the subject of savings.

What happens when a country doesn't save enough and consumes over 97 percent of its output? Think of saving in the most human terms; of how one generation takes care of the next. As a father, I am not proud of the unacceptable consequences of the low rate of saving in the United States. For the first time in American history my daughter's and son's generation cannot look forward as a birthright to a standard of living higher than the standard of living our parents' generation passed on to us.

In "Reviving the American Dream," Alice Rivlin writes:

> The "American Dream" may sound vague and grandiose, but it means something concrete and important to many Americans. It means an economy in which people who work hard can get ahead and each new generation lives better than the last one.

Here is the reality, a rude awakening from the American dream. In his book, "The Vanishing Nest Egg: Reflections on Saving in America," B. Douglas Bernheim writes:

> When a society fails to save, its members must ultimately pay the price for collective profligacy. For a time, a strong demand for consumer goods may buoy the economy, but robust economic performance simply masks the symptoms of a serious malady. Sooner or later, stagnation must displace prosperity as performance deteriorates.
>
> Most individuals are not currently saving enough to provide themselves with adequate financial security. In addition, low rates of saving depress investment, thereby depriving the economy of new plant and equipment that are necessary for continued growth and prosperity.

The budget deficit, the trade deficit, exchange rates, the low dollar are not acts of God. They are of our own making, the consequence of our national saving rate. Here is the interaction between undersaving by individuals and businesses, dissaving by government and some of our economic ills.

In "Saving and Investment in a Global Economy," Barry P. Bosworth of the Brookings Institution writes:

> * * * the root of the U.S. balance of payments problem lies in the sharp decline in the Nation's rate of saving during the 1980s, which in turn can be attributed to a fall in private saving and a substantial increase in the federal government's budget deficit. The shortfall of national saving in relation to investment demands, combined with a monetary policy aimed at suppressing inflation, increased the competition for funds in financial markets and sent interest rates climbing. Foreign investors, attracted by the high returns moved their funds into the United States. The increased foreign demand for dollars, required to invest in American markets, in turn drove up the value of the dollar and thus the price of American products in global markets. The result was a substitution of foreign for domestically produced goods—that is to say, exports declined and imports increased. As Americans began to spend more on imports than they earned from exports, the net supply of dollars to foreigners rose until it came into balance with the higher level of demand for dollars by foreign investors. Thus, the increased flow of foreign financial capital into the United States was matched by an equal deficit in the trade account. In that sense the United States financed a surge of consumption spending by borrowing from abroad or in later years by selling assets to foreigners.

So we've become a Nation of consumers. Fine. If we pay for consumption out of genuine earnings and not be eating the seed corn. Peter G. Peterson put it this way in "On Borrowed Time":

> Behind the pleasurable observation that real U.S. consumption per worker has risen by $3,800 between 1979 and 1986—and this is the real cause of much of the 1980s optimism—lies the unpleasant reality that only $1,500 of this extra annual consumption has been paid for by growth in what each of us produces; the other $2,300 has been funded by cuts in domestic investment and a widening river of foreign debt. It is impossible to continue consuming indefinitely in this manner. The longer we remain on our current economic course, the bleaker the prospects for posterity will become.
>
> (We cannot) go on starving domestic investment to finance our consumption. Soon we must stop and replenish the factories, bridges, and schools we have forgone or else forever relegate ourselves (and our children) to slower growth in our standard of living. . . .
>
> It is therefore all but inevitable that our level of consumption must slow its climb, or even fall, while our level of production catches up. But of course the speed with which it can catch up depends in turn on how much we can invest, which depends on how much we can save.

Mr. Speaker, saving is simply unspent income. Through the saving-banking-borrowing-lending process we Americans need to channel more unspent income into productive investment. Everyone has their own definition of productive investment. Mine is input that adds to output—tools, factories, machines that make machines, technological innovation, education, job training, infrastructure that in the words of economist Robert Heilbroner "yields a positive payback over many years to come." Therein lies the essence of capitalism. As Heilbroner, in "21st Century Capitalism," describes it:

> Capital is wealth those value does not inhere in its physical characteristics but in its use to create a larger amount of capital. Typically, this use takes place as money is converted into commodities such as raw materials, the raw materials converted into finished goods and services, and the finished goods sold on the market—not to make a profit and retire to a life of ease, but to buy more raw materials and start the process over again.

So, if you like capital, you've got to love saving which is the source of all capital and the beginning of this wonderful process of self renewal. In a nutshell, saving equals investment equals productivity growth equals higher standard of living. The economist William J. Baumol puts it beautifully in "Productivity and American Leadership":

> . . . (Productivity growth) provides the resources, and smooths the political process, for the activities undertaken to improve the status of society generally. Education, environmental protection, widespread public health care, income redistribution programs, and a variety of other activities that will readily occur to the reader are most easily financed out of the yields of productivity growth. This is particularly so because, in an economy whose productivity is growing, an increase in outlays on such social services can be paid for entirely out of the annual increment in national output that productivity contributes, hence entailing no offsetting reduction in disposable incomes and expenditures.

And, Alice Rivlin in "Reviving The American Dream":

> . . . almost everyone who writes and speaks about revitalization of the American economy comes up with the same list of policy imperatives: increase public and private investment, especially in technology, skills, and infrastructure; get rid of the federal deficit; and reform the health payment system to cover more people and slow cost growth. The big question is not what needs to (be) done, but why so little is happening and how to get more action.

Discovering the root causes of the decline of the American saving rate, and addressing those causes, may hold the key to setting the American economy back on sound footing.

□ 1930

WE CAN'T GO EVERYWHERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MANN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, before the six cameras paid for by the taxpayers start to pan an empty Chamber which is not completely empty—I see four of my colleagues out there—keep in mind there are dozens of colleagues watching on television as they wrap up today's business in their offices, and there are a million people, low estimate, on C-SPAN watching these proceedings.

I did a 1-minute this morning, Mr. Speaker, and held up a page from the Washington Times, and on it there were the photographs of about a third of the first 28 American soldiers, 1 civilian—State Department—killed in Somalia. That figure is now up to 34, if we include nonbattle deaths of young men who would not have been over there if we were not trying to feed people. Of those 34, Mr. Speaker, 2 were killed while George Bush was President, 1 on December 23 and 1 on January 12. All the rest have been killed, or died in accidents since Mr. Clinton had his inauguration. We totally turned over the charter with Clinton himself on the White House lawn saying, "Mission accomplished, success. People fed. Three hundred fifty thousand lives saved."

Why we put our men in harm's way under the United Nations with a strange chain of command after we had worked out in this Chamber and the Senate under Goldwater-Nickles, two World War II veterans, Barry Goldwater of Arizona, now a retired U.S. Senator, and Nickles who lost one of his legs in the Herken Forest in Germany walking out of a mine field to save a wounded colleague, one of our great Members from Talladega, AL—those two men, with majority overwhelming votes in both Houses tightened up the chain of command so that the field commander said: "Give me armor, give me helicopters, give me snipers, give me more fire support, give me fast landing craft, anything to accomplish a mission."

Tight, quick chain of command was approved.

What broke down there?

Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues used this map in a 1-minute this morning, and, assuming that half the million people watching and listening, Mr. Speaker, are different, here is a map, and I found a couple of hot spots that are not on there. Here are areas where every red dot is on our planet where the United Nations wants to send people and where people are dying today or can start dying at a moment's notice, like North Korea; the Philippines; Indonesia with Timor, still human rights violations; Cambodia; Burma where my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] here on the floor, has been many times; India, whether it is Kashmir or the Tamil Tigers in the south; Kyrgyzstan; Abkazia, a section on the Black Sea; and it goes on, and on, and on—1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 hot spots in Africa, Northern Ireland, up in Tablisi, in Moldava, of course Bosnia, and that is not to mention what can happen in Albania, the Kosovo province of Serbia. We have Americans now, several hundred in Macedonia.

Over there, Shining Path slaughtering people in Peru, spills over to Ecuador, unbelievable drug wars with Escobar-type mass serial killers still loose; Nicaraguans killing one another, starting up again, Violeta Chamorro hanging on by her fingernails because she left the Communist thugs in place controlling the treasury, the interior, and the armed forces; Humberto Ortega's brother with the million and a half dollars—I mean Danny Ortega's brother, Humberto, still with a million and a half in a Swiss bank. And then, of course, Haiti, which is unbelievable. Cuba can explode at any minute. What is going to happen if the people rise up there and overthrow Castro or God takes him out with a lightning bolt? Are we going to send Americans down there?

Mr. Speaker, the long and short of all of this is: The new world order is the new disorderly world.

We cannot go everywhere. The luckiest thing that ever happened to Mr. Clinton was that the U.S.S. *Harlan County* followed by the U.S.S. *Fairfax County*, which is where I live when I am back there, those two ships going back to Guantanamo have saved us dozens of Americans being wounded or killed on that western half of the island of Hispaniola, the nation called Haiti.

I am going to put in the RECORD tonight the names of the remaining five missing in action. Well, I cannot put in one name because his remains are in the air as we speak. He will be landing in 2 hours at Dover, be taken to the mortuary, and his sacred remains will be identified by his mother. His mother already identified him alive on color TV. She saw her big, tall, six-foot-three, handsome son being torn apart by a crowd.

I will put the names of the other four men, Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD:

Field (25), Gordon (33), Shughart (35), Frank (45), and these two should get the Medal of Honor. They rappelled down on to that second crash site and gave their lives for their fellow man.

ARE WE SERIOUS ABOUT CUTTING SPENDING?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to use the 5 minutes I have this evening to bring my colleagues up to date on the status of our efforts to terminate further funding for the superconducting super collider.

As my colleagues may recall, earlier this year the House voted 280 to 150 to terminate further funding for the super collider and provided for an orderly wrapdown of that project, and I would point out that nearly two-thirds of the Members of this body on both sides of the political aisle voted for the Slattery-Boehlert amendment to terminate further funding. Nearly two-thirds, Mr. Speaker.

We have an opportunity in the next few weeks to demonstrate to the American public that we are serious about cutting spending. This is the largest single cut in any of the Committee on Appropriations' bills that have come before this House this year that was adopted. So, we are talking about the single largest cut in any appropriation bill, and the House will have an opportunity in the next few days to say, "Yes, we were serious about terminating funding for the super collider," or we will find ourselves in sort of a parliamentary quagmire and may lose the opportunity to terminate funding for the super collider.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope and my firm belief that at least 218 Members out of the 280 that voted earlier this year to terminate funding will stick to that commitment, and the procedure might be a little tricky, and we may have to defeat the previous question on a motion to recommit in order to get a direct vote on the super collider issue.

□ 1940

If that fails, then we will have to defeat the conference committee report, send it back to conference, and make it very clear that we are not going to support a conference committee report with funding for the super collider in it.

Now, we are circulating a letter, and more than 120 of our colleagues have already signed this letter indicating they intend to do everything they possibly can, including vote against the conference committee report if it contains funding for the super collider.

I would point out that the tide is clearly on our side. Last year only 232 Members of this body voted to terminate funding. This year fully 48 more Members of the body joined us in our effort to terminate funding for the super collider. In the Senate last year there were 32 votes against funding. This year there were 42 votes. So the tide in the Senate is on our side.

It makes absolutely no sense for us to proceed with funding for a project when nearly two-thirds of the Members of the House on both sides of the political aisle have gone on record saying they do not support this project, and when 42 Members of the other body are clearly saying this year that they do not support further funding either.

It is time that we follow through on our decision earlier this year and terminate this project.

Mr. Speaker, I would just point out that this again is the single biggest cut in any appropriation bill that we have adopted this year. I do not see how this body or this institution can go home this year and tell the taxpayers of this country that we are serious about cutting spending when we walk away from this opportunity to save the taxpayers at least $10 billion.

Some people might be thinking, well, $10 billion is not that much money. But we have broken this down on a state-by-state basis so that taxpayers across this country understand exactly how much of their money is going to be going to this project. Let me just share with you some of these numbers.

California's share of this $11 billion projected price, and that is going up, by the way. It has gone up at least another billion dollars, and some people say $2 billion. But to just be very conservative, we will assume a total of $11 billion as the price for this project. The California share is about $1.449 billion. Almost $1½ billion of this project will be paid for by California taxpayers. Florida taxpayers will pay $575 million; Georgia taxpayers, $254 million; Illinois taxpayers, $572 million; taxpayers from Kansas, our share is $103 million for the super collider project; Massachusetts taxpayers will be asked to contribute $312 million to build the super collider; Michigan $405 million; Missouri, $202 million; New York, $940 million of taxpayer money will go to fund the super collider.

Mr. Speaker, again, I am disappointed that in the conference committee we do not have any representation from the 280 Members that voted to terminate funding. No one on the conference is representing the majority position expressed by more than two-thirds on either side of the political aisle. That is the reason we need to change the rules of this House, to prevent that sort of thing from happening again in the future.

DEMOCRATS QUIET ON DELAY IN EXTENDING JOBLESS BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MANN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak of the hypocrisy going on in this House chamber with respect to the extension of benefits for unemployed families in this country. This is the fifth time benefits have been proposed to be extended for families who have exhausted their 26 weeks of State benefits and are still not able to find employment. The first three times we extended those benefits, we paid for those benefits. Under the Bush administration, the Congress came forward with bills eventually that paid for those programs. All three times there was debate on the Democratic side of the aisle that chastized Republicans for their indifference to the plight of the unemployed in holding up unemployment extensions with demands of having them paid for.

Well, the Democrats got their way when Bill Clinton was elected President, and in the first attempt to extend unemployment benefits in this session of Congress with the new administration, they in fact passed benefits without a funding mechanism, citing, all four times, I might add, the urgency of passing benefits, that we cannot allow people who are looking for us to help them through this difficult time, to not fail them.

Mr. Speaker, in fact I will quote from Members from last February when we extended benefits. "The reason we are moving ahead quickly," Mr. MATSUI of California said, "is because in 10 days, on March 6, 1993, extended benefits, the EUB program, will expire."

Mr. REYNOLDS said, "There are Americans out here expecting us to act. We are beyond the gridlock that we faced for so long in this body, and these Americans are expecting us to act."

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia said, "Less than 2 weeks from today, nearly 1.8 million jobless Americans risk losing their shield against financial disaster, unless we act quickly on the legislation before us."

Mrs. KENNELLY from Connecticut said:

> Those of us in Connecticut know far too well that these benefits can mean the difference between keeping a home or losing a home; between making a car payment and defaulting; between economic survival and economic devastation. I commend the President for his effort to move quickly to address the problem of continued high unemployment. These unemployed individuals cannot afford to wait. Quite literally, when the benefits run out, time runs out.

Mr. Speaker, time has run out on the unemployed in America under this administration and under this Congress. On October 2, extended benefits expired. Two weeks ago extended benefits expired. There was a bill ready to be voted on on the floor of the House 2 days before the expiration of those benefits, and the bill was pulled by the Democratic leadership. Why was it pulled by the Democratic leadership? It was pulled by the Democratic leadership because there was a funding provision, a provision to pay for the extension of benefits that was objected to by several members of the Hispanic caucus.

What was the funding mechanism that was objected to, to provide extended benefits for working Americans who had paid taxes into the unemployment compensation fund? It was a provision to cut welfare benefits from aliens. Welfare benefits from aliens: $320 million out of the almost $8 billion a year we pay to aliens in this country in welfare benefits. We suggested that that would be a good place to find money to help pay for unemployed American citizens who had been paying unemployment compensation taxes all of their lives.

They pulled the bill. They scheduled it for a vote the following week, and, guess what? They pulled the bill again.

For 2 weeks these American families that were talked about in February, in many cases the next-door neighbors of some of these families they were talking about in February, on February 24, that we had to so urgently act on their behalf, have now here no one on that side of the aisle. No one. In 2 weeks, no one has come to this floor to express concern about these people that they were railing against those of us who wanted to pay for the proposal last time, wanted to delay a single day, and still have a timely measure. Nobody is here.

Why are they not here? Because it is special interest politics that wins out over you, the American public, every time. It is the coalition that keeps their people in power that wins out over working Americans every time.

This has nothing to do with fiscal responsibility. It has everything to do with special interest politics and the people that get hurt. And this is a classic example, where the people that get hurt are the working Americans in this country who will not get unemployment benefits. In fact, the proposal now that was supposed to be voted on today, that is now put off until tomorrow, is to strike the funding for immigration and reduce the benefits from a 4-month extension to a 3-month extension. This is hypocrisy in the highest order.

WHITEWASH AT THE WHITE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I stood in this Chamber and asked President Clinton to appoint a special prosecutor to investigate some serious allegations that Commerce Secretary Ron Brown may have been offered a bribe in exchange for lifting the trade embargo, or at least easing the trade embargo, against the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

Since that time, Secretary Brown has refused to answer questions about the allegations. Attorney General Janet Reno says that she will not appoint a special prosecutor, citing the appearance of a conflict of interest for her even to appoint a special prosecutor, which, of course, is absolute baloney.

President Clinton has declined to appoint a special prosecutor, although he clearly has the authority to do so.

What we have here is a whitewash, a whitewash from the White House. These are serious allegations against the Secretary of Commerce. They deserve a serious investigation.

□ 1950

Our Secretary of Commerce may have been offered $700,000 in exchange for lifting the trade embargo against Vietnam. And guess what the Clinton administration has been doing. Lifting the trade embargo against Vietnam. What a coincidence.

I recently met with Mr. Binh, who has made these charges of the bribe attempt. And his argument seemed very convincing. But it is ever more convincing to me.

I personally handed a list of political prisoners to the head of the Communist government of Vietnam. I put it in his hand, 500 political prisoners, and told him I would fight lifting the embargo until at least these 500 people were released as a sign of good faith and a belief in some sort of liberalization and human rights progress.

I put that same list directly into the hands of President Clinton. At the very least, when we started easing the embargo, this administration could, at the very least, have said, "We want those political prisoners released."

People have been arrested because they are trying to preach the gospel. People are trying to start a newspaper or a discussion group, political prisoners languishing away, but yet we ignored them while just precipitously lifting the embargo or easing the embargo on Vietnam.

There are demands that should have been made for information about POW's in Vietnam. Again, those demands were not made.

Could it possibly be that there is another motive at work? We need to know the answer. Why did Mr. Brown's press secretary, for example, mislead the media when he said that Mr. Brown had never met with Mr. Hao, the man who was accused of offering him the bribe?

Now we know he has had at least three meetings. What involvement did Secretary Brown have in the administration's decision to ease the trade embargo against the Communist government of Vietnam?

In my Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. Brown testified that he did not participate at all in the decision of lifting the trade embargo. In fact, he never spoke to another administration official. He never even spoke to the members of his own Department, the Department of Commerce, about lifting the trade embargo.

The question we have to ask is, Why did he not? If he is the Secretary of Commerce, he should be deeply involved with that issue, deeply involved with an issue of commerce and lifting the embargo against Vietnam.

If he was not involved with that, why was he not? Could it be that if he accepted some money from someone, he should not be the Secretary of Commerce? If he did not accept money from someone, he should be deeply involved in that discussion of a very important economic issue.

We need these questions answered. Did money change hands? Why was the bank account set up in the Indosuez Banque in Singapore? Why was even a foreign account even discussed at a meeting with Ron Brown and this representative of the Vietnamese Government?

Did Secretary Brown have a discussion with Mr. Hao, who is representing the Vietnamese Government? Did that violate the Trading with the Enemies Act, because Vietnam, I might add, is still listed as an enemy country of the United States?

So people at home will understand, the Trading with the Enemies Act, which was passed during World War I, prohibits a U.S. citizen from doing business with certain countries. The current list of prohibited countries includes North Korea, Cambodia, and Vietnam. The law specifically prohibits "having any form of business or commercial communication or intercourse with an individual, partnership or government representative" of one of these countries. Only those people who have a license granted them by the President of the United States may engage in such activity.

Today I wrote the U.S. attorney in Florida asking him to investigate whether or not it is possible that our Secretary of Commerce violated the Trading with the Enemies Act.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a copy of that letter.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
October 13, 1993.

Mr. KENDALL COFFEY,
U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of Florida, Miami, FL

DEAR MR. COFFEY: I am writing to you concerning allegations made against the Secretary Commerce, Ron Brown. I understand that your office is in the process of investigating these allegations that Secretary Brown may have accepted a bribe from a Vietnamese national or the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

According to press accounts of Mr. Binh's allegations, it appears that Secretary Brown may also have violated the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917 (50 USC App. 1). As you no doubt know, 31 CFR Section 500.201 includes Vietnam on the schedule of nations covered by the Trading With the Enemy Act.

I point all of this out in order that your office may conduct a thorough investigation of all possible violations of federal law by Secretary Brown, and I look forward to hearing from you concerning the disposition of this particular allegation. Please feel free to contact me if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

DANA ROHRABACHER,
Member of Congress.

We need a thorough investigation of all of these charges. We need answers to these questions.

COMMERCE SECRETARY RON BROWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MANN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to elaborate. The reason I am taking the 1-hour special order, and I will not use all of that, for those at the desk, probably take about 20, 25 minutes, the reason I am taking the longer special order is so that I can go into some indepth analysis of the issue that was just raised by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

In order to do that, I need to set the stage by telling the story of a man named Mr. Binh Ly.

Mr. Ly came to us in the Congress, those of us in the Congress who are with the Republican Study Committee, a few weeks ago. And he told us a very interesting story.

He told us that some time ago he met with this Mr. Hao in Florida. And Mr. Hao, who is also a Vietnamese-American and who had been an official in Vietnam back during the Vietnamese war, said that he wanted to work with Mr. Ly to set up an economic development plan for Vietnam and to try to get the embargo against Vietnam lifted so that the Vietnamese country would then start taking steps toward economic development and move out of the Dark Ages created by the Vietnam war.

Now, they decided that they were going to set up an organization called the Vietnamese Development Corp., and, if you will, come up with something like a prospectus.

Mr. Hao said that he had connections with a fellow named Ron Brown, who is the former head of the Democratic National Committee and very close to the President-elect, Mr. Clinton. And so they worked out a prospectus, if you will, or a plan for the normalization of relations with Vietnam. And that plan was sent to Mr. Brown.

The connection between Mr. Brown and Mr. Hao was a fellow named Marc Ashton in Florida, at least is what I understand.

They sent this plan to Mr. Brown. Mr. Brown read the plan last December, and he allegedly chartered an

$8,000 personal private jet and flew down to Florida to meet with Mr. Hao.

Mr. Hao met with him, and then he, after the meeting, he told Mr. Binh Ly, the gentleman who was working with him on this project, that Mr. Brown thought it had a lot of merit. And he thought they should proceed, and he showed him Mr. Brown's business card.

Mr. Hao then suggested that Mr. Ly and two other Vietnamese-Americans go to Ho Chi Minh City, formerly Saigon, and then up to Hanoi to meet with government leaders in Vietnam to try to sell the program.

Now, Mr. Hao had a lot of connections in Vietnam. He had been a high government official in South Vietnam and had connections with the now current Communist government.

They flew to Ho Chi Minh City. They were there for a short time. They got a telephone call. They met with the Mayor of Ho Chi Minh City. They met with other Communist government officials, and then they got a call from the Prime Minister of Vietnam in Hanoi.

He invited them to come up, at Government expense, at the Communist government expense, to meet with him.

And they flew to Hanoi. They met with the Prime Minister of Vietnam. And after they had this general meeting, the Prime Minister had a private meeting for about a half an hour with Mr. Hao. Mr. Hao came back after the private meeting and told Mr. Binh Ly that the deal had been set and Mr. Brown was in.

Now, he said that Mr. Binh Ly had to work with him to draft a letter to be signed by the Prime Minister which would then, in turn, be given to Mr. Brown to let him know, let Mr. Brown know that the Vietnamese Government was on board and wanted to work with him to normalize relations and remove the embargo against Vietnam.

So Mr. Ly worked with Mr. Hao, and they drafted a letter. The letter was then sent to the Prime Minister of Vietnam. He signed the letter. It was given back to Mr. Hao, and Mr. Hao then told Binh Ly to contact a fellow named Marc Ashton in Florida to tell him that the deal was on track. Everything looked good and to set up a meeting with Mr. Brown in Washington, DC.

Mr. Binh Ly then dialed the number to fax the letter to Mr. Marc Ashton. Mr. Ashton picked up the phone and said that he would accept the fax. He put the phone down. The fax went through, and then after that, a short time later, all the parties then returned to the United States through different routes.

Mr. Ly went through Taiwan, because he had some relatives or friends he wanted to meet with. And Mr. Hao came back through a more direct route.

When Mr. Ly got back to the United States, Mr. Hao had already been to Washington, DC. And he told him that he had met with Mr. Brown and that Brown had eight requirements that had to be met in order for them to consummate a business deal.

One of those requirements, according to Mr. Hao, was that $700,000 be deposited in an offshore bank for Mr. Brown in order to be, in essence, good faith money for the deal.

□ 2000

Also, Mr. Brown enumerated six or seven other items in the letter that were necessary to consummate the deal. One of those items, according to Mr. Ly, was that Mr. Brown would have exclusive contractual rights to American businesses that went over there from the Vietnamese side. In other words, he was going to get a cut out of the 100 or 150 American businesses that he would take into Vietnam, and he would be, in essence, the beneficiary of any profit made by the Vietnamese Government, or at least a percentage of that.

In addition, Mr. Ly indicated there was going to be huge oil-drilling exploration taking place, and that Vietnam had the third-largest oil reserves in the world, at least he was led to believe that, and that Mr. Brown was going to get royalties off of all of the oil that was sold by the Vietnamese Government to the United States, and other entities.

When Mr. Ly found out about this, he said "I don't want any part of this." He started indicating this was not part of the deal, that he thought this was going to be an honorable business arrangement. Mr. Hao said to him, "You are a young man. Do not worry about this. Let older, cooler heads prevail. Things will work out, and you will probably get a great position with the Vietnamese Government, maybe in charge of the Vietnamese oil corporation."

So Mr. Ly did not say any more about it at that time, but he was very concerned. Mr. Hao indicated that he was going to take Mr. Brown's letter and go back to Vietnam to try to solidify the agreement with the Vietnamese Government, but because Mr. Ly had objected to the possible dishonest things that were going to be done, he did not want to take Binh Ly with him, so Mr. Hao then goes back to Vietnam. He takes the letter with him, and when he comes back he indicates that the deal is done.

He lays on the table in front of Binh Ly something Binh Ly never looked at in detail, but Mr. Hao said it was a bank account that had been opened by the executive vice president of Banque Indosuez in Bangladesh; that this executive in Bangladesh had opened a bank account in Singapore with the Banque Indosuez in Singapore, so that the Vietnamese Government could deposit $700,000 in there for Mr. Brown, and $300,000 for the purpose of opening up the Vietnamese Development Corp. in Washington, DC, an office there.

Mr. Ly really was concerned about this. Incidentally, I might add, during the time that Mr. Hao went to Vietnam, Mr. Ly took his wife and he went to Louisiana, where he met with two people in whom he had great confidence, and he told them the story and said he was very concerned about the corruption factor, and he thought he ought to get out of that, and these gentlemen agreed with him. One was kind of like his father. He said, "You ought to get out of that, because it is corrupt and a lot of people could go to jail."

He suggested to Mr. Ly that when he goes back, he might listen one more time to Mr. Hao, but then extricate himself from this as quickly as possible. When Mr. Hao came back from that meeting, of course, his phone has been ringing off the wall, Mr. Ly, his phone had been ringing off the wall from Mr. Hao. Mr. Hao then told him of the agreement with the Vietnamese Government and the opening of the bank account in Singapore.

This really scared Mr. Ly and Mr. Ly said, you know, he wanted out. Mr. Hao kept imposing upon him his will, saying, "No, you don't want to get out. You don't want to get out." Mr. Ly indicated he was going to get out. He gave him a letter of resignation. He said he was getting out.

Then Mr. Hao said to Mr. Ly, through an intermediary, that he had better keep his mouth shut. Mr. Ly became very concerned and he went to the Miami Herald. The Miami Herald printed the story. The next day the FBI called Mr. Ly and said to Mr. Ly, "We would like to talk to you." They met with him and they asked if he would take a lie detector test, going into all these details I just enumerated.

He took the lie detector test, which lasted 6 hours, and he passed it with flying colors. After he passed it with flying colors, the FBI said they wanted to work with him, and they gave him a beeper. They worked with him trying to tap telephone conversations between him and Mr. Hao. By this time Mr. Hao was not having any part of this. He was very concerned.

During this period of time, just before the FBI investigation took place, after the Miami Herald had just come out, Mr. Hao contacted Mr. Ly through his brother-in-law, through Mr. Ly's brother-in-law, and said that he had better keep his mouth shut, because the Vietnamese Government would be very concerned about it and might take action. It was an indirect threat to him. Mr. Ly was very, very concerned about this.

Then, finally, after the Miami article came out, Mr. Hao called Ly through his brother-in-law and said, "You have to meet with him tomorrow," so Mr. Ly did meet with him. He said he was

out, he didn't want anything to do with it. Mr. Hao said to him, "How much money do you want? How much money do you want?" Mr. Ly says, "You don't understand. I'm out. I don't want anything else to do with it." Mr. Hao kept on and on and on insisting that he take money. Mr. Ly finally got up and left.

To make a long story short, the FBI investigation continued until about the middle of April. During the middle of April they came to him and they said that they wanted the beeper back, because there had been budget cuts. This beeper cost $10 to $15 a month, and Mr. Ly could not figure out why they were calling off the investigation.

One of the reasons could be, and we are not casting any allegations on individuals in the administration, but it could be because Janet Reno, the Attorney General, had been confirmed just 5 weeks before. I am sure she was aware of the investigation.

In any event, the investigation was curtailed at that point. We did not hear any more about it for 3 or 4 months. Then stories started to break in a number of different publications about this investigation. The word started leaking out.

To give the Members one thing that is a big question in my mind, and I am not accusing anybody at Justice of wrongdoing, but these are very coincidental things.

On Friday, July 16, a newspaper called the Spotlight was contacted by the FBI about three articles that they had printed indicating that Mr. Sessions, the FBI Director, had taken personal involvement and control over the investigation against Mr. Brown and Mr. Hao back in the early part of the year, and because of these three newspaper articles the FBI came and they wanted copies of the articles. They got these articles on July 16.

This may be just a coincidence, but on July 17, the next morning, Janet Reno and a gentleman who is an Associate Attorney General, Mr. Webster Hubbell, called the FBI Director into his office. The FBI Director had other problems, of course. We know about those. They were in the paper.

However, I don't know if it is a coincidence or not that these revelations took place on the 16th about Mr. Sessions being involved in the investigation of Mr. Brown and Mr. Hao, and on the 17th, the very next morning, the Attorney General and her Associate Attorney General, Mr. Webster Hubbell, who incidentally was a former law partner of Mr. Clinton's down in Arkansas, told Mr. Sessions he had until the following Monday to resign, or else he would be fired.

Mr. Sessions thought that the FBI should be separate from the executive branch, and he would not retire because of this pressure, so on the Monday morning following, on July 19, he got a call from the President of the United States who said. "You are fired." Then a few minutes later the President called back and told the Director his dismissal was effective immediately, and then they had FBI agents come into Mr. Sessions' office, as I understand it, and in a gentle way they helped him, escorted him out of the building. This was the former FBI Director.

Those questions created by these actions need to be answered. Was the Justice Department playing politics in this sort of thing? Were they trying to get this thing cooled down before it went out of control?

In any event, the media started beating on this issue. Then about 5 weeks after a story came out by ABC News and another major news publication in this country, Ms. Reno and the Attorney General's office and the U.S. district attorney for the southern part of Florida empaneled a grand jury to investigate these allegations. This was in September. Bear in mind that they called off the dogs in April, and here we are 5, 6 months later, 5 months later, that they are finally empaneling a grand jury to investigate it.

Mr. Brown said he never met with Mr. Hao. He said this through a person who was a spokesman at the Commerce Department. Then after he said that, Mr. Brown, the attorney for the Secretary of Commerce admitted that Brown not only had met with Mr. Hao once, but three times, and the third time was when they had dinner here in Washington, and then he took him over to the Commerce Department with two other people to talk about something, we don't know what.

Mr. Brown's spokespeople say these were personal visits, and they had nothing to do with business. He denied he even knew Mr. Hao. He denied he had ever even met with Mr. Hao, and now his attorney tells us he met with him not once but three times, and Mr. Hao is the man who allegedly gave him $700,000 that was in a Singapore bank.

Then we found out that the bank account not only was opened, but the FBI has indicated that they now know that moneys were transferred from the Government of Vietnam through electronic transfers to a bank in Singapore. Could that be a coincidence? Maybe, but we are stretching it pretty far right now.

Finally Mr. Brown then came before a committee on which I served, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, about a week ago. This is the thing that I think is a new revelation, that my colleagues ought to pay particular attention to.

At the committee meeting the gentleman from California, DANA ROHRABACHER, the gentleman who preceded me in the special order, he asked Mr. Brown a couple of questions. Mr. Brown said:

> I am not going to answer any questions today bearing on the grand jury investigation in Miami. All I am here to talk about today are trade issues.

When it came my turn to ask Mr. Brown questions, I asked him questions relating to trade, and I would like to read into the RECORD the questions that I asked.

□ 2010

Here is the first question. I said:

> I would like to ask a question that is relative to this hearing. Can you tell us, Mr. Brown, about any involvement that you or your staff may have had in relation to trade negotiations or the possibility of trade negotiations with the Republic of Vietnam?

And Secretary Brown said:

> I had no involvement with those, Congressman.

He made a categorical denial that he has been involved in any way with negotiations or discussions regarding normalization of relations with Vietnam.

Then I went on and said:

> Trade promotion with Vietnam, the possibility of further trade and lifting of the sanctions against Vietnam is very important, and it is trade related.

And if somebody in his administration did participate in the decisionmaking or the negotiations, my question is: Did Mr. Brown involve himself with his employees in this discussion. I tightened the question a little bit further. And he said:

> I answered that in the negative, Congressman. But I'll also say that we're not going to have internal discussions about internal policy formation.

Now, yesterday a fellow who is close to the National Security Council came to see me because he thought this issue needed to be clarified and illuminated. And he told me that on June 14 a notice of principals meeting was sent to the various secretaries of the various branches of government, this is the top-level secretaries, saying that at 2 o'clock in the afternoon on June 16, in the White House Situation Room, that they would be discussing the Vietnam operations paper.

Now, the Vietnam operations paper was a compilation of the results of a deputies' meeting. Let me explain to my colleagues that there are three levels of National Security Council meetings. One is the principal level. That is the top dogs in every government agency, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of the Treasury, and so forth. Then they have below that one rung the deputies' level, or the assistant chief deputies, or the people that are right next to the heads of various departments. And then they have below that what is called the experts level.

So this meeting that was being called on June 16 was as a result of a previous meeting held at the deputy level at which they discussed Vietnam options. The options paper, as I said, was a compilation of the results of that deputies'

meeting, the second level. Brown, Secretary Brown, would have had to have at least been briefed on the results of the deputy meeting, plus prior to the deputy meeting he would have had to approve the Commerce Department's position. I mean, can you imagine the head of a department not knowing about something as important as normalizing relations with an arch-enemy, Vietnam, when 2,200 POW/MIA's had not been accounted for. Obviously he would have had to know this.

But Brown said to me in the hearing he had no discussions, no contact with anybody about normalizing relations with Vietnam, or removing that trade embargo. So either Mr. Brown was not doing his job or he lied to the Congress of the United States, which I believe is a felony. In either event, he should not be in that office, because something as important, as Mr. ROHRABACHER said, as normalizing relations with Vietnam and removing that trade embargo, when we have 2,200 POW/MIA's unaccounted for is something that the Commerce Department should be totally aware of, and especially the head of it. And if he did know about it, he lied to Congress.

Now let me tell Members what went on at that meeting, because this is very important. There were three options discussed.

The first option was to approve international financial institutions initiatives. This is at the White House in the Situation Room, evidently, where they met. Approve international financial institutions' initiatives and delay a decision on lifting the embargo to September.

Now what we mean by approving international financial institutions' initiatives is the World Bank and IMF loans, Japan and France and others who had obligations owed to them by the Government of Vietnam, relaxing those obligations so that Vietnam could get World Bank and IMF loans, and thus open up the door for trade. So the first thing was to approve these international financial institution initiatives and delay a decision on lifting the embargo until September.

This approach did not pass muster. There were several that thought it might be a good idea, but they went to what called option 1–A. This is what option 1–A was, option 1–A was to allow international financial initiatives, but to ease the embargo, to start the ratcheting down of the embargo, so we could start normalizing relations with Vietnam. The majority of those at the National Security Council approved that, but not the Department of Commerce.

The Department of Commerce supported option No. 2. Here is what option No. 2 was: lift the block on international financial institutions and to totally, completely lift the embargo on Vietnam. And do you know who pushed this the hardest? The Department of Commerce. Mr. Brown said he didn't know anything about it, he said he never discussed it with anybody in his department, and yet at this deputies' meeting his department was pushing harder, almost totally by itself, than anybody else to completely remove that embargo with Vietnam.

Now why would he do that? Some people say well, it is because of trade. Well let us think about that. He said he did not know Hao, never heard from Mr. Hao. Then he admitted through an attorney that he met him not once, but three times. Mr. Hao had allegedly given him $700,000 and put it into a bank account from the Vietnamese Government in Singapore.

Mr. Brown said that he had never had any communication with the Vietnamese Government, and then in a cursory statement later on he said "Yes, I believe I did read the letter from some government official over there." It was the Prime Minister of Vietnam. So he has been caught in two or three falsehoods already.

Now he says he had no discussions whatsoever with anybody on his staff, and yet his head deputy, or their designee was at this meeting leading the charge for removing the embargo against Vietnam. Somebody is lying. Either he is inept, or he lied to Congress, and we need to get to the bottom of this.

I have written a letter to the President of the United States, a second letter now. In that second letter I wrote to him, I asked for complete material from the NSC meeting of June 16, which we do not have yet. That would be the principal level. And I would like to have further information on this meeting, and who was the point man at this meeting for the Department of Commerce to try to force through the removal of the embargo against Vietnam. We need to know the man's name from the Department of Commerce. We need to know if he talked to Ron Brown, and if he did talk to Ron Brown how extensive was the conversation. I believe it was probably very extensive. Otherwise, he would not have taken such a strong initiative at this meeting. And if that is the case, then Mr. Brown probably should be taken to task, and maybe even removed from his office.

But we will delay that for a later date, because we are getting more information all of the time. Yesterday or day before Mr. CLINGER, the ranking Republican on the Government Operations Committee, sent a letter to the President of the United States at the White House, asking for a number of pieces of information that will help give us the picture that we need to come to a conclusion on this issue. We need to have phone bills, we need to have logs of phone calls coming in and out of the Department of Commerce. Did they come from Mr. Hao? Did Mr. Brown take them? Did Mr. Brown call Mr. Hao? These are all records that are over there, and we need to pursue this to a complete conclusion, because there is a cloud hanging over the Clinton administration.

Now why do I say that? This government has said for years that we would never normalize relations with Vietnam until we had a full accounting of the 2,200 POW/MIA's. We do not have that accounting. We are not anywhere near it. And yet the Clinton administration in July and in September took two giant steps toward normalization of relations with Vietnam.

The first step in July allowed the World Bank and IMF loans to go into that country. Then in September it allowed American businesses where agreements have been reached with the Vietnamese government for industry to go over there, for American businesses to go in and bid where those IMF and World Bank loans have been approved. And so this administration has taken two giant steps toward normalizing relations with Vietnam, even though we do not have the POW/MIA issue anywhere near resolved.

Why did they do that? Why did the administration take two steps toward normalizing relations? Could it be because Mr. Brown used his influence? Could it be that he got $700,000, plus the promise of maybe hundreds of millions of dollars, or royalties or other fees from the government of Vietnam? I suggest that these questions have to be answered. Otherwise the Clinton administration is in jeopardy. This could be another Watergate or worse. It could be another Irangate or worse. And we need to get to the bottom of it. The American people need to have confidence in the administration, in the White House and in this government, and we need full disclosure.

Now, if we do not get answers from the President, and from Mr. Brown in the not-too-distant future, I will file a resolution of inquiry with the Congress. It will be referred to Mr. CLINGER's committee, and we will try to force the issue. But we hope there will be voluntary compliance with our request, Mr. CLINGER's and mine, and others, so that we can get to the bottom of this.

□ 2020

It stinks to high heaven.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read you something that is very humorous to me. In the magazine Newsweek this week, Mr. Brown's attorney told Newsweek that the existence of a bank account in Singapore—and he has no knowledge of it—does not implicate his client. He said that there are any number of reasons why the Vietnamese would open an account in Singapore wholly unrelated to Ron Brown. Give me a break. We knew it was in a Swiss

bank in Singapore, we knew that the executive vice president of the Indo Swiss in Bangladesh opened an account. Mr. Howe said that the money was going to be deposited in this bank. Now we have a wire transfer from Vietnam to a bank in Singapore and his attorney says it could be wholly unrelated to Ron Brown. Well, maybe, but it is a big, big coincidence, do you think? I think it is a big coincidence. We need to have answers.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that Mr. Brown ought to be forthright, Mr. Clinton ought to be forthright, our President, we ought to get to the bottom of this as quickly as possible. Otherwise, as I said before, I believe very strongly that this administration is going to be in jeopardy. The longer it goes on, the worse it is going to get. We need to get to the bottom of it quickly.

THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MANN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I am joined this evening by my distinguished colleagues from the Democratic side of the aisle and perhaps maybe even a Republican or two who believes in the same cause we are advocating, will join us this evening. But, Mr. Speaker, I am here with MARCY KAPTUR, the gentlewoman from Ohio, the gentleman from Ohio, SHERROD BROWN, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. STUPAK, and we expect a few others, to talk about the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, there is a deep, dark secret hidden within the North American Free-Trade Agreement. NAFTA supporters will not talk about it, they will not even mention it; they act like it does not exist, but it is there and it is not going to go away, it is not going to fly out the window, it is not going to disappear in a wisp.

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the costs of NAFTA. I do not mean the economic costs, because we know NAFTA will send half a million jobs to Mexico; I am not talking about the social costs, because we know NAFTA will drive down our standard of living; I am not talking about the human costs, because we know NAFTA will uproot the lives and livelihoods of our friends and our neighbors. I am talking about the actual costs, the dollars-and-cents costs, the monetary costs hidden deep within NAFTA.

I just cannot get anybody from the other side to come forward and even talk about it.

The big question is this, and it is a $50 billion question. Even conservative estimates of the costs of implementing NAFTA say it will cost the United States anywhere between $40 and $50 billion. That is understandable when you consider that we are going to lose anywhere from $2.5 to $3 billion in tariff revenues over 5 years. Estimates of cleaning up the environmental cesspool that has been created at the border have run as high as $21 billion over 10 years. The Secretary of Commerce has estimated it will cost between $15 and $20 billion to rebuild roads and bridges and sewer systems along the border.

The State of Texas alone guesstimates it will cost $10 billion from the Federal Government to pay for NAFTA's implementation.

Other border States—New Mexico, Arizona, and California—are just completing their wish lists now.

These requests are above and beyond the $5 billion-plus the administration estimates will be necessary to retrain workers whose jobs will leave for Mexico. That is the administration's guess on what retraining will cost because we will be losing jobs to Mexico.

That is not even counting the increase in unemployment benefits expected, or the increase in agriculture price supports that NAFTA will force, or the cost of extra customs inspectors to stop drugs from coming into the border.

And that is not even mentioning the loss of revenue and the dislocation costs we experience already when 500,000 Americans lose their jobs if this deal goes through, as 500,000 Americans have lost their jobs to Mexico over the last decade.

When all is said and done, NAFTA could be a new $40 billion Government program.

Just look at the European example.

By European example, I am talking about the European Community's 40-year struggle to integrate the poorer economies of Spain, Portugal, and Greece into the EC, even though the economies of those countries were a lot closer than ours and Mexico's.

The dispartiy is 3 to 1 or 2 to 1 at the most between the richest and the poorest, whereas ours between the United States and Mexico is somewhere between 7 to 1 and 10 to 1.

And even though the wage scales between those countries were a lot closer than ours and Mexico's, and even though the basic legal and political systems between those countries were a lot closer than ours and Mexico's, and even though the standards of living between those countries were a lot closer than ours and Mexico's, the Europeans recognized that there would be tremendous dislocation and adjustment costs to integration, and they built them into the system.

Since 1989, they have spent $100 billion on adjustment programs to integrate their economies that were vastly more similar than ours and Mexico's.

And in the years ahead, they will spend even more.

Yet we are trying to rush this agreement through to satisfy the former President of the United States, and now this President of Mexico, we are trying to rush through in 3 months what has taken the EC 40 years and over $100 billion to do. Who will pay for the costs in this country that will result from NAFTA, costs to retool our factories, to retrain our workers, to rebuild our infrastructure, to clean up the environmental mess along the border? That is the $50 billion question. Nobody on the other side seems willing to talk about it. There is a defeaning silence.

Mr. Speaker, in the past 6 months we could not come up with $16 billion to pass the jobs bill to create jobs right here in America. We had to struggle to make real cuts and we had to make real sacrifices to reduce the deficit by half a billion dollars. In the past few days we have not been able to find $1 billion to extend unemployment benefits to 1 million Americans who have been out of work for a long time. And yet we are being asked to buy a $50 billion bill of goods that somehow, some way we are going to be able to pay for down the line.

Well, I was born at night, but I was not born last night. And if you think that we are going to implement NAFTA without spending a dime, I have a bridge I would like to sell you over the Rio Grande.

NAFTA proponents are asking us to stake America's future and our standard of living on conjecture, on theories, and on articles of faith.

On the one hand they are asking American workers to jeopardize their jobs, the jobs they have got now, to opt for two in the bush. And on the other they are saying to Congress, "Trust us, pass NAFTA, and we'll find a way to pay for it."

Well, there is an old saying about this kind of thing: "Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me."

I do not think the American people are going to be fooled again. They are already on the fact that NAFTA is a bad deal for America and will make jobs our No. 1 export. They are not going to fall for more promises.

Mr. Speaker, I raise this issue because I have the revolting feeling that we are going to be asked to raise taxes in order to pay for NAFTA. We are going to be asked to raise our taxes in order to send our jobs to Mexico. And if you think that sounds outrageous, I would like to direct your attention to an article from last Friday's New York Times:

The headline reads: "Traveler Fees May Rise to Pay for Trade Accord."

According to the story, the administration is planning a sharp increase in customs, immigration, and agricultural fees in order to pay for the tariff revenue loss from NAFTA.

That means that every time you fly out of the country and come back, you are going to pay a higher tax.

It says that they will likely propose a 100-percent increase in these fees, that is, taxes.

It also says that the administration has also been looking at the imposition of border-crossing fees on trains, trucks, and individuals who cross the border. That means every time one of our trucks went over the border and came back, it would have to pay a border tax.

And that is just the beginning.

□ 2030

According to the story, U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor said that "there are a number of different alternatives"—I want people to focus in on this—under consideration. He says: "Higher customs fees are only one of them. We've looked at 15 or 20 different alternatives."

And when an aide was asked to cite what areas they were looking at as alternatives—this is what he said in the paper, maybe he did not say it, but it is in the paper, the New York Times, I believe it was, he said, "Medicare, disability, and Social Security."

Mr. Speaker, are they really considering taking money from Social Security in order to pay for NAFTA?

Are they really thinking about taking money from Medicare in order to pay for this treaty?

Are they really considering ways to use money from disability payments to come up with the money for NAFTA?

Well, if they are, they better think again. We're not touching Social Security or Medicare to pay for this fatally flawed treaty.

What are we going to read about next?

Are laid-off auto workers in Michigan going to have their taxes raised to clean up environmental waste coming from Mexican factories that took their jobs?

Are garment workers in North Carolina going to have their taxes go up to pay for new bridges carrying products from Mexico that used to be made in North Carolina?

Are laid-off furniture workers in California going to have their tax bill go up to rebuild the roads that carried the trucks that took their jobs and their factories to Tijuana?

Are workers in the Northeast and the Midwest who lose jobs going to be asked to pay extra taxes out of their unemployment checks to help with economic development in border States that have taken their jobs?

Where does it end, Mr. Speaker?

Well, I say it has got to end here.

The buck has got to stop here.

We have go to defeat this treaty here.

There is no question who will pay the costs of NAFTA?

The American people will pay the costs.

In lost jobs.

In a lower standard of living.

In higher taxes.

In uprooted families.

In decimated communities.

And in years spent wondering how we will put the lives of our families and our neighbors back together after NAFTA. Those are important questions we have to ask.

We can not afford these social costs.

We can not afford these human costs.

We can not afford these economic costs.

This charade has gone on long enough.

We have got to say no to this NAFTA Treaty.

I am going to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK], and to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK], who I see is here also; but before I do, for those who have not seen it, I want to share with them again this chart, because I think from an economic standpoint it makes the case very well.

This is a chart that has been made up of an ad that has been running in publications in U.S. trade magazines all over this country. It is a Mexican Government ad. It basically says to a beleaguered looking American businessman, scratching his neck, wondering how to make things meet, and he says:

I can't find good loyal workers for a dollar an hour within a thousand miles of here.

The ad goes on to say:

Yes, you can, in Yucatan.

The ad also says to come down to Yucatan where the wages and benefits are a dollar an hour. You can save up to $15,000 a year per worker and you and your plant managers can live well and you can be more productive.

This is what is going to happen if this treaty goes through. We will see an exodus of American jobs. We have already lost half-a-million to Mexico.

Why would they stay? If they did not have to worry about environmental laws being enforced, they did not have to worry about worker safety laws, if they did not have to worry about enforcing child labor laws, if they did not have to worry about cleaning up the environment, if they can get away with paying slave wages to children and oftentimes young women of a dollar an hour, exploiting their work, saving $15,000 a year per worker, why would they stay?

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for yielding to me.

For this entire year, those of us particularly who are first termers, like the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] and others who have been with us on many of these special orders in the evenings, have been struggling all year trying to figure out how to cut spending. I think we have begun that journey and we have made some major cuts.

We have also at the same time found it difficult to find ways to pay for things that are absolutely necessary, like unemployment compensation, like the flood victims in the Midwest from the floods this summer.

We are now saying let us come up, the NAFTA proponents are now saying we have got this new $50 billion program.

The problem is they are not admitting to it. They are playing word games about the cost. They are hoping that the issue of the cost of NAFTA will simply go away.

We saw on the floor of the House earlier this evening our colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] talking about cutting the super collider, something we need to do. We need to make these major cuts. We cannot go to people who are working on a project like the super collider and say, "We want to cut you, but we have got this nice new program that is $50 billion, the NAFTA Program, and we simply can't do it."

As Carl Sagan might say, it is billions and billions and billions of dollars.

It is an issue that has been with us where Commerce Secretary Ron Brown back in July said it would cost $15 to $20 billion. Now they are admitting it is going to cost more than that. Now we are estimating it is going to cost between $40 and $50 billion. By the time all the estimates come in, the Governor of Texas puts her request in, the Governor of California puts his in, the Governors of New Mexico and Arizona put their requests in, the worker retraining money which nobody can estimate because nobody can agree. Everybody agrees it costs jobs. Nobody knows how many jobs it is going to cost. When those dollars are calculated in, with the lost $3 to $5 billion in tariffs, we lose those moneys, where are we going to come up with the money?

The law in this country now says under the budget resolution, you either come up with $50 billion in taxes to do it or you come up with $50 billion in cuts, or you have a combination of $50 billion in taxes or cuts. You can call it revenue enhancement. You can call it cutting waste if you do the cuts. Any way you do it, it is going to hurt people.

You cannot expect people in Toledo, OH, or people in Macomb County, MI, or the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, or western Pennsylvania, or my district in Medina or Lorain, or Chardon, OH, you cannot expect people to pay more in taxes or to see their programs, like Social Security, cut to fund a program that is going to cost our region and

cost this country. It simply is not fair. It is something that we cannot in good conscience do.

It is one more of the many reasons that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has laid out to oppose NAFTA. It is icing on the cake. It is just one more reason that anybody who cares about the budget deficit, who cares about getting this country back on track, who cares about giving service to people in this country, providing the kinds of services with Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security and environmental laws and all the things that we care about deeply, we simply cannot put that aside to fund a bankrupt program, a morally bankrupt program like NAFTA.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his comments. I think he is right on in terms of the ideas that have been suggested by the administration.

I mean, to come up with what they are advocating now, or at least floating in the papers, $2½ to $3 billion in additional taxes to pay for this and, of course, it will pay for just a very small part of it. We are talking about a $50 billion program. It will pay a very small part of that $50 billion, certainly less than 10 percent of it.

They are talking about an airline tax. We know the airline industry is beleaguered right now. They are on the ropes. They cannot afford this additional tax.

It seems to me that this has not been well-thought out. We still do not know how they want to deal with all the other questions of worker retraining, which even they admit will be hefty and handsome.

So I thank my colleague for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Toledo, OH [Ms. KAPTUR] who has been so very eloquent and dogged on this issue.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] and also thank the people of Michigan for electing him to serve here as someone who has been such a consistent leader on this issue, with all his other responsibilities that he has been elected inside this Chamber to handle, and we are most grateful for the gentleman's intrepidness, and it is a pleasure to join with our colleagues who were sworn in back in January this year, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK], and my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], who has been such a leader among the new members, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK].

I always like to say to the American people they should have heart, because elections do make a difference. We have over 110 new Members of this House. I believe we do have the votes to defeat this current NAFTA Treaty, but only if the American people keep helping us.

Mr. BONIOR. On that point, Mr. Speaker, just very briefly, and then I will yield back to my colleague, this new class of Members of which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] are Members, we have 67 new Democratic Members. I believe people understand that they are the freshest group of people who came out of the country.

□ 2040

They represent a point of view that I think is fresh and new, and I think we are going to get 57–58 out of the 67 Members voting against NAFTA because they sense, and they understand, the frustration that the American worker has had, and they understand basically that this is a bad deal.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield for one moment, it is a good point that 80 or 90 percent of the freshman Democrats are opposed to NAFTA, and a big reason for that is almost every one of us—I know that BART, in spite of the fact that there is no plane directly between here and there, goes home every weekend, and I know RON does, and I do, and almost all the freshmen go home every weekend, and we are listening to people, and we are finding out the more people hear about NAFTA the less they like it. I think the freshmen are probably, and I know that many senior Members obviously, are real in touch with their districts, too, but I think the freshmen are probably hearing the most and are back home the most, and they really do hear about the opposition to NAFTA and that there is nothing good being said about it among the people. The only people that are out of step are the big newspapers, the trendy economists of the east and west coasts——

Mr. BONIOR. People whose jobs are not at stake——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. People whose jobs are not at stake, yes.

Mr. BONIOR. It is an interesting thing that we heard this morning when he had Jorge Castenada, and Adolpho Aguillar and Carlos Arreras, who are learned scholars from Mexico, came up here to talk to us about it, and they mentioned to us at our meeting that even the Mexican workers are figuring this out now. At one point a year ago 64 percent of the people polled in Mexico City, where they do the polling—they do not do it outside Mexico City where I suspect the numbers would even be more favorable to our position—but 64 percent were in favor of this a while back. The latest poll that was taken recently took only 32 percent because they have figured out this was done by the elites on both sides of the border in the country. There is nothing in there for the Mexican worker.

As my colleagues know, the Mexican worker's wages have gone down 32 percent since 1980. They are lower, 32-percent lower than they were in 1979 and 1980. They know this is not a good deal for them. It does not guarantee them the economic wherewithal to provide a living for their families.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. BONIOR. I will, and then I will get back to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. STUPAK. I know we have been jumping around here a little bit tonight, but I think it should be noted that this week, as we came back again from our weekly trip, as many of our freshmen do, go back to our districts, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY] has come out and publicly is going to now be against NAFTA, and I think it is worthwhile noting that as the time draws closer to this vote on NAFTA, which we now believe is going to be—I believe, Mr. Leader, you said about——

Mr. BONIOR. The 17th of November, or something like that.

Mr. STUPAK. November 17 or 18—time is drawing short. We need the people back home and our constituents to continue, not only to write to us for those of us who are against NAFTA—we are definitely against it—but those who maybe are undecided, those who may even be for NAFTA. It is going to be popular support that wins this battle, and that is why we are here every week, to keep the support up, to defeat this NAFTA, but we need their help, and we need our listeners to help us by contacting other Members who may remain uncertain, or might have lost their way and would consider voting for this poor agreement.

Mr. BONIOR. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] is absolutely correct, and I thank him for mentioning that.

I yield to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that.

I earlier this evening talked a little bit about who is going to benefit and who this is going to cost, and I say to the gentleman, "I am glad, Mr. Leader, that you brought up the cost from our taxpayers." Who knows? Forty billion? Fifty billion in lost revenues and other costs associated with this agreement?

But I entered into the RECORD a little earlier this evening who is benefiting already from a lot of the business interests in Mexico, and in the 1993 September issue of U.S. Latin Trade it is clear that since the time that the current President has been in office in Mexico, Mexico now has more billionaires than any country in the world, but for the United States, Germany, and Japan, and most of them having been created over the last 6 years.

Mr. Speaker, this is why we need the American people to stick with us on

this. The amount of money they are contributing to protect their own special interests is phenomenal.

Mr. BONIOR. How much is coming into the United States? I mean I have seen figures that say somewhere in the neighborhood of $30 billion. Maybe the gentlewoman from Ohio would enlighten us on that.

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, what is interesting is this article indicates that these people were asked each to contribute $25 million to the ruling party's coffers down there in Mexico back in February, and, in order to kind of cement their control which they have increased over the last several years——

Mr. BONIOR. I think, to put that in perspective, people ought to understand that there are about 36 families in Mexico that own 54 percent of the wealth. I mean these are families that own the banks, that own the television stations, that own all the natural resources in the country. So, they are capable of putting up $25 million.

Ms. KAPTUR. Tremendous money, and in a city like mine, of Toledo, OH, we have been known for years as the glass center of the world, and yet our workers are being asked to compete against a company called Vitro Glass in Mexico, which is one of these major companies which we were just talking about, a contributor to the PRI, essentially a monopoly and the second largest glass maker in the world which pays its workers one-seventh of what we pay ours in the Toledo area, and I do not really think it is fair that our people should have to compete with an international monopoly on our own soil.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, would the gentlewoman yield on that?

Ms. KAPTUR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KLINK. On one of the points, I think, that the gentlewoman may have heard about, Vitro S.A., this huge glass plant, and the gentlewoman is absolutely speaking the truth—right now in flat glass products, and we are talking about windshields for cars, the glass units that are put into skyscrapers, those sorts of things, they do about three-tenths of 1 percent of the business that is done in the United States. It is estimated that after NAFTA went into effect that they would, within a 2-year period, have 13 percent of our business, displacing 6,000 U.S. workers that currently make flat glass products, and in preparation for the NAFTA agreement, and they are hoping, of course, that it is approved, they have already bought warehouse space in Laredo, TX, and are ready to flood the market, and, as my colleagues know, we have companies in the Pittsburgh area like PPG that compete in this, and they would like to be able to sell the windshield glass to the auto plants that have already decided to leave this country and move down to Mexico.

But the gentlewoman is right. They will not be able to compete because there is no reciprocity under this NAFTA. The glass that is made by Vitro S.A. in Mexico and is shipped here will have no tariff, yet we have a 10-year-long prolonged tariff on the same glass products being made in the United States, and it is being shipped to Mexico to go back to those factories.

So, what we are saying about the NAFTA for one moment, let us forget about the wage differential. There is no reciprocity. It is not a fair trade agreement, and we will ship that industry, and the gentlewoman is right, the glass industry, appliance industry, home appliance industry is another one where there is no reciprocity, and in the small appliances the estimation is that we lose 10,000 jobs in that same 10-year period.

Ms. KAPTUR. If I may reclaim just for a second, I think what is interesting at the same time is that these kind of individuals really are ripping off their public and ours. We, our taxpayers, are being asked to fund this NAFTA through hidden mechanisms within our own Government.

I sit on the Appropriations Subcommittee that this year again was asked for hundreds and millions of dollars to pay for environmental cleanup, and the money is hidden in all these different accounts across our Government, and it has been for a number of years where our taxpayers are literally having their dollars diverted to try to build installations south of our border, as well as taking care of sewage, for example, in the San Diego area that is coming from Mexico. We are not charging the companies that are creating the mess in the first place, which is where the burden should be placed. Cost and benefits should somehow cross at some point, but our taxpayers are being asked to fund this out of general revenues, and I am so glad the gentleman brought this up because the costs are absolutely phenomenal, and there is not a fair method of paying for the damage that is already being done.

On just one other point, I also want to mention on the dislocated workers, people in our country that have already lost their jobs to Mexico. Many of them are still on the unemployment lines, many of them on the welfare rolls, many of them working part-time jobs where they are earning a third of what they earned before. Today our Federal Government only takes care of about 5 percent of workers in our country that have lost their jobs. These dislocated workers' funds and retraining funds are completely underfunded, and I do not see any proposal coming from the administration——

Mr. BONIOR. Nothing.

Ms. KAPTUR. To take care of people who are already in the unemployment lines.

Mr. BONIOR. And, as everybody here understands, and I am going to yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK], and then my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT], and then the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS]—as everybody understands that is here, everybody has a friend here, or a neighbor, or maybe someone in our own families who has lost a good job who we know is working for 50 percent of what they used to make. They may have a job for $13–$14 an hour. They are working for $5 and $6 an hour now.

□ 2050

These are people with families, who have had their lives devastated. And here we go again with a $50 billion program, with nothing to fund it, and an agreement which even the proponents of the agreement admit will cause dislocation of jobs.

Mr. KLINK. If the gentleman will yield for one moment, you talk about the cost of NAFTA, and I think the gentle lady from Ohio is absolutely correct, that this money is hidden throughout, and the American taxpayer will be asked to pay.

But the gentleman from Michigan brings up a wonderful point. I am quoting Prof. Ed Lemur of the University of California, a very big advocate of free trade. And he concludes his research:

> One effect of NAFTA will be the average wage loss of $1,000 for every worker in the lower 70 percent of our work force. So people will lose that $1,000 out of their own pocket. It is not just your tax dollars that are going to be lost, it is going to be less education, less benefits to the people of our country, less defense dollars, less things for infrastructure. But they are going to reach in your pocket and take $1,000, and that money is going to go down to Mexico because of the fact that these companies know they can hold wages down by threatening to move their companies down there. We have seen it happen in the past.

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman will yield just on that point, the first workers in our country to feel that pinch will be women and minorities, because they are on the bottom rung of the ladder of economic opportunity. And they are largely ignored in this debate. And I thank the gentleman for bringing it up.

Mr. BONIOR. Just the other side of that coin, it is not just going to be lower wage jobs we are talking about here. As all of my colleagues know from reading Harley Shakin, professor at the University of California-San Diego, his books on this issue and papers on this issue, it will be high-technology jobs.

I will give you a quick example. Hughes Aircraft in California moved down to Mexico, to Tijuana. They paid 17 bucks an hour to workers. This is highly refined, skilled work, electronic work. Seventeen dollars an hour on very difficult work.

They moved down to Mexico. They have very productive workers down

there who are willing to work for $6 a day—a day—as opposed to $17 an hour.

So people who think they are protected because they have got good-paying jobs and high-skilled jobs ought to think twice, because what we are seeing at automobile plants, airplane plants, Hughes Aircraft, and other facilities that are moving down to Mexico, is that they are taking very high-skilled jobs and good-paying jobs as well.

I yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. STUPAK. Thank you again, Mr. BONIOR, for once again organizing another special order on NAFTA.

You are commenting on the $40 to $50 billion it is estimated it is going to cost us to implement NAFTA, and yet we could not pass a $16 billion stimulus project for our own country. Yet we are willing to spend $40 to $50 billion to stimulate the Mexican economy. And yet your chart there, where it says yes, you can, in Yucatan. In the fine print there it says for every worker, you will save $15,000.

Is Mexico and the Yucatan going to give us back $15,000 for every worker who loses their job so we can pay this $40 to $50 billion we are willing to spend to stimulate their economy? I think not.

But instead of making them reimburse us for the lost revenue to our country, the administration is proposing all kinds of taxes. We will lose $2.4 to $2.5 billion just in lost tariffs. So how are we going to make it up?

There is only two ways we can do it under the 1990 budget enforcement agreement. Either raise taxes, or cut programs that you mentioned, like Medicare, Social Security, and make the Americans suffer even more.

So the administration said, so that does not happen, we will put almost double the fee on airline tickets for custom fees, immigration fees, agricultural fees. We will double it. That will bring us in about $500 million a year.

When we double these fees on airline tickets, we count on this industry to bring tourism and travelers to our country. But will that money go for increased infrastructure, roads, bridges?

How about tourism and trade? None of it. It is all going to go to pay for this flawed agreement. Plus the administration wants another $225 million a year to start cleaning up the border, the environmental problems.

We have at least four agreements on the books right now with Mexico to clean up that border. None of it has been enforced, so now we are going to count on this magical, mystical NAFTA agreement to clean it up and cost us another $225 million per year for something we did not contribute to?

Extra money for more customs officials, because you have got to have more customs officials to make sure the agreement is being lived up to. What is the cost of that? The administration has not told us.

Plus they want money to retrain American workers who lost their jobs. The claim, no job loss. But then why is the administration willing to put out the carrot at the end of the stick saying we will give money to retrain your workers who lost their jobs?

We cannot pass a stimulus package here, but we will give you money for more training for jobs that do not exist.

Remember when we passed the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, and we had to raise the price of gas in this country by 4.3 cents to try to take care of our deficit. Yet we are going to give them another $50 billion to increase our deficit to stimulate the Mexican economy? We are asking the American people to come up with $50 billion, and roll out the red carpet, so our jobs go south, and someone earns $15,000 for every American job we lose that goes to Mexico.

So we have increased costs of unemployment benefits. We have increased public assistance programs. And they want to throw in job creation programs, because we voted away our American jobs and we voted $50 billion-plus-plus-plus for this agreement.

I say it is no more. We voted today. You saw Mr. SLATTERY up here, saying no more superconducting super collider. We said no more on the space station. We are arguing over unemployment extension benefits right now because we have high unemployment in this country. The superconducting super collider is probably a good program. So is the space station. But we do not have the money to do it. We do not have the money to take care of American projects that would put Americans to work, but yet we want $50 billion-plus-plus-plus for this agreement, to help the Mexican economy, to further pollute our country, to further give away our jobs, and to further suppress human and political rights under the Salinas regime in Mexico. And to accomplish all of this, to do all of these great things, it is only going to cost us another $50 billion-plus-plus.

We do not have $50 billion. We do not have NAFTA. I urge the listeners and our colleagues to vote no, whether it is November 17 or November 18. We must stop this madness. We have a financial mess. We have a deficit of $300 billion. That is not even counting our debt of $4.3 trillion. Yet we want to add at least $50 billion more.

Mr. Leader, Mr. Majority Leader, I appreciate your help and leadership here, and we will continue to work on this, because we cannot allow this to happen to our country, not only for our jobs, our environment, the economic disruption it will cause to our country, but continue the further repression of human and workers' rights south of the border.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for his comments. I think they are right on the money. He hit it perfectly clear. Our priorities are out of order.

I think if I could just elaborate a little bit on what you said in terms of the costs here, now, the administration would point out in response to your argument that well, of course, we will be investing this money and we will create a larger middle class in Mexico and they will be able to purchase American products.

But the fact of the matter is that Mexico is a low wage society. They keep their wages low. They do not have free labor unions to help bargain up wages for their workers. They do not tie workers' wages to productivity.

Wages for Mexican workers have stayed low since 1979. They are 32 percent lower now than what they were then. They are going in the wrong direction, while productivity is increasing.

So, without that basic component you will not be able to increase the standard of living of Mexicans, and they will not be able to purchase American products and thereby have American jobs. And that is the basic flaw in the argument of the administration, that anybody who has looked at what they can purchase in Mexico, you know, they have 80 million people there, but only about 9 million of them have the capacity, out of the 80 million, to purchase consumer goods.

The rest of them, 58 cents an hour is the minimum wage down there, for heaven's sakes, and a good paying job is $2 an hour. People work all day for, as I have mentioned, in some of these production plants like Hughes Aircraft and the Hermosillo plant that makes Fords, for wages all day, what they might earn in the United States for an hour.

So I thank my colleague for his contribution. The cost of this is absolutely horrendous, $50 billion, and we are obviously moving in the wrong direction.

□ 2100

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT].

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I just simply wanted to come out on the floor tonight, because I have sat in my office and at home and watched as you have week-after-week led this effort on the special order time to discuss this treaty, to try and educate the American public. I wanted you to know personally how much we respect and I respect the efforts that you have done to lead this fight and, as well, to those who have joined you every week to my friends from Ohio, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms KAPTUR], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr.

KLINK] and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] and others who have been out with you week-after-week.

What I realize now is that the fire is really starting to turn up, because I have read the articles about how the President is making individual calls to Members and how the businesses in our districts are being told to lobby us.

I read a very disturbing report that particularly the retail businesses in my district were being encouraged to tell their workers and to pass out literature to their customers to say call their Congressman to support NAFTA, because they are arguing that it would be better for consumers when, in fact, we know for a fact not only will it not be better for consumers, because the prices are not going to go down, they are not going to get any economic benefit from it, but their very jobs are at stake.

But we see that this is the lobbying effort that is out against it. I thought you might need some fresh bodies out here on the floor as we focus on this subject of dislocated workers and the amount of money that our Government is proposing to spend on the subject.

Not only is it, as you have pointed out, an admission that there is going to be dislocated workers as a result of this treaty. But in all of my conversations with my constituents on NAFTA, every single one, there is no greater insult that you can deliver to a worker in this country from a representative of their government than to say to them, "Yes, you will lose your job, but we will provide you with some unspecified program to retrain you for a future job."

Their answer is loud and clear. It is, "Don't take my job in the first place. I like the job I have. I want to keep my job. You are not representing me, if you are sending my job to Mexico and then promising me some future program to retrain me."

Mr. BONIOR. It is the theoreticians. It is the economists. It is the pundits. It is the columnists that are saying this. It is very easy for them, but Robert Novak is not going to lose his job. Lee Iococca is going to keep cashing in his stock options. These people are not affected by what goes on.

Mr. FINGERHUT. It is the ultimate slap in the face, particularly to workers in the part of the country that you represent and that I represent and others represent who have taken lick after lick from their government over the years. And they expected that this Government and this administration and this Congress was going stand up for them. It is the ultimate slap in the face to say that the answer to all of their concerns is a retraining or relocation program.

I thank you for your efforts. You can count on my help to keep this fresh blood going.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank you for your contribution and appreciate your support.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], who is a strong opponent of this treaty.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. I want to congratulate him for his outstanding leadership on this effort.

What I would like to do is briefly put this discussion of NAFTA in a broader context and then say a few words about a trip that I and 5 other members of the Government Operations Committee recently took to Mexico last week.

The context of what we are talking about now is the deindustrialization of the United States of America.

The Associated Press had an article the other day which reported that since February of this year, we have lost 260,000 manufacturing jobs. We are now down to 17.6 million manufacturing workers, the lowest since 1965.

What is going on in this country is that the General Electrics, the General Motors, the Digitals, the AT&Ts are downsizing. They are moving to Mexico. They are moving to the Pacific rim. And by the hundreds of thousands, they are throwing our working people out on the streets, disrupting communities that were thriving and going to countries in order to pay the workers there starvation wages.

Let us be very frank about what is going on here. If this trend continues, and we continue to lose our decent-paying manufacturing jobs, the jobs that you were talking about that pay $10, $15, $20 an hour, that allow a worker a little bit of dignity, if we lose those jobs and replace them with the new type of jobs, the $5 and $6 an hour jobs, which are temporary, part-time jobs, in 20 years, if we continue that trend, this country will have a Third World economy.

That is the overview of what is going on. It is not an accident that every multinational corporation in America thinks NAFTA is a great idea, that they are putting millions of dollars into this campaign to convince this institution to support them.

It is not an accident, because they understand that if NAFTA is passed, their profits go up and, at the same time, for American working people, we descend into a Third World economy.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is not just the issue of jobs leaving, going to Mexico. The other issue is how Americans, large American corporations can use the threat of going to Mexico. NAFTA is the hammer over their heads to say, "Well, if you don't do this dollar give back in these negotiations, if you are not willing to give up some health care, some retirements, if you don't do that, we are going to go to Mexico."

There are enough companies that have already gone, that workers take that, take that threat very, very seriously.

Mr. BONIOR. You do not even have to say it. All you have to do is take this chart and hang it on the bulletin board at work. I think the workers get the message very quickly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. One other thing, he talked about the money that the U.S.A. NAFTA is spending.

Last week I brought one of the brochures that a lobbyist had dropped off in my office that was pro-NAFTA. This is their new publication. They made it look like a coupon book with all the jobs they say it is going to make for each State.

You can cut out your State and put it on the refrigerator, cash it in or something. It is multicolored, much nicer than any political brochure that any of us have had.

It is typical of the pro-NAFTA people. They are spending so much money, $30 million from the Mexican Government, tens of millions from large American corporations, as the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] said so well, who are going to benefit from NAFTA, to do this kind of garbage to convince Members of Congress. And never in history has a foreign government tried to spend that kind of money to lobby elected officials in another government. And never, really, has there been this kind of lobbying effort from our own corporations.

Mr. SANDERS. The interesting question is, I think we can recognize, with all due respect to our colleagues, that the U.S. Congress is not one of the most courageous institutions in history.

I fear very much, and the American people have to make this judgment, as to whether the Members of the House and the Senate are capable of standing up to the tremendous onslaught of corporate America. I would say that the result is still in doubt. I am not sure that we can.

In the next month, you are going to see what tens of millions of dollars are going to do. You are going to see what the corporate media is going to do.

The fundamental question will be, does this institution have the guts to understand who sent us here. Are we going to represent the ordinary working people of this country, or do we bow down to corporate America and do they win another victory?

If I might, I would like to say a very few words——

Mr. BONIOR. We would like to hear about your trip.

Mr. SANDERS. About a trip that I and five other members of the Government Operations Committee just took last week to Mexico.

Let me be brief in highlighting some of the vivid impressions that I recall right now from that trip.

We went to Matamoros, which is below Brownsville, TX. There was this lovely state-of-the-art General Motors plant that manufactures and assembles

car radios. It was a state-of-the-art factory.

Workers there were making $1.80 an hour. And right across the street from that plant we saw where the workers were living.

Where they were living were in shacks without running water, without electricity.

I must tell you, I say this deeply, I was embarrassed, as an American citizen, to see an American corporation like General Motors treat its people in that way, forcing them to live without running water and without electricity. Then we had another meeting, and we met with women. I think the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] made the point, most of the people working in these factories in Mexico are women, 80 percent who were working in this GM factory.

Why do you choose women? The feeling is that they are more exploitable. They are going to fight back a little bit less.

In any case, we met a woman in a meeting who was working for the Zenith Corp. She made a dollar an hour. And in describing her life, she broke down. She cried, talking about what it is like to keep a family in existence on a dollar an hour.

Then we went to Brownsville, TX, and we met with a Dr. Carmen Roca, a very courageous physician in that area. She described the birth defects that are taking place in that area. And she pointed out that today we still do not know where all of the toxic waste being produced in Matamoros is going.

Theoretically, what the law says is they are supposed to take their toxic waste, take it to the United States, discharge it is a nice and safe and environmentally sound way.

□ 2110

Nobody believes they are doing it. They are discharging it in ways nobody knows where it is going, but the fear is that birth defects are rising in Brownsville, TX.

I want to say one last point. We went to Chihuahua, Mexico, and we met there, I, myself, spoke with two separate groups of about 250 farm workers. There is an illusion that only Americans and Canadians are concerned about this NAFTA agreement. Not so.

In Chihuahua, Mexico, we met with small farmers. They are scared to death that as a result of Salinas' agricultural policies plus NAFTA, they are going to be forced off the land that they have farmed with dignity, with pride, that their parents and grandparents have farmed. They are going to be forced off the land. They are going to move north to the maquiladoras, and they are probably going to illegally immigrate to the United States.

The last point that I wanted to make is it is not just Americans and Canadians who have concerns. Millions of people in Mexico share that concern.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. Before my colleague came here, I mentioned a recent poll that was done in Mexico on this agreement. At one point 64 percent of the Mexican people supported this agreement. It is now down, in the latest poll, to 32 percent, because they understand instinctively that the workers are getting a bad deal, American workers as well as Mexican workers.

I just have 10 minutes left, Mr. Speaker, and I want to make sure all my colleagues get a chance to speak. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK], who has been waiting, if he wishes time, and then to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY].

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I just want to add my voice to those, I would say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], who thank him for his leadership in this. He has been really stalwart in this effort, has held us together, and shown us great leadership in what I consider to be probably the most important issue that this Congress will take up.

I just wanted to mention tonight, we were talking about the cost. My Governor Casey, who, of course, is Robert Casey, from Pennsylvania, who has been recovering from hearttransplant surgery, and the acting Governor, Mark Singel, as well as our labor secretary, Tom Foley, have come out strongly opposed to NAFTA. We are one of the few States where the chief executive is in opposition.

I just want to mention some of these things. I take this, actually, from Tom Foley's comments that he made in testimony against NAFTA. We are talking about the cost, and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] was absolutely correct, and others have alluded to it, where there is a cost to the workers where that threat is held over their heads, but we also have a threat to our environmental and our labor laws. Tom Foley pointed that out, I thought.

He is saying that "United States and Canadian firms already are arguing that they cannot compete with Mexican factories that do not meet the same standards. Thus, they will either move their operations or lobby the United States and Canada to harmonize or lower the standards to keep jobs here." We are talking about labor standards, we are talking about environmental standards.

In the State of Pennsylvania Tom Foley is estimating that we have already lost about 2,000 jobs just in the last couple of years. There was a Volkswagen plant near me that now makes those cars down just outside of Mexico City. The Volkswagen plant was one of the prides of the State of Pennsylvania when we attracted that factory. At one time we employed 5,000 people. It is now closed.

Sony Corp., oddly enough, has taken that over, but those jobs, all 5,000 of them, have gone to Mexico.

The State of Pennsylvania is estimating the cost to us of this NAFTA will be 349,500 jobs, and like the gentleman's State of Michigan, the State of Pennsylvania has paid dearly in the past decade and a half. I just want to, again, go to the back part of the report and quote Tom Foley again.

In closing, he says, "Let me repeat why NAFTA in its current form should not be supported. First," he says, "there is no clear evidence that Mexican wages will rise substantially and in turn stimulate the U.S. economy by creating more jobs, particularly high-skilled, high-wage jobs."

Second, Tom Foley says, "The side agreements are inherently flawed, will not result in equal enforcement, and in fact, may be used to invalidate existing U.S. laws."

He concludes by saying, "We cannot afford to take the chance that NAFTA will send us backwards to the disastrous days for manufacturing in the State of Pennsylvania, particularly the 1980's. We, workers, families, communities, cannot afford the NAFTA."

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Foley has what position in the State of Pennsylvania?

Mr. KLINK. He is the secretary of labor in the State of Pennsylvania. He is speaking on behalf of the Governor, and the Acting Governor. The State of Pennsylvania is firmly opposed to this NAFTA.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague. It should be noted also that the opposition likes to say that they have 42 Governors in support of NAFTA, but anytime an election comes around, you cannot find any of them in support of NAFTA. If in fact you look at the elections that are occurring in New Jersey, in Virginia, and in some of the other mayoral races, you will find overwhelmingly candidates are opposed to it, because they instinctively know it means jobs lost.

I yield to my good friend and stalwart on the other side of the aisle, someone who has been concerned about workers and workers' rights in the State of Maryland and in this country for many years, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY].

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] very much, not only for yielding to me, but particularly for taking this time, for making the presentation tonight. I was in my office and I thought, "I can't let this opportunity bypass without coming over and saying it is a bipartisan effort."

Mr. BONIOR. It is.

Mrs. BENTLEY. It is not just a one-party effort. There are people on this side of the aisle who very definitely also oppose it.

Mr. BONIOR. The gentlewoman is absolutely right. I believe we will have a

good number of Republicans as well as independents, and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] joining us in defeating this.

Mrs. BENTLEY. I am just going to touch on some points that have already been talked about tonight, if the gentleman will continue to yield, but I want to reinforce them.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] mentioned the Volkswagen plant that moved down to Mexico from this area. That is a perfect example of the type of industries that are going across the border, and more of them will go. These are the jobs that pay the most.

We are not going to find the plants that pay the minimum wage, or $5, or $6, those kinds of companies, as apt to move across the border that rapidly as we will those that are paying $9, $10, $12, and $15 an hour. Those are the good-paying jobs, the better-paying jobs we are losing in this country, one of the reasons why so many Americans are finding it necessary to hold two jobs just to hold their families together, if they can find them, if they can find them.

Another point, the gentleman from Vermont was talking about the woman who got $1 an hour. She was well paid. Some of the people that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] and I saw down there when we were down there, it was 58 cents an hour, or 60 cents an hour. I can tell the Members that those women were very tearful, too. One of them, as the gentlewoman from Ohio has said here on the floor a couple of times, said, "I work for hunger." She worked for an American company, Zenith.

I would say to the gentleman, like him, we were embarrassed. We were very embarrassed. What the gentleman saw was in a colonia, no electricity, no water, nine people living in a 10 by 10 room, which is what we saw. The outdoor toilet was a central outdoor toilet for the community, with all of the effluent running into a stream that was then later used for agriculture. Yes; the gentleman is right. Also there was a central kitchen for the whole area. This is what these people are living under, and these conditions are just absolutely horrifying.

One of the important points, I would say to the gentleman from Michigan, that I want to make tonight is that in the United States today there was a chart that the Journal of Commerce had this week in the publication, and it showed the percentage of the gross national product of the principal industrial countries of what was manufacturing exports from that country.

As I recall, and I am sorry, I do not have it here tonight, and I will present it tomorrow on the floor again, but Germany, as I recall it, was No. 1. They exported 30 percent. Thirty percent of their gross national product was manufacturing exports. The United States was 5½ percent of our gross national product is manufacturing exports. We are getting narrower and narrower, as more and more of our plants are moving out of this country, and more and more of our good jobs are being lost.

This is something that we need to analyze very carefully, what is going to be left here. This, again, is one of the reasons, and people fail to tie these things together, that our economy has not made the comeback.

Why? Because the good jobs are not out there. The manufacturing is lost in this country. That is what we have to provide. We have to provide it to the urban areas, so our unskilled and semiskilled people have somewhere to go, as they used to have when there were good-paying jobs out there and they could go down to a manufacturing plant and they could work in the summers and go to school. They could earn enough in the summer and go to school and improve themselves.

Those are not there anymore. This is one of the reasons why our people lose out.

Mr. BONIOR. One of the things the Germans do so well is they have this apprenticeship program that I know the gentlewoman knows about, and we have talked about it. They train their young people from a relatively early age. They do not trap them necessarily to the point where they cannot get out of it if they want to pursue a professional career, but they train them for these high wage jobs, good skilled jobs. That is why they are so far ahead of us in terms of manufacturing.

□ 2120

They work at it. They pay the price to make sure their workers and their students are trained. That costs money.

What we want to do in this proposal is use that money to retrain our workers who have been thrown out of work. For what?

Mrs. BENTLEY. Yes, for what? That is the big question. We do not have anything for them to go to.

I cannot tell you how many people from 40 on up in age, 40 and older who have come to me, who are skilled people, who have been retrained and they say, "I can't find a job," because the only thing left out there are the hamburger joints.

Mr. BONIOR. That is correct.

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman will yield, I just want to acknowledge Congresswoman BENTLEY's absolute integrity and leadership on this issue of jobs in America. And though she and I are of different political parties, we are both members of the U.S. Patriot Party.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Yes, we are. That is our party.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank her for her work over the years in shipbuilding, and maritime, and manufacturing, and for her knowledge in this area. You make a contribution not just to the people of your district, but to our Nation, and we thank you.

Mrs. BENTLEY. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for those very kind remarks, and to just add on what a pleasure it is to work with her on all of these issues, because we do think exactly alike, and we are both willing to fight it.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleagues for coming and joining in with me this evening. And we will be doing this on a regular basis, I invite them back. We need to educate the American people, and we need the American people to write and call in, and make their views known as we approach this vote.

STATEHOOD FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it was not much of a sacrifice to wait the hour to hear that extraordinary presentation regarding the NAFTA. It is a subject about which our country needs hours and hours of education and explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer remarks this evening on another subject about which our country, for the most part, is even less well educated. I rise to try to explain myself, and to explain the views and the votes of the people I represent for statehood for the District of Columbia.

But Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that most of my colleagues, and most of the American people are simply unaware of the details of the indignities that the 600,000 residents of the District of Columbia experience, and that if they understood and knew these details they could not and would not condone them.

Mr. Speaker, I am called a Delegate. There are four others like me. We are officially called also Congresswoman and Congressman. My other colleagues who come from States also are officially called Congressmen and Congresswomen. But they are called Representatives as well, because we do not represent States. Under the Constitution we are not called Representatives. But Mr. Speaker, the fact is that I do represent more people than most Members of Congress. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that I do represent people who pay more taxes than those represented by most Members of Congress. The residents of the District of Columbia, Mr. Speaker, are the third per capita in taxes paid to the Federal Treasury. And Mr. Speaker, I do represent people who have fought in greater numbers, in larger numbers than most of my colleagues. That is who I represent. That

is who this Delegate from the District of Columbia represents.

Allow me to try to put a face on our plea for statehood. Mr. Speaker, I do not claim the privileges of a State. The House has been generous in affording me what privileges it can under the Constitution, including a vote in the Committee of the Whole, and the vote in the committee, the right to speak on the floor, the right to introduce legislation. I appreciate that this body has gone as far as it can, short of statehood, to recognize the fact that there are people who live right under the noses of this House and the Senate, who live not as second-class citizens. There are plenty of those scattered around America. But they are people who live as no other Americans live, people who do not have control, do not have autonomy, do not have democracy, but can be overruled in each and every law they pass by the Members of this body who represent nobody in the District of Columbia.

I do not claim the privileges of a State. I am appreciative for the privileges granted me by this House.

But I do, Mr. Speaker, want to become a State. I do represent people who want to become a State.

I want to tell those who hear me, Mr. Speaker, that I am talking about my Washington and not your Washington. Your Washington, the Washington of America, is not the place I wish to become a State. The Washington of America is a great and beautiful Federal enclave which contains, yes, this House and the Senate, and the Capitol, and the monuments, and the Government buildings, the great national enclave.

I have introduced H.R. 51 to denote the fact that we would become the 51th State of the United States of America. And in my bill I name the great Federal enclave, would you believe, Washington, DC, because I want to leave Washington, DC, as it is for my country. But the fact is that the 20 million people, foreigners and Americans who come to Washington every single year do not come to the place I wish to become the 51st State. They do not come to Ward 8 across the Anacostia, Mr. Speaker. They do not come to Ward 3 in Upper Northwest, Mr. Speaker. They do not even come as far out in Capitol Hill as I live. They come to Washington, DC, which shall be left as it is for them, the great Federal city.

It is my Washington, it is the Washington of neighborhoods, it is the Washington that has no relationship whatsoever to the Federal presence today that I am asking this body to make the 51st State.

Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues, one of my very good friends and colleagues wrote a letter to my hometown newspaper, the Washington Post, recently, chiding those in the District whom he says cling to the idea that the District can become the State of New Columbia while maintaining a unique relationship with the Federal Government. I am here to disabuse any who believe of that notion. We seek statehood in order to become fully equal. We ask for no personal privileges, and we have thought this out. My bill I think reflects this. We seek to become a State like every other State. We understand fully that while each State is unique, each and every State in its relationship to the Union must be equal.

□ 2130

No special burdens, no special privileges. To the extent that you can call the Federal payment we receive now a privilege, where we are paid for the burdens that are put upon us as a capital city, to the extent that you call that a privilege, we would turn it back and ask to be treated with respect to Federal funds like every other State. I will elaborate upon that in a moment.

The basic principle that commands our transformation was stated as well as it has been in the first editorial of the Washington Post ever to support statehood. It was written January 13, 1993. For all these years, the Washington Post really wondered whether it should be for statehood, has been a strong supporter of home rule. It has never said it was against statehood. It has simply never written an editorial for statehood.

Finally, this year it did so.

I quote a sentence from the editorial:

> Denying District residents the right to send people to Congress who can vote on taxes or decide questions of war and peace while at the same time expecting them to shoulder the burdens of citizenship, including the obligation to pay taxes and to fight and die for their country, is wrong; forcing local officials to perform their duties under today's restrictive conditions is not better.

Today's restrictive conditions mean that it is a charade to represent to the American people that Washington, DC, has a Mayor and a city council. We do. They have considerable authority. But they work always with the notion that the Congress can take back anything they do, despite the hypocrisy of passing something called the Home Rule Act, which Congress itself can violate at will. Sounds more like the old Soviet Union to me and it feels a lot like it if you happen to be an American who lives in your own capital city and especially if, like me, you happen to be a fourth-generation American, a fourth-generation Washingtonian who lives in this city and whose great-grandfather came to this city in order to escape slavery in Virginia. He did not find full democracy here when he came. I expect that he thought that 100 years later his grandchildren and great-grandchildren would have found it, and we have not.

How dare we ask for statehood? "Surely there are qualifications for statehood, Delegate NORTON," or Congresswoman NORTON, whichever you prefer. "Do you qualify for statehood?"

Let me speak to qualifications: number of people, too small for statehood? Approximately 600,000. If we are too small for statehood, then so is Alaska, so is Vermont, so is Wyoming, because they are smaller than we.

Taxes: The territories generally in our country, indeed always, have never paid taxes until they become part of the United States of America. With the territories of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, no taxes to the Federal Treasury this very day. They are after all not full States, and since our country was founded on the notion that you do not pay taxes without representation, we have kept that basic compact with those four territories; not with us. We have paid taxes from day one when we were created by the Founders.

Higher taxes per capita than 48 of the 50 States; $1 billion in taxes to the Federal Treasury. Yet in the Senate of the United States there is nobody who can raise her voice for the District of Columbia.

Our budget, three-quarters of it raised in the District of Columbia, comes to this House as if they had anything to do with it, and then goes to the Senate. At least there is somebody here that can speak for us because at least this House has recognized the insult of having any Americans who have no one to speak for them in the national body. But in that House, the other body, our budget and our lives pass before 100 Senators to do with as they will and nobody to speak up and say, Here me," first, because there is no such thing as a delegate to the Senate.

Whoever heard of a city becoming a State? Surely your economy will not meet the demands of statehood.

Not true. Business services higher than 30 States, legal services higher than 41 States. Hotels and lodging higher than 27 States; finance, insurance, real estate higher than 14 States, 21 million tourists per year.

We think we can make it. We have read history. Most States come in as a rag-tag band of loosely knit subplaces within the territories, trying their best to put on a good face, totally unorganized, undeveloped. We look a lot more like a State than most States did when they became States.

Citizen obligations? Watch out. Not only met but exceeded. Service in all American wars, including fifth per capita in the Persian Gulf, fourth per capita in causalities during the Vietnam war. We have paid our dues, and then some, Mr. Speaker, and then some.

What has our country paid to us?

Constitutional qualifications? All met. There has been a majority vote of the residents, we have the requisite population and the resources, and we have a commitment to a republican form of Government and to democracy. It is all the Constitution looks to.

How will the Federal interests be protected if we are surrounded by this place called New Columbia? Not to worry, Mr. Speaker.

In the first place, the Federal Government has shown itself quite capable of defending itself against forces mightier than the population of the District of Columbia. But in fact only the neighborhoods would become a part of New Columbia. The seat of Government would remain the large Federal expanse, including all the Federal buildings and national monuments, all of this in compliance with Article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution, which has nothing to say about how small the capital city will be but only that it not be larger than 10 miles square.

Our country has already made it smaller once. We were larger. We included parts across the river in Alexandria, but the State of Virginia came to this place and demanded its land back because the Congress was about to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia.

If this is a body that can make the capital city smaller in order to preserve slavery, then this must become a body that can make the capital city even smaller to create a democracy in the neighborhoods of the District of Columbia. It takes nothing, it takes nothing from our country or from our colleagues; it takes everything from us to leave us as we are.

One hundred fifteen nations grant representation in their national legislature to their capital city. One nation, one nation and only one nation, Mr. Speaker, denies representation, full and equal representation to the residents of their capital city, and that one and only one nation is my Nation, my country, the United States of America.

□ 2140

Mr. Speaker, we seek no special relationship to our country. We seek the relationship that our country has given to every other American.

Precisely to make the point that we seek only equality and nothing special, I amended the original statehood bill when I was elected to Congress in ways that make that perfectly clear.

We receive a Federal payment now. It does not recompense us for the burdens of being the Capital City, but it has been important. I have included in my statehood bill a section abolishing the Federal payment. What it does do is say the District shall have available any payment in lieu of taxes for which it may qualify and for which thousands of jurisdictions in the United States qualify. I do not know what that policy will be, but generally in the United States if there are Federal impacts, there has been some payment in lieu of taxes for that. We do not want to admit the District of Columbia as the New Columbia without according it what is available to every other State, a payment in lieu of taxes that meets certain qualifications. That is all that we would expect.

If the District of Columbia gets to the point where it must precisely have the kind of Federal payment it has had, then it must give up statehood. It must understand that. I will tell you that it does understand that.

If it figures that at the bottom line this State is not viable, despite the figures I have given you, then it would be foolish for it to exchange political rights for economic bankruptcy. That is not what I believe will happen. If it were to happen, if there were any signs that it were to happen, then I would myself withdraw the bill. I will not be remembered, if at all, as the delegate who presided over a transformation that brought on bankruptcy for the District of Columbia.

If we know that the District of Columbia, like New York, Atlanta, and L.A. and many other large and many small places is having an economic crisis at the moment, it has not recovered from the recession, whole States have not recovered from the recession, either.

In the 1980's when the country was flush and doing well, the District did very well. The District went for 5 years with no increase in the Federal payment. It has a high-income population on the one hand, and like every large city it has low-income residents, too; nevertheless, it raised its own taxes 50 percent over a period of 5 years. It does not need or want to do that again; but I think it does show certain strengths.

When the economy is good, then New York State does well, or to take a State that is perhaps really feeling it now, when the economy does well, California does well. California is nearly bankrupt now because the economy is not doing well and because there have been other problems, structural problems in California, but nobody says California should not be a State because there are economic problems that arise from time to time. The District tends to do just as well as the rest of the country when the economy is doing well, and like every other State when it is not doing well, we ought to expect that its economy does not do well, and it must take measures to account for that.

I also amended my bill in order to allay a fear that some may have had, even in the District of Columbia, and that is that if you made the District a State, then perhaps some would want to build high buildings and blot out the wonderful vistas that L'Enfant left in his plan; not if I can help it.

First of all, half of us would drop off the statehood bandwagon if we thought that would happen. Congress would not have to worry about that. We are proud of our vistas, as we are of nothing else that adorn this city; but I have amended the bill just to make sure.

We had a legal dilemma, and I worked with some of the best lawyers on this dilemma. The dilemma was that the Federal Government cannot admit a State while conditioning its admission. So we could not in fact say we admit the State of New Columbia, but by the way, you cannot build high buildings, as the Federal Government does say now. There is a statute to that effect passed in 1910.

There turns out to be a way to do it, however, and that is to allow the Federal Government to do what it has constitutional power to do and does all the time, and that is to engage in a taking by eminent domain, in this case of the air rights above New Columbia, something it can do, something we would welcome, because it would guarantee that the air rights above New Columbia, which by the way have no market value under the law, would belong to the people of the United States, to the Federal Government. That would mean it did not belong to the District of Columbia at all, so we could not possibly build high buildings and blot out the White House or the Monument.

I think that I have taken actions that demonstrate in my bill itself that I seek no special relationship between the State of New Columbia and the Federal Government. On the contrary, I take action which makes a special preferred relationship impossible.

Does this sound like a city that needs or wants a special relationship, Mr. Speaker? The District raises most of its own $3.8 billion budget, and as with most States, it does so through income property and sales taxes, in that order, looking only at locally raised revenues, discounting all Federal funds, every bit of it.

The District raised more revenues than 11 States in the fiscal year 1989–90, the last year for which I have figures. We raised in the District alone from District taxpayers more money than—listen for your State—more money than Delaware, Idaho, Maine, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming.

They are States, Mr. Speaker. If they can take care of themselves, raising less money from their taxpayers than we do, surely no case can be made that we are not a viable State.

Mr. Speaker, the present home rule that we enjoy is patently insufficient and defraudinate. It gives the impression that if you elect a mayor or city council to govern yourself, like everybody else you like to put out principles that we say we must have.

Let me quote from an editorial from the New York Times of November 25, 1991, on home rule and how it operates in the District of Columbia. The editorial says in part:

The Home Rule Act left the Federal Government's dictatorial powers intact. Congress can overturn any law the District

Council passes. A powerful Senator can throw some cash to friends by attaching amendments to the city's budget bill and one meddlesome Congressman can by himself trigger hearings on any law by simply raising an objection to it.

□ 2150

That is from an editorial in the New York Times entitled, "The D.C. Plantation, Freedom Soon?"

When I rise on the floor, when Members come forward with their own ideas for laws for the District of Columbia, which they then proceed to vote upon, or to vote down our laws, when I rise and say, "But there is a Home Rule Act, and you said that you were giving this power to our own Mayor and City Council," invariably somebody rises to say, "But we included a little section that said, 'But if we want to, we can violate it.'"

I kid you not, Mr. Speaker. That is how it goes, and of course constitutionally, plenary power; the government of the District of Columbia remains in the Congress of the United States until it becomes a State. But how can we pass a law giving democratic powers to the District of Columbia and then say, "However, we reserve the right to violate it anytime we please," Mr. Speaker?

Is that fraud or is that not fraud? It is a fraud on the people of the District of Columbia, I can tell my colleagues that.

"How does this work?" you say. "Congresswoman Norton, how can it be? Give me examples. I don't even understand this notion," you say.

Mr. Speaker, I have just signed letters to those who will be conferees on the District of Columbia appropriation. Understand that the District of Columbia appropriation is mostly funds raised in the District of Columbia, but that budget, nevertheless, comes here to be passed on by Members of Congress who had nothing to do, not a thing to do, with raising one cent of it.

It is as if I went into Toledo, OH, or Atlanta, GA, and tried to tell those taxpayers that I wanted them to spend the money this way rather than that way, and they wanted me out of town in their order.

We do not want to throw the Congress out of town. We just want statehood for the neighborhoods of the District of Columbia.

I have just signed a letter to the conferees who sit on our budget asking them to allow the regulatory processes of the District of Columbia, now under way, to decide whether there should be a cogenerator in a neighborhood of the District of Columbia. The reason I wrote that, and I have had to write several letters, and thus far I am grateful that both the Senate and the House have heeded my plea and understood this as a home rule issue, but there is a neighborhood where a university wants to put a cogenerator plant, and they have problems with the cogenerator plant.

I say to my colleagues, "Go home and talk to your mayors. They have these problems every day. If you are a Member of Congress, you don't even know much about it. You don't want to be drawn into those problems. You do like I do. You say, 'Wait a minute. That's for the mayor and the city council. You sent me here to deal with health care and Somalia.'"

But there has been an attempt to get the Senate involved in this issue. The Senate has declined, although the Senate did write in its report of the bill that it wants the District to proceed forthwith to settle the question. So, it did raise its voice. I am grateful it did no more than raise its voice and did not direct the District one way or the other on the cogenerator issue, as it might have.

I say to my colleagues, "You can imagine how you would feel if a local issue of this kind made its way to the Congress of the Untied States. You would be the first to tell them to get out of your local business."

Mr. Speaker, we have heard people on this floor this very evening speak about the kind of business this Congress is in.

We are in the Somalia and the Bosnia business.

We are in the Haiti business.

We are in the NAFTA business.

We are in the health care business.

We are in the stimulus package business.

We are in the authorization business.

We are in the appropriations business.

We are in national business; we are not in local business. Under our Constitution, under our Declaration of Independence, under each and every principle that created this country, there are local affairs and there are national affairs, and, when Congress tries to get in local affairs, it finds a great barrier, that barrier of democratic traditions that are 200 years old, and those barriers are respected for every jurisdiction in the United States except the District of Columbia, even in the four territories.

Mr. Speaker, nobody tells Puerto Rico what to do, nobody tells Puerto Rico to send its laws here before they become law, even though Puerto Rico is a territory. Puerto Rico does whatever it wants to do and passes whatever law it feels like. And so does the Virgin Islands, and so does American Samoa, and we would have it no other way. Why would we have it this way for 600,000 people who live in the District of Columbia? We cannot have it this way much longer.

Mr. Speaker, I went around the House today speaking to Members as we count votes on our appropriation because there is a reproductive freedom issue that is raised by District law, does not have anything to do with our appropriation. There is no money in our appropriation for reproductive issues, nothing. Moreover, the District is like every other jurisdiction in the United States. It could not use Medicaid money for abortions because there is an amendment, the Hyde amendment, that keeps that from happening.

Even though three-quarters of the money in our budget comes from local taxpayers, in the minds of some Members there is the notion we ought to superimpose reproductive freedom, inhibitory language, in our appropriation. We do not do that for anybody else in the United States of America.

I say to my colleagues, "This isn't your money. This is our money. It shouldn't be over here in the first place."

To its credit the House and the Senate let this issue be. When our appropriation came through the first time, and I hope and pray that when the conference report comes before this House that the Members of the House would treat me as I would treat them, that the Members of this House will say, "Their will be done."

We have our set of local values and traditions, and I will insist upon them where I live. Where my colleagues live, Mr. Speaker, it is for them to decide, and what traditions they should have.

The unfairness has loomed large because, not only does the Congress interfere in the District of Columbia as it does in no other jurisdiction in the United States, we incur, and have incurred, substantial liability in the most unfair fashion. For example, when the Congress granted home rule for the District of Columbia, it said, "Fine, take this, it's all yours. Free at last."

First of all, it turned out we were not free at last. We were free as long as they wanted us to be free. We could operate as a democracy until they decided that they did not want any democracy for purposes of any particular action or bill, and, in addition to all of that, the Federal Government handed us a Cadillac pension plan that it had enacted for employees of the District Government before home rule when it was Congress who ran the District of Columbia. We got home rule only in 1973, 20 years ago. It enacted this Cadillac pension plan and then handed us this pension plan steeped with $2 billion in unfunded pension liability. "So, now you pay for it."

Now, on top of all of the difficulties that jurisdictions like the District are encountering, Mr. Speaker, we encountered this burden placed upon us by the Federal Government 20 years ago which is now ticking like a bomb in the midst of recession from which we have not begun to recover, posing a real and present danger to the economy of the District of Columbia.

□ 2200

Thank you very much, Uncle Sam, for giving us our freedom and giving us a whole big debt you incurred to go along with it. I suppose it would be hard to disagree with the Village Voice, who wrote in a recent editorial:

That the District of Columbia has not become New Columbia, our 51st State, is a national disgrace. Denied the meager autonomy of electing its own mayor and city council until 1974, the District still must have its budget approved by both Congress and the President. And even rearranging garbage pickups can be a matter for Capitol Hill debate.

We need to face these facts, Mr. Speaker, as I come forward and ask for a vote on the House floor this year for the first time in American history. It is time for this House to face this issue, even as the country is beginning to face it. It has become, interestingly, the most important priority this year for the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, which has taken it as its number one project. That is interesting because the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights usually engages in actions that help us get legislation like the Civil Rights Act of 1991, like bills that otherwise restore or improve upon equality, bills that aid disadvantaged people, sometimes monetarily. Two hundred organizations, including unions, churches, synagogues, there is virtually no progressive group in the United States that is not a member of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, revered and feared in this institution.

The Leadership Conference has gone all across this country, spoken to Members here and in their districts, in preparation for a vote this year on statehood for the District of Columbia. Moved by the prospect of that vote, the Senate of the United States will hold its first hearing ever on statehood for the District of Columbia. For them that is a giant step forward.

The bill in the House has gotten out of committee twice before. It will be out of committee again this year. The House has been receptive, often, to our concerns.

It almost broke my heart today, at least momentarily, when I went up to a good Member that I admire and respect, and I said I was looking to make sure we had the votes on the D.C. appropriation. In effect, the House is voting mostly on our money, and I wondered if he was going to vote with me.

He said, "If you want me, Eleanor, I am going to try to help you and vote with you." But he did say to me, "You know, I generally vote against the D.C. appropriation." He said, "It is an easy vote."

It broke my heart, because he is a good colleague and he could not have understood what he was saying, especially since he said it to me and he is such a good friend of mine. "It is an easy vote. I vote against the appropriation."

You know, it is not his district, so I guess he gets some points for voting against appropriations. That will not go into the budget. But because these issues have not been made clear to him, Mr. Speaker, he does not understand that he is voting against men, women, and children who raise their own money and who get a Federal payment only to pay them in part for the services they render and the burdens they bear from being the Capital City. He does not understand it, and I can understand why.

Mr. Speaker, I have very little criticism. Why should a Member from another State, with all we have to do in this House, spend time thinking about a city not in his jurisdiction? It makes no sense.

We can hardly get through each day. I never feel that I have leisure time. Why should I be thinking about Syracuse, NY, or San Francisco, CA? That is for the Member from that district to think about. So he has not immersed himself in the details of our status or our needs, and there is no reason for him to. I do not want to extract that time and effort from him and away from his constituents.

Yet, on this floor, every year there is debate at length about the details of governance of the District of Columbia. It happens on this floor because, one, we do not respect the Home Rule Act that we ourselves passed 20 years ago, and, two, we are not a state. One or the other of those things has to happen to get the Congress off the District's back.

The Congress, quiet as it has been kept, has not been mean to the District of Columbia. That is not true. For the most part the Congress treats the District of Columbia with a great deal of benign neglect. It does not want to be bothered with the District of Columbia.

The Congress at time has been extraordinarily generous to the District of Columbia. In 1991 it increased the Federal payment 40 percent, in part to make up for 5 years of no increases. That very same year it passed a Federal payment formula.

This is not a Congress which sets its sights against the District as the District, but it is a Congress which has not faced the elementary facts of the lack of democracy in the District. And for that, there is shame. For that there must be shame.

You cannot trot to the far corners of the Earth, making your way to Somalia, now to Haiti, tentatively to Bosnia, to South Africa, and the Soviet Union, preaching democracy, as if you invented it, which you did, without reinventing it here where you live in this House and in the Senate. And we will not let you rest, we will not let you rest until you face it. We are not going to go away. We are not going to shut up. We are not going to stop telling the truth. And the truth is this country practices democracy in every State of the Union and in every territory, and insists upon it in every corner of the Earth, but does not practice it here in the Capital City, in our own country.

That is the truth. And nobody can rise, nobody can rise, to contradict that statement. We must make it no longer the truth. We must take this burden off your back and you must get off of our back. We must become the state of New Columbia.

We come to you as the last resort. We have tried everything else. We tried to get voting representation, full voting representation, somewhat beyond what I enjoy in this House, and beyond anything we have ever enjoyed in the Senate.

In the 1970's, when a constitutional amendment went around the country that would have given voting rights to the District of Columbia, we got 16 states out of 38, Mr. Speaker, 16 states out of 38. Had we gotten all 38, we would have had an anomaly that would have embarrassed this House and the Senate, because we then would have had full voting rights in the House and the Senate and still would have had the House and Senate voting on local appropriations of the City Council of the District and voting whether it wanted to disapprove this or that law of the District. That is an embarrassment, or should be, Mr. Speaker. It is an anomaly we cannot live with any longer.

□ 2210

Voting rights would have been half a loaf and, besides, it is a loaf that you turn down. I say to my country, turn down.

Retrocession to the State of Maryland has been offered as an alternative. Mr. Speaker, I submit that that would be harder than getting Statehood for the District of Columbia. Neither jurisdiction desires it. Anyone familiar with Maryland politics must have grave doubt that Maryland would vote for the admission of the second largest city, given the way it treats its only large city, Baltimore.

After 200 years, the District, after all, has acquired a distinctive culture and demography. You are not likely to get the residents of the District of Columbia disclaiming that identity built up over decades and generations. We are what we are.

This country has never said to any State, go and become a part of some other State. You have got to take us on our merits, our own merits.

We are and should be treated the equivalent of other States.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there are some in my city, including some officials, who feel that the situation has, in the House and the Senate, has been so unresponsive that they have been driven to other actions. They are not actions

that I have myself advocated, but they are actions that I entirely respect.

There are people who, in order to draw attention to the undemocratic practices fostered on the District of Columbia, have gone to the streets and submitted themselves to civil disobedience.

They include the Mayor of the city, Sharon Pratt Kelly. They include several council members, Councilman Kevin Chavous, who heads the Statehood Committee of the District of Columbia; Councilman Frank Smith, who was arrested on his 50th birthday.

That was a poignant one for me to see, because I first met Frank Smith as a member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in 1963, when I went down and there was only SNCC in the delta, and only seven or eight of us. And Frank Smith was one of them. And here Frank was being arrested, not in the delta, as a youngster, but in Washington as a council member and also for the denial of democracy.

When people are driven to those lengths, I think people ought to sit up and take notice. They have done it, I think, with dignity. They come into the street. They inform the Capitol Police ahead of time that they are going to be arrested. They do exactly what we did when I sat in as a student, willing to take the consequences in order to make clear that we are not going to take it anymore.

That is what they are doing. That is what I thought was appropriate, when I was arrested as a student. That is what I thought was appropriate, when I was arrested in the South Africa demonstrations in 1984.

I never thought that I would see residents of my own hometown sitting in in the same way that as a youngster we did in the old confederacy, but there you have it.

It is not my purpose or intention to be arrested. I have access to this floor. I alone, in the District of Columbia, have access to this floor and have the right to come to this Chamber to express the anguish of the District of Columbia directly to my colleagues. And I will use that authority and that privilege to make my point.

I will use the vehicles provided by this body, including the opportunity I shall ask for a vote up or down on whether the Members of this body stand for or against the patently undemocratic practices, not created, not created by this body but surely fostered and condoned by this body every day that you allow it to remain in existence.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an American, and I am equally proud to be a Washingtonian. I was proud to be an American, even when as a student I felt I had to engage in civil disobedience because of segregation here in the Capital and in other States of the Union.

I am proud of the capacity of our country to change.

I believe our country will change the status of the District of Columbia as well.

Mr. Speaker, I ask each and every one of my colleagues to consider how you and your constituents would feel if you had to submit to congressional control. I ask you whether you believe you could take it even for a minute. If you believe that that is unfair, one way to express it is to vote for statehood for the District of Columbia. That is what I will be asking that I be granted, the right to have that vote.

Another way to express it, pending that time, is to respect the Home Rule Act passed and enacted by this body 20 years ago. Under that act, the Congress recognized that it was wrong to continue to govern the District of Columbia from this Chamber. Occasionally, indeed in each and every Congress, there are opportunities to do just that. And those opportunities have, in fact, been taken by some of my colleagues.

As one of you, I ask you this evening to abstain from those opportunities. At the very least, abstain from voting against our appropriation. Abstain from voting to overrule laws passed democratically by our Council and our Mayor. Abstain from attaching your laws to our appropriation. You are not elected to govern in the District of Columbia.

Do that and, finally, as you think about it, 200 years of inequality in a democracy, I ask you also to consider doing what I am sure you would ask me to do if you were in my place. And that is, to vote to make the neighborhoods of the District of Columbia the 51st State of the United States of America.

SOMALIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that it is a late hour and that we have not only you but diligent employees who have to stay as long as we stay in session, so I will attempt to be as brief as I possibly can.

I have asked for this time tonight because, as a Member of Congress, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and as the Representative of many people, including one who I had the chance to meet last week, who have served in the military of this country and, particularly, served in our mission in Somalia, I am deeply concerned about the direction not only of our Nation's policy in Somalia but also about the broader implications of our foreign policy decisions with respect to the use of military force.

□ 2220

Mr. Speaker, the events in Somalia are moving very quickly. Indeed, it may be that something has occurred today that I am not even aware of, as I stand here on this floor. We tend to react in this body on a day-to-day basis, to react to the news, reacting to the pictures on television instead of acting with coherence and with a plan.

All too often, Mr. Speaker, I feel, particularly as a new Member of this body, that that is how we react to so many issues that we have to consider. We react on a day-to-day basis. We do not react with thoughtfulness or with an overall plan.

Frankly, all too often, in addition, we react by throwing barbs at each side, blaming one side or the other for the current events.

It is my hope in the next few moments to think aloud a bit, together with my constituents, about what we face, not only in Somalia but perhaps in Haiti and Bosnia, and in the crises that we cannot yet see in which we will be asked to send our troops.

Mr. Speaker, this weekend during my time in the district I had a chance to welcome Army Lieutenant John Willoughby back to the 19th Congressional District of Ohio from a 4-month tour in Somalia. Mr. Speaker, John Willoughby is what every American thinks of when they think of their troops. He is a fine soldier, a fine human being, a patriot, intelligent, hard-working. He represents the best of America today and the best of the future of our country. He was part of a construction and engineering unit that went to Somalia to build roads, but instead, found themselves dodging bullets.

According to Lieutenant Willoughby, his units, in typical gallows humor, summed up the danger this way: "When you are up to your neck in alligators, it is hard to remember that you came to drain the swamp." The joke had larger meaning for me.

My talk with John Willoughby helped me think about not only our role in Somalia, but also our increasing use of our troops throughout the world, and finally, our priorities as a nation. There has been a lot of talk on this floor and in the media about the mission to Somalia. I agree, and will vote with those who believe that our mission is over, that we have accomplished the humanitarian goals we set out to accomplish, and that, other than securing our troops and coming home as quickly as possible, we have no further responsibility.

Lieutenant Willoughby confirms what I have come to believe, and that is that this could be accomplished by the end of this year at the latest, and perhaps even sooner. He told me even more disturbing things. He talked about the low morale of the troops in Somalia. He talked about soldiers who have dedicated themselves to the military and their country, who were in firefights in Desert Storm, who have made great sacrifices for their country,

that are so discouraged by our efforts in Somalia that they talk of leaving the service altogether.

He talked about their pride in accomplishing the initial mission. He talked about the famine and the suffering that we did alleviate, but also how, since the beginning of May, when the mission was turned over to the United Nations, how we have failed to grasp the declining situation on the ground in Somalia; how we have failed to understand that the first mission was finished, and that we had no clear idea of why we were still there.

Indeed, I think sometimes even this body and the country believed that when we removed our contingent of troops, our 20,000, 30,000 troops who were in Somalia, that we believed the mission was over and did not pay adequate attention to the 4,000 troops we left to continue the U.N. peacekeeping mission, that we left under the control of the United Nations.

Certainly as a new member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I put myself in the category of one who did not fully understand the implications of the decision that we had made on that day, and who thinks that perhaps the vote to continue the authorization of troops in Somalia for up to 1 year was the wrong vote to cast, and believes that a fuller debate on this issue today is perhaps a bit late, but certainly something that we must undertake if we are to appropriately understand our role today and in the future.

Lieutenant Willoughby had the same reaction that I did to the administration's announcement last week. Why is it that a March 31 date is now the appropriate date for withdrawal? What is it that we believe we can accomplish between now and March 31 that we have not already accomplished? What confidence will it give to the rest of the world that they would not otherwise already lack if we say that we are not being driven out by the recent events in Somalia, but whether we succeed or not by March 31, we will leave anyway? Setting a date 6 months hence simply makes no sense to me, and I believe it makes no sense to our troops on the ground in Somalia today.

Since our experience, our national trauma in Vietnam, we have agreed, I believe, on two military principles: First, that we must have a clear mission that the Nation is behind; and second, that we must use not only the necessary force but the overwhelming force to accomplish that mission.

It is clear, I believe, to everyone in this Congress and everyone in this country that we are violating both of those principles in Somalia now. So, despite the fact that the news today looks more promising than the news did a week ago, I still believe that the correct decision is to leave, to leave as soon as we can secure our troops, to declare that what we have accomplished is something that a nation can be proud of, but that what we have to accomplish in the future is not worth the expenditure of our financial resources and our most precious resources, our young people.

I have joined with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], who in July introduced a resolution calling on the President to withdraw our troops. As a cosponsor of that resolution I applaud Mr. BROWN's efforts. I believe that over the course of the next few weeks, we will be called upon to debate this issue. I hope that we will stand fast in the understanding that it is time to bring our troops home.

I really believe, however, that this is an occasion not just to think about Somalia but to look beyond the events in Somalia to what our proper role in the world is and when we should use our troops, because whether it is Somalia, Bosnia, Haiti, or some other country in crisis, we have to know what the standards are that will guide us when countries ask for our help, when the United Nations asks for our help, or when, simply, our humanitarian instincts ask for our help.

The first principle, I believe, is that we must recognize that the United States will always be called upon to have an aggressive foreign policy, to steer other countries to democracy, to protect our national interests around the world. We cannot pursue an isolationist policy without severe damage to our position in the new world order.

The United States is the last superpower. It is the country that all eyes turn to in times of trouble. We cannot and should not pretend that we live on an island. However, calling for an aggressive foreign policy that promotes democracy around the world is not the same thing, is not the same thing, as saying that we should order our troops into every situation where we would like to promote democracy or promote stability around the world.

We have a remarkable arsenal as a country to effect change in the world. We have all of our diplomatic efforts, and they should never be underestimated. We have the power of aid that we are able to give and that we do give to countries around the world. We have the power of trade, the ability to open or to close the American market, which is the greatest consumer market in the world.

Yes, we even have the ability to help assist in training other people's troops, in arming other people's troops, in helping other people provide for the ability to fight if there is fighting that they must do.

□ 2230

The military forces of the United States, however, particularly the use of our ground troops, should be our last resort, to be used only when our national interests are severely threatened and all other options have been completely exhausted.

But recently it seems, Mr. Speaker, that military force has not been that last option, but rather has become Option No. 1, the first arrow that we pull from the quiver. It seems that our first response to any troubles in foreign countries has become send in the Marines.

Perhaps this is a form of national hubris that has come over us after our great military success in Desert Storm. Certainly other countries have learned that when they fight a war and they win overwhelmingly that the temptation is to believe that any place we send any troops that we will be automatically successful. But when we lead with our troops instead of remembering why the success was there in Desert Storm, the well-defined mission, the overwhelming force, when we lead with our troops we put our people on the front line, we lead with our chin when we would be better off working behind the scenes and avoiding putting American lives at risk. This tendency to lead with our chin, to lead with our troops is particularly evident in Bosnia. We have called for months on the United Nations to lift the arms embargo so that we can at least allow those who come under attack to fight back. Some of us, myself included, have said we would support air strikes to try and even the military advantage there.

But not having taken either of these steps, we are nevertheless seriously talking about sending in 20,000 troops on the ground to try and keep a peace which we all know cannot be kept.

It also seems that we have moved much too soon to use our troops in Haiti. The lessons have been learned quickly, quite fortunately, and the administration has moved to pull the troops back. But we sent 600 troops in to train. Why could we not train the Haitian forces on our bases in the United States if we felt that was necessary to do? Why could we not provide for sophisticated armaments if that was necessary? Certainly we have already taken a step back and called for economic embargoes. If we believe today that has a chance to work, why did we not believe that it had a chance to work before we were willing to put 600 troops in harm's way?

Again, the tendency that seems to have developed, to believe that putting American troops into a situation is an automatic solution to a problem instead of the very last resort, is a very, very dangerous trend, and something that I believe requires us to take a step back and to think about it at great length.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think that this rash of peacekeeping efforts, interventions around the world, however you wish to describe them, calls into even more fundamental question what our national priorities are.

Mr. Speaker, we serve in a Congress that is grappling with many difficult domestic issues. No issue is more difficult than the question of setting our national fiscal policy. We all know the situation we find ourselves in with respect to the deficit, and with respect to the national debt. We have great wars on this floor as we try and figure out a national consensus for balancing our Federal budget, for reducing our expenditures, for paying down the national debt so that we no longer continue this practice of adding to the debt every year and leaving the problem for our children to solve.

Wherever you are in this debate, whatever your side of the aisle that you have been on, it is clearly a question that concerns us. What it has done, I believe, is it has made each decision we have taken with respect to Federal spending, it has made each decision more focused, it has made each decision more closely a choice among competing national priorities. Something as simple as $2.5 million in the military budget that went to the civilian marksmanship program became a subject of great debate on this floor several weeks ago because we understand that every single penny is a prioritization decision and that we must answer not only to our constituents today, but also to future generations.

We will wage a great battle on this floor in the next few weeks, in the next few days over the superconducting super collider. We rejected a rule on one entire appropriations bill, the VA-HUD bill because of a small item, the ASRM Program that this House wanted to kill and the other body is determined to try and continue funding for. These are the kinds of difficult choices we have made.

Yet, somehow, even as we have our fiscal choices so clearly framed for us, we do not understand that our choices with respect to the deployment of troops are also fiscal choices. They are also priority choices that we must make.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I ask that not only when we ask our questions about Somalia we not only talk about Somalia in the next few weeks, but we put Somalia in the broader context of how it is we wish to use our troops and try and develop a policy, one that this Member is only beginning to develop in his own mind, about how we would deploy our troops, and what their application would be in Bosnia, and Haiti, and all of the other situations that we know are going to come up. But even more fundamentally, take a step even further back from that and recognize that the dollar that we spend on the 600 troops that went to Haiti yesterday is the dollar that we would spend on a domestic program, whether it is Head Start, or education, or any of the other programs that people would like to fund in this House, health care, Medicare for seniors, pharmaceutical coverage. It is the same dollar that we would like to reduce the deficit by and retire our debt so that we do not add the debt onto our children, and leave that legacy for our children. These are in fact the priority choices that we are facing.

Mr. Speaker, there are no easy answers. But I came here to the well of the House today to ask that we begin to ask these questions, ask them in a thoughtful way, ask them in a way that does not throw bombs across this political aisle here that too often divides us, ask the questions in a way that makes the public proud of the debate that we will have on these questions, ask them in a way that puts the safety of our troops first, ask in a way that protects the dignity of the American Government and American choices, ask in a way that keeps America as a leader in promoting democracy around the world, but also asks in a way that understands the realistic choices of the fiscal policies that we have to make in this country.

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. EWING) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOOLITTLE, for 60 minutes each day, on today, October 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, and 21.

Mr. SANTORUM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GILLMOR, for 30 minutes each day, on October 14, 18, 19, 20, and 21.

Mr. HORN, for 60 minutes each day, on October 14, 20, 21, 27, and November 2 and 18.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ROHRABACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request for Mr. FINGERHUT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LAROCCO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SLATTERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEPHARDT, for 5 minutes, on October 14.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY, for 30 minutes, on October 14.

Mr. CONYERS, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEHAN, for 60 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 60 minutes, on October 14.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EWING) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. HOBSON in two instances.
Mr. ROTH.
Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
Ms. SNOWE in two instances.
Mr. GALLEGLY in two instances.
Mr. MANZULLO.
Mr. SPENCE.
Mr. DORNAN.
Mr. SOLOMON in three instances.
Mr. QUINN.
Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.
Mr. HYDE.
Mr. SAXTON.
Mr. GILCHREST.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FINGERHUT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REED.
Mr. SABO.
Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. HOYER.
Mr. JACOBS.
Mr. CLAY.
Mr. RAHALL.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. KREIDLER.
Mr. PARKER.
Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.
Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
Mr. TRAFICANT.
Mr. VENTO.
Mr. SANDERS.
Mr. PICKLE in three instances.
Ms. HARMAN.
Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
Mr. TAUZIN.
Mr. KOPETSKI.
Mr. PICKLE.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 832. An act to designate the plaza to be constructed on the Federal Triangle property in Washington, DC, as the "Woodrow Wilson Plaza"; jointly, to the Committees on Natural Resources and Public Works and Transportation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 14, 1993, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports of foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel authorized by the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives during the first, second and third quarters of 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, as well as reports of foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel by various miscellaneous groups of the House, are as follows:

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSOLIDATED SPEAKER REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO MEXICO, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 22 AND MAR. 23, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Richard A. Gephardt	3/22/93	3/23/	Mexico		80.33		657.00				737.33
Stewart A. Elmendorf	3/22/93	3/23/	Mexico		80.33		657.00				737.33
Michael R. Wessel	3/22/93	3/23/	Mexico		80.33		657.00				737.33
Committee total					240.99		1,971.00				2,211.99

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Oct. 4, 1993.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSOLIDATED SPEAKER REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. CANDACE JONES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 22 AND MAY 30, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Candace Jones	5/22	5/30	Africa		796.86						796.86
Committee total					796.86						796.86

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CANDACE JONES, Sept. 30, 1993.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO AUSTRIA, HUNGARY, SLOVAKIA, ALBANIA, AND BELGIUM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 2 AND JULY 11, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Martin Frost	7/3	7/4	Austria	5,106.25	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/4	7/6	Hungary	30,363	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/6	7/7	Slovakia		208.00		(3)				208.00
	7/7	7/9	Albania		362.00		(3)				362.00
	7/9	7/11	Belgium	22,927	656.00		(3)				656.00
Hon. David Price	7/3	7/4	Austria	5,106.25	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/4	7/6	Hungary	30,363	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/6	7/7	Slovakia		208.00		(3)				208.00
	7/7	7/9	Albania		362.00		(3)				362.00
	7/9	7/11	Belgium	22,927	656.00		(3)				656.00
Hon. David Skaggs	7/3	7/4	Austria	5,106.25	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/4	7/6	Hungary	30,363	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/6	7/7	Slovakia		208.00		(3)				208.00
	7/7	7/9	Albania		362.00		(3)				362.00
	7/9	7/11	Belgium	22,927	656.00		(3)				656.00
Hon. James Bilbray	7/3	7/4	Austria	5,106.25	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/4	7/6	Hungary	30,363	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/6	7/7	Slovakia		208.00		(3)				208.00
	7/7	7/9	Albania		362.00		(3)				362.00
	7/9	7/9	Belgium				(3)				
Commercial transportation							1667.55				1667.55
Hon. Gerald Solomon	7/3	7/4	Austria	5,106.25	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/4	7/6	Hungary	30,363	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/6	7/7	Slovakia		208.00		(3)				208.00
	7/7	7/9	Albania		362.00		(3)				362.00
	7/9	7/11	Belgium	22,927	656.00		(3)				656.00
Hon. Doug Bereuter	7/3	7/4	Austria	5,106.25	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/4	7/6	Hungary	30,363	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/6	7/7	Slovakia		208.00		(3)				208.00
	7/7	7/9	Albania		362.00		(3)				362.00
	7/9	7/11	Belgium	22,927	656.00		(3)				656.00
Hon. Michael Bilirakis	7/3	7/4	Austria	5,106.25	430.00						430.00
	7/4	7/6	Hungary	30,363	430.00						430.00
	7/6	7/7	Slovakia		208.00						208.00
	7/7	7/9	Alabania		362.00						362.00
	7/9	7/11	Belgium	22,927	656.00						656.00
Kristi Walseth	7/3	7/4	Austria	5,106.25	430.00						430.00
	7/4	7/6	Hungary	30,363	430.00						430.00
	7/6	7/7	Slovakia		208.00						208.00
	7/7	7/9	Alabania		362.00						362.00
	7/9	7/11	Belgium	22,927	656.00						656.00
Delane McHone	7/3	7/4	Austria	5,106.25	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/4	7/6	Hungary	30,363	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/6	7/7	Slovakia		208.00		(3)				208.00
	7/7	7/9	Albania		362.00		(3)				362.00
	7/9	7/11	Belgium	22,927	656.00		(3)				656.00
James Doran	7/3	7/4	Austria	5,106.25	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/4	7/6	Hungary	30,363	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/6	7/7	Slovakia		208.00		(3)				208.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO AUSTRIA, HUNGARY, SLOVAKIA, ALBANIA, AND BELGIUM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 2 AND JULY 11, 1993—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
	7/7	7/9	Albania		362.00		(3)				362.00
	7/9	7/11	Belgium	22,927	656.00		(3)				656.00
Cathy Brickman	7/3	7/4	Austria	5,106.25	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/4	7/6	Hungary	30,363	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/6	7/7	Slovakia		208.00		(3)				208.00
	7/7	7/9	Albania		362.00		(3)				362.00
	7/9	7/11	Belgium	22,927	656.00		(3)				656.00
William Freeman	7/3	7/4	Austria	5,106.25	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/4	7/6	Hungary	30,363	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/6	7/7	Slovakia		208.00		(3)				208.00
	7/7	7/9	Albania		362.00		(3)				362.00
	7/9	7/11	Belgium	22,927	656.00		(3)				656.00
Ken Kodama	7/3	7/4	Austria	5,106.25	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/4	7/6	Hungary	30,363	430.00		(3)				430.00
	7/6	7/7	Slovakia		208.00		(3)				208.00
	7/7	7/9	Albania		362.00		(3)				362.00
	7/9	7/11	Belgium	22,927	656.00		(3)				656.00
Committee total					26,462.00		1,667.55				28,129.55

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military transportation.

MARTIN FROST, Aug. 17, 1993.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO HAITI, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 9 AND JULY 11, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
Hon. Tony P. Hall	7/9	7/11	Haiti		249.00		632.45				881.45
Martin S. Rendon	7/9	7/11	Haiti		249.00		632.45				881.45
John H. Morrill	7/9	7/11	Haiti		249.00		632.45				881.45
Committee total					747.00		1,897.35				2,644.35

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

TONY P. HALL, Sept. 21, 1993.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO LATVIA, GERMANY, LITHUANIA, AUSTRIA, BELGIUM, BULGARIA, AND THE NETHERLANDS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 27 AND AUG. 6, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
Kristi Walseth	7/28	7/30	Latvia		1,200.00						1,200.00
	7/30	8/1	Germany								
	8/1	8/2	Lithuania								
	8/2	8/3	Austria								
Commercial transportation							3,701.05				3,701.05
Anita Bedelis	7/28	7/30	Latvia		600.00						600.00
	7/30	7/31	Germany								
Commercial transportation							3,364.55				3,364.55
Cathy Brickman	7/27	7/30	Latvia		1,700.00						1,700.00
	7/30	8/1	Germany								
	8/1	8/5	Lithuania								
	8/5	8/6	Denmark								
Commercial transportation							3,701.05				3,701.05
William Freeman	7/27	7/30	Latvia		1,700.00						1,700.00
	7/30	8/1	Germany								
	8/1	8/5	Lithuania								
	8/5	8/6	Denmark								
Commercial transportation							3,701.05				3,701.05
Henry Collins	7/27	7/28	Belgium		1,050.00						1,050.00
	7/28	7/30	Bulgaria								
	7/30	8/1	Netherlands								
Commercial transportation							3,508.45				3,508.45
Committee total					6,250.00		17,976.15				24,226.15

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

KRISTI E. WALSETH, Aug. 26, 1993.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO JAPAN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 28 AND SEPT. 3, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
John Edward Porter	8/28	9/3	Japan						89.03		89.03
Jolene Unsoeld	8/28	9/1	Japan						89.03		89.03
Mike Synar	8/28	9/1	Japan						89.03		89.03
Bill Richardson	8/28	9/1	Japan						89.03		89.03
Vicki Elkin	8/28	9/3	Japan						89.03		89.03

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO JAPAN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 28 AND SEPT. 3, 1993—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
Jim Hoff	8/28	9/3	Japan						89.03		89.03
Committee totals									543.18		543.18

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended

JOHN E. PORTER.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GERMANY, ARMENIA, AND RUSSIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 28 AND SEPT. 4, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
Hon. Pete Peterson	8/28	8/29	Germany		375.76		[3] 3,047.01				3,422.77
	8/29	8/30	Armenia		204.00		([4])				204.00
	8/30	9/4	Russia		1,582.00		([4])				1,582.00
Suzanne F. Farmer	8/28	8/29	Germany		375.76		[3] 1,477.00				1,852.76
	8/29	8/30	Armenia		204.00		([4])				204.00
	8/30	9/4	Russia		1,582.00		([4])				1,582.00
Shannon L. Smith	8/28	8/29	Germany		375.76		[3] 3,047.05				3,422.81
	8/29	8/30	Armenia		204.00		([4])				204.00
	8/30	9/4	Russia		1,582.00		([4])				1,582.00
Committee total					6,485.28		7,571.06				14,056.34

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Commercial transportation.
[4] Military transportation.

PETE PETERSON, Sept. 21, 1993.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ROMANIA AND POLAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 11 AND SEPT. 18, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
Kristi Walseth	9/12	9/18	Romania		1,500.00						1,500.00
Commercial transportation							3,526.65				3,526.65
William Brown	9/12	9/16	Romania		1,400.00						1,400.00
	9/16	9/18	Poland								
Commercial transportation							3,536.65				3,536.65
Cathy Brickman	9/12	9/16	Romania		1,000.00						1,000.00
Commercial transportation							3,526.65				3,526.65
William Freeman	9/12	9/16	Romania		1,000.00						1,000.00
Commercial transportation							3,526.65				3,526.65
Henry Collins	9/12	9/16	Romania		1,000.00						1,000.00
Commercial transportation							3,526.65				3,526.65
Committee total					59,000.00		17,643.25				23,543.25

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

KRISTI E. WALSETH, Oct 1, 1993.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. STEFAN LEE RUSNAK, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 10 AND AUG. 21, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
Stefan Lee Rusnak	8/10	8/12	Hong Kong	5,102.10	658.00						658.00
	8/12	8/15	Vietnam		771.00		90.93		15.53		877.46
	8/15	8/19	China	4,523.12	788.00						788.00
	8/19	8/21	Japan	79,700	786.00						786.00
Committee total					3,003.00		90.93		15.53		3,109.46

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

STEFAN LEE RUSNAK, Sept. 22, 1993.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. HENRY BONILLA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 29 AND AUG. 30, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
HON. Henry Bonilla	8/29	8/30	Mexico	506.50	163.00					506.50	163.00
Committee total					163.00						163.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HENRY BONILLA, Aug. 31, 1993.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. MARGARET SULLIVAN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 27 AND SEPT. 15, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
Margaret Sullivan	8/27	8/29	Ireland		514.00						514.00
Margaret Sullivan	8/29	8/30	Germany		358.00						358.00
Margaret Sullivan	8/30	9/1	Italy		436.00						436.00
Margaret Sullivan	9/1	9/1	Germany		0.00						0.00
Margaret Sullivan	9/1	9/2	Czech Republic		280.00						280.00
Margaret Sullivan	9/2	9/5	United Kingdom		786.00						786.00
Excess per diem[3]					−210.00						−210.00
Committee total					2,164.00						2,164.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Excess per diem of $140.00 received in Germany and $70 in Czech Republic; $210.00 returned to the United States Treasury via the Speaker's office on Sept. 14, 1993.

MARGARET SULLIVAN, Sept. 27, 1993.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO 89TH INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 8 AND APR. 17, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
Hon. Barbara Rose Collins	4/10	4/16	India		1,140.00		[3] 7,407.45				8,547.45
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega	4/10	4/15	India		950.00		[4] 3,441.15				4,391.15
Michele Manatt	4/8	4/17	India		1,330.00		[5] 1,820.85				3,150.85
Elizabeth Bergere	4/8	4/17	India		1,330.00		[5] 1,820.85				3,150.85
Delegation expenses:											
Control room									1,063.72		1,063.72
Embassy personnel (American and FSN) and office supplies for control room.									400.88		400.88
Committee total					4,750.00		14,490.30		1,464.60		20,704.90

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Commercial—Washington/New Delhi/Detroit.
[4] Commercial—Taiwan/New Delhi/Washington.
[5] Commercial—Washington/New Delhi/Washington.

ENI FALEOMAVAEGA, June 5, 1993.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 6 AND JULY 9, 1993

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
Hon. Benjamin I. Cardin		7/5	United States				(3)				
	7/6	7/9	Finland		528.00		42.00				570.00
Mr. David M. Evans		7/5	United States				(3)				
	7/6	7/9	Finland		528.00		42.00				570.00
Ms. Mary Sue Hafner		7/5	United States				(3)				
	7/6	7/9	Finland		528.00		42.00				570.00
Hon. Steny H. Hoyer		7/5	United States				(3)				
	7/6	7/9	Finland		528.00						528.00
Mr. Jesse L. Jacobs		7/5	United States				(3)				
	7/6	7/9	Finland		528.00		42.00				570.00
Hon. Frank McCloskey		7/5	United States				(3)				
	7/6	7/9	Finland		528.00						528.00
Mr. Ronald J. McNamara		7/5	United States				(3)				
	7/6	7/9	Finland		528.00						528.00
Hon. James P. Moran		7/5	United States				(3)				
	7/6	7/9	Finland		528.00						a528.00
Ms. Victoria A. Showalter		7/3	United States				[3] 1,494.60				1,494.60

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 6 AND JULY 9, 1993—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
	7/4	7/9	Finland		880.00						880.00
Hon. Louise McIntosh Slaughter		7/5	United States				(3)				
	7/6	7/9	Finland		528.00		[3] 42.00				570.00
Mr. Martin Sletzinger		7/5	United States				(3)				
	7/6	7/9	Finland		528.00						528.00
Ms. Beth West		7/5	United States				(3)				
	7/6	7/9	Finland		528.00						528.00
Mr. Samuel G. Wise	7/4	7/9	Finland		880.00		(3)				880.00
Delegation expenses	7/6	7/9	Finland						4,899.00		4,899.00
Delegation expenses	7/8	7/8	Estonia						468.88		468.88
Committee total					7,568.00		1,704.60		5,367.88		14,640.48

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. cu.rency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] U.S. military transportation.

STENY H. HOYER, Aug. 2, 1993.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2004. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-117, "Metropolitan Police Housing Assistance Program and Community Safety Temporary Act of 1993," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2005. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-119, "Financial Accountability and Management Act of 1993," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2006. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-120, "Omnibus Spending Reduction Act of 1993," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1): to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2007. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting notice of relief of regulatory provisions under the Student Assistance General Provisions, Federal Perkins Loan, Federal Work-Study, Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant, Federal Family Education Loan, and Federal Pell Grant Programs, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2008. A letter from the Deputy Inspector General, Department of Defense, transmitting the fiscal year 1992 Superfund financial transactions, report of audit by the U.S. Army Audit Agency, pursuant to section 111(g) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2009. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed lease of defense articles to Israel (Transmittal No. 01-94), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2010. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially to Canada (transmittal No. DTC-36-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2011. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the report of political contributions by Theodore E. Russell, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Slovak Republic, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2012. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2013. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 93-44: Loan Guarantees to Israel Program, pursuant to section 226(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2014. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1998 resulting from passage of H.R. 20, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2015. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1998 resulting from passage of H.R. 873 and S. 184, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2016. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB's estimate of the amount of discretionary new budget authority and outlays for the current year (if any) and the budget year provided by H.R. 2295, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-578); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2017. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2018. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2019. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2020. A letter from the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting a proposed plan for the use of the Walker River Paiute Tribe judgment funds in Docket 87-A (Grazing and Fiscal Claims), before the U.S. Court of Federal Claims, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 1402(a), 1404; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2021. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the 1990-91 report on the Clean Lakes Demonstration Program, pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 1324; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2022. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report entitled "Strengthening America's Shipyards: A Plan to Compete in the International Market," pursuant to Public Law 102-484, section 1031(b)(3) (106 Stat. 2489); jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2023. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the national estimates on the number of boarder babies, the cost of their care, and the number of abandoned infants, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 670 note; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Energy and Commerce.

2024. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report on aircraft deicing study, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 2226a note; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Public Works and Transportation.

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:

Ms. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 275. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2491) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-289). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself and Mr. BUNNING):

H.R. 3265. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, and the Social Security Act with respect to the establishment and jurisdiction of a United States Court of Appeals for the Social Security Circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. ZELIFF):

H.R. 3266. A bill to provide for automatic downward adjustments in the discretionary spending limits for fiscal year 1994 set forth in the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 equal to the amount of rescissions contained in this act; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Appropriations

By Mr. BLACKWELL:

H.R. 3267. A bill to make supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1994 to provide for a full employment economy and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Education and Labor.

By Mr. COMBEST (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. SARPALIUS):

H.R. 3268. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to reform the laws relating to Federal firearms licenses and licensees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 3269. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make improvements in the procedures used by the Department of Veterans Affairs in adjudicating claims for veterans benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FISH (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DARDEN and Ms. MOLINARI):

H.R. 3270. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the death of President Roosevelt; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 3271. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for willfully harming law enforcement animals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida (for himself, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. HASTERT):

H.R. 3272. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to establish a national clearinghouse to assist in background checks of law enforcement applicants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREIDLER:

H.R. 3273. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise the requirements for eligibility under chapter 67 of that title for receipt of retired pay for nonregular service

in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PARKER:

H.R. 3274. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to carry out such activities as are necessary to stabilize the bluffs along the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Natchez, MS, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

H.R. 3275. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to ban activities of political action committees in Federal elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 3276. A bill to make technical corrections to title 23, United States Code, the Federal Transit Act, and the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 3277. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act to eliminate certain mandatory minimum penalties relating to crack cocaine offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABO:

H.R. 3278. A bill to increase the minimum wage and to deny employers a deduction for payments of excessive compensation; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Education and Labor.

By Mr. VALENTINE (for himself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. LANCASTER):

H.R. 3279. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on ranitidine hydrochloride (bulk and dosage forms); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3280. A bill to suspend temporarily the duties on salmeterol xinafoate (bulk and dosage forms); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

Ms. BYRNE introduced a bill (H.R. 3281) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade of the United States for the vessel *Too Much Fun*; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 51: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLYBURN, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MINETA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHENK, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. VÉLAZQUEZ, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WASHINGTON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Mr. WHEAT, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 93: Mr. KLUG, Mr. FROST, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 144: Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 302: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 417: Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. BLUTE, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 522: Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 636: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 642: Mr. MCCRERY.

H.R. 649: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 688: Mr. CAMP and Mr. SANTORUM.

H.R. 786: Mr. HUTTO and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 830: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MINGE, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MICA, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEVY, and Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 911: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 916: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

H.R. 979: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. COPPERSMITH, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1017: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 1046: Mr. WILSON, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1076: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1260: Ms. BYRNE.

H.R. 1276: Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 1293: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 1552: Mr. BATEMAN and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1559: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1682: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 1697: Mr. SANTORUM.

H.R. 1796: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. WYNN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1800: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1897: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MANTON, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1910: Mr. MICA, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. POMBO, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 2012: Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. KASICH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H.R. 2019: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 2112: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2121: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 2153: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. FURSE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. FISH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 2241: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

H.R. 2396: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. FROST, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 2443: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. FURSE, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. KLINK, Mr. CHAPMAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. REED, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2467: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DEAL, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2547: Mrs. MINK, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 2580: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2600: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 2602: Mr. BREWSTER.

H.R. 2605: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 2641: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 2707: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. MCDADE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2727: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DIXON, Mr. VENTO, Ms. PELOSI, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2787: Mr. SYNAR and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2831: Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 2872: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LEVY, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 2873: Mr. FILNER, Mr. STARK, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 2874: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2884: Mr. HUGHES and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2912: Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 2918: Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 2937: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 2939: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2941: Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 2975: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. FROST, Ms. BYRNE, and Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H.R. 2988: Mr. CLAY and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 3021: Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 3030: Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. GOSS, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 3039: Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.

H.R. 3059: Mr. PETRI, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 3065: Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 3080: Mr. QUILLEN and Mr. KING.

H.R. 3087: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 3098: Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. STARK, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. MEEK, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Flordia.

H.R. 3109: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 3131: Mr. DERRICK.

H.R. 3135: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 3145: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 3173: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 3203: Mr. PARKER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. WALSH, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. REED, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 3207: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.J. Res. 38: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. GOODLING.

H.J. Res. 165: Mr. ROYCE, Ms. FURSE, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 178: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. FARR, and Mr. MFUME.

H.J. Res. 191: Mr. PALLONE.

H.J. Res. 197: Mr. HOYER, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. SABO, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. EMERSON.

H.J. Res. 205: Mr. SHARP, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. YATES, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. TALENT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. CRANE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ROTH, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. CARR, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. KLUG, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. OWENS.

H.J. Res. 206: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.J. Res. 209: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KLUG, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY.

H.J. Res. 212: Mr. ROSE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.J. Res. 218: Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. REGULA, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BREWSTER, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CAMP, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. STOKES, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. YATES, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.J. Res. 237: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H.J. Res. 242: Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SABO, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. LEACH, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.J. Res. 265: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. CRANE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CLINGER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CONDIT, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DEAL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. EWING, Mr. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Ms. FURSE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HERGER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KLINK, Mr. KLEIN, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. POMBO, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SABO, Mr. STARK, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. MINETA, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HARMAN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. WATT, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SHARP, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. FISH, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PARKER, Mr. SWETT, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HAYES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. BILBRAY.

H. Con. Res. 141: Mr. HERGER, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H. Con. Res. 147: Mr. SANDERS.

H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, and Mr. SANTORUM.

H. Res. 33: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. SANDERS.

H. Res. 38: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. STARK.

H. Res. 156: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. ALLARD.

H. Res. 225: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, and Mr. CANADY,

H. Res. 234: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LINDER, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. YATES, and Mr. MAZZOLI.