associated Aids, their families and their friends. These folks have put aside their differences, rallied together and learned to use the legislative process to further their goals. I am extremely proud of their work and pledge to redouble my efforts to make sure this bill gets heard during this Congress.

Hemophilia is an inherited blood-clotting disorder causing serious internal bleeding episodes that, if left untreated, can lead to disfigurement and even death. To help control and prevent such bleeding, hemophiliacs rely on blood-products, which are manufactured and sold by pharmaceutical companies. Because these products are made from the pooled blood of thousands of people, the potential for infection with blood-borne disease among those who use them is very high, something that has been well-known for decades. In fact, since the 1970's, the hemophilia community has grappled with the serious consequences of hepatitis, a debilitating chronic illness. But in the early 1980's, a much more deadly villain struck, as nearly one-half of all people with hemophilia in the United States became infected with the virus that causes aids. Today they are dying at a rate of about one each day.

Mr. Speaker, we have long argued that the Federal Government shares responsibility for this devastating situation, because it failed to respond to the early warning signs that Aids was transmissible by blood and blood products. During the early years of Aids, repeated opportunities to reduce the likelihood of contaminated blood entering the supply of blood products were missed.

This conclusion was supported by a 2-year study, conducted by a distinguished panel at the institute of medicine. In a report entitled ''HIV and the blood supply,'' the IOM panel concluded that the Federal agencies missed opportunities to protect the public health because they consistently chose the least aggressive response to the early warning signs. The report concluded that the system—which was charged with protecting the blood supply, ensuring the safety of manufactured blood products, and informing the public of risks—failed to deal with the relatively well-known problem of hepatitis and was therefore unprepared to confront the crisis of Aids. Mr. Speaker, the premise behind the Ricky Ray bill is that the Government has a unique responsibility for regulating the safety of blood products, based on a Federal blood policy and several major statutes that establish the regulatory framework for blood.

Members should also understand that the legal system classifies blood products in a unique way. Even though they are commercially marketed and sold, blood products enjoy special status under the so-called ''blood shield'' laws of every State, which protect against product liability lawsuits.

Given these facts, we have concluded that Government has a unique obligation to assist the victims and so the Ricky Ray bill authorizes the creation of a trust fund, administered by the Attorney General, to provide $125,000 in assistance to each victim who meets strict eligibility criteria.

The trust fund would sunset after 5 years, would be capped at $1 billion and would be subject to funding through annual appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has yet to set up an assistance program, even though more than 20 other nations have done so. Just last month the Government of Japan and five drug companies—including several American firms—agreed to provide the equivalent of $430,000 to each of the estimated 1,800 victims in Japan, with the government paying 44 percent and the companies paying 56 percent.

It is time the United States took its share of responsibility for what happened to 8,000 American hemophiliacs during the 1980's. Please join the majority of bipartisan support of the Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund Act.

SEEKING AN HONEST DEBATE ON THE ISSUES WITH REGARD TO BILINGUAL EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to respond to assertions that English-only proponents are making about bilingual education in their efforts to advance their cause.

Yesterday a Member came to this floor to praise Mr. Thomas Doluisio, for his fight against bilingual education. The Member went on to say that the National Association of Bilingual Education officially condemned Mr. Doluisio at their 1994 convention. This information, taken from a Wall Street Journal editorial by John Miller of the Heritage Foundation and Center for Equal Opportunity, is not accurate. The National Association of Bilingual Education has never condemned any individual officially or otherwise, including Mr. Doluisio. His story may have been discussed among bilingual educators, but this is a far cry from official condemnation by a respected national organization. I am informed that a letter was sent by the National Association of Bilingual Education refuting the Wall Street Journal article.

There have been other statements made by English-only proponents that I take issue with. One of the statements continuously used by English-only advocates is that bilingual education costs the taxpayers $8–$12 billion a year. This figure is inaccurate and is an exaggeration of the costs of educating bilingual children. The $8–$12 billion is the total cost of education for children who are limited English proficient, not just students being taught in bilingual programs. Furthermore, it multiplies the total cost of educating these children not just the marginal cost of bilingual education. If we wanted to save $8–$12 billion, we'd have to kick these 2.3 million kids out of school entirely!

In fact, the Institute for Research in English Acquisition and Development Journal, funded by U.S. English, an English-only advocacy group, has now come forth and stated that the $8–$12 billion figure is misleading. The true cost of bilingual education is the additional funds necessary to shift from a monolingual English program to a bilingual program. The total Federal expenditure for bilingual education is $156 million not $8–$12 billion.

This week the other body will debate the Immigration Control and Financial Responsibility Act. During that debate, an amendment to include an English-only requirement will be offered. It is clear from this maneuver that proponents would rather dodge a floor clear from this maneuver that proponents would rather dodge a floor debate on a separate English-only bill. The administration has recently announced its support of the Senate immigration bill, but if English-only language is included members of Clinton's cabinet are certain to recommend a veto.

I am not pointing these things out in an effort to discredit those who are not being totally honest in their arguments. What we seek is an honest debate on the issues, not a war of anecdotes and imaginative mathematics. Let's stick to the facts and keep fiction out of this debate.

□ 1545

I dare say that I am probably the only Member of this institution who has been a bilingual education professional, and if anyone in the House wants to understand bilingual education at its very basic and grassroots levels, I stand open to be contacted.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, last night I missed rollcall No. 117. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay'' on it.

D.C. EMANCIPATION COMMEMORATION SPEECH

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, today commemorates one of the most significant events that has ever taken place in the history of this great country. One hundred thirty-four years ago today Congress emancipated over 3,000 slaves owned by residents of the District of Columbia. This city's slaves were the first to be freed in our country—9 months before President Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation took effect on January 1, 1863.