during that fiscal year or the succeeding fiscal year'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''under paragraph (1)(B)'';

(3) in subsection (a)(3), by striking ''$100,000'' both places it appears and inserting ''$150,000'';

(4) in subsection (a)(4)—

(A) by striking ''income'' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof ''payments'';

(B) by striking ''the payment of royalties to inventors'' in the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof ''payments to inventors'';

(C) by striking ''clause (i) of paragraph (1)(B)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''clause (iv) of paragraph (1)(B)'';

(D) by striking ''payment of the royalties,'' in the second sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof ''offsetting the payments to inventors,''; and

(E) by striking ''clauses (i) through (iv) of''; and

(5) by amending paragraph (1) of subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(1) by a contractor, grantee, or participant, or an employee of a contractor, grantee, or participant, in an agreement or other arrangement with the agency, or''.

SEC. 6. EMPLOYEE ACTIVITIES.

Section 15(a) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710d(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''the right of ownership to an invention under this Act'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''ownership of or the right of ownership to an invention made by a Federal employee''; and

(2) by inserting ''obtain or'' after ''the Government, to''.

SEC. 7. AMENDMENT TO BAYH-DOLE ACT.

Section 210(e) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking '', as amended by the Federal Technology Transfer Act of 1986,''.

IN MEMORY OF JACK TURNER

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1995

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. John H. ''Jack'' Turner who recently passed away. Jack was a good and dear friend who will be missed by the community he worked so hard to improve, and all who knew him.

Jack dedicated his life to helping others. He attended Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, served on the Christian County Board, worked as a Democratic Precinct Committeeman, and was a dedicated member of the Rosamond Community Presbyterian Church. Jack also served on the Pana Board of Education of 10 years, was President of the Illinois Association of County Boards, served with the Executive Board of Illinois Brotherhood of Electrical Workers 702, and was a past president and proud member of the Pana Lions Club. Through his many civic minded activities Jack was able to positively impact the lives of his friends and neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, Jack's passing is a great loss to us all, for his life was spent improving the lives of the people in his community. Mr. Speaker, Jack Turner was a fine man, and will be missed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOMBING OF HIROSHIMA

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1995

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the 50th anniversary of the United States dropping of the world's first and only atomic bombs; one on August 6, 1945 on Hiroshima and one 3 days later, on August 9 on Nagasaki. I take this moment to share with you the unanimous resolution of the Oakland—California—City Council in stating that they join ''with Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the profound conviction that nuclear weapons must never be used again'' and also calls for the achievement of a ''world free of nuclear weapons.''

Each August 6th and 9th provides us with the occasion to acknowledge the enormity of the decision to drop these two weapons upon populations that were overwhelmingly civilian, and who became the object lesson of our message to the world that we had a weapon of incredible power and destruction.

I am pleased to reiterate my support of the city of Oakland's passage of a statute which declared Oakland to be a Nuclear Free Zone which restricts city investments in and purchases from companies that make nuclear weapons, provides for city designation of local routes for transportation of hazardous radioactive materials and requires a permitting process for nuclear weapons work in the city.

It is my privilege to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following resolution adopted by the city of Oakland:

RESOLUTION TO OBSERVE THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOMBINGS OF HIROSHIMA AND NAGASAKI

WHEREAS, 1995 marks the 50th Anniversary of the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and

WHEREAS, the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan on August 6 and 9, 1945, represent the first and only use of nuclear weapons against a civilian population; and

WHEREAS, the atomic bombings of these cities resulted in the immediate deaths of over 200,000 people, the complete devastation of the cities, and untold suffering for those who survived; and

WHEREAS, hundreds of thousands of people have since died or continue to suffer from the long-term effects of the bomb, including some 1,500 ''Hibakusha''—atomic bomb survivors living in the United States, most of whom are Japanese American citizens; and

WHEREAS, there are 628 known HIBAKUSHA residing in California, approximately 275 in Northern California, as of 1993; and

WHEREAS, the people of Oakland have repeatedly expressed their opposition to nuclear weapons; and

WHEREAS, in 1986 the Oakland City Council voted unanimously to support a Comprehensive Nuclear Test ban; and

WHEREAS, in 1988 the residents of the City of Oakland approved an initiative ordinance known as the ''Oakland Nuclear Free Zone Act'' and

WHEREAS, despite the end of the Cold War, many thousands of nuclear weapons remain deployed around the world; and

WHEREAS, all humanity must strive to achieve a world free of nuclear weapons and to attain peace so that such untold suffering never occurs again;

THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED THAT:

1. August 6 and 9, 1995, be proclaimed Hiroshima and Nagasaki Remembrance Days, respectively.

2. The City of Oakland joins with Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the profound conviction that nuclear weapons must never be used again.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1995

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, August 26, 1995 marks the 75th anniversary of women's suffrage in the United States, a movement first begun in 1647 by Margaret Brent of Maryland, heir of Lord Calvert and Lord Baltimore, who demanded a voice in the legislature. Ultimately, of course, her request was denied.

Struggling to maintain their fight, suffragettes were actively involved in the abolition movement. Elizabeth Chandler, abolitionist writer, argued that women—as well as slaves—were in bondage to white males. Abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison also tied the plight of slave women to all women.

The temperance crusade during the 1840's also drew women into social and political movements. The Civil War and anti-slavery activities prompted women to organize in their communities and to petition Congress. As the abolitionist movement shifted from a moral to a political struggle, however, women were often excluded from the movement.

The American Equal Rights Association, founded in 1866, brought Lucretia Mott, Susan B. Anthony, and Henry Blackwell into the political process, enraged by the proposed 14th amendment that would grant the vote only to male citizens. The Federal women's suffrage amendment was first introduced in Congress in 1868, and the National Women's Suffrage Association was founded by Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Stanton Cady the following year to secure passage of a suffrage amendment. The amendment was again introduced in 1878, containing the same language that ultimately passed in 1919.

The 41-year struggle to pass the 19th amendment in the House and Senate was a history of parades, arrests of suffrage supporters, hunger strikes, the founding of a National Women's Party, and picketing and bonfires in front of the White House. In 1917, Jeanette Rankin of Montana became the first woman elected to Congress. The First World War raged throughout Europe, and it was only at the war's end that President Wilson argued for women's suffrage. In 1920 in Tennessee, the last State to ratify the amendment, passage was by a single vote. A 70-year struggle finally culminated in the signing of the 19th amendment into law on August 26, 1920.

I hope to celebrate this great historical event in my district on August 26, during Rialto Days. But I think it is also fitting that we mark this anniversary in Congress in the days before our recess. The past few days have seen an incredible attack on the rights of women to decide their own reproductive fates. This House has launched an assault on the dignity

of women to pander to the Christian coalition voters back home. This, to me, does not seem a fitting commemoration of a milestone in American woman's political involvement.

But American women knew in 1920 that their political struggle had not ended. They recognized that the granting of suffrage did not release them from the bondage of decisions made by males. It will come as no surprise to women today that they will need to reengage their leaders in Congress in a battle to retain their freedoms. The significant achievement of the 19th amendment is that women can exercise their vote in judging our actions here. I can only hope that they celebrate that vote in 1995, and exercise it in 1996.

TRIBUTE TO JIM JENKINS

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1995

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, effective August 31, a tradition of the House will end.

The last remaining doormen on the 3rd floor of the Capitol will become either security aides or chamber security.

James L. Jenkins, the 3rd floor chief doorman, will be sorely missed.

Jim Jenkins has served as chief doorman for 22 years, an outstanding record of service to this House.

We will miss all the 3rd floor doormen and the unfailing dedication and service they have provided to each and every Member.

Whenever the House is in session throughout the night or throughout the weekend, the doorman were right here with us.

I would like to thank Jim Jenkins and all the gallery doormen on behalf of all the Members of the House.

These fine men and women should not go unrecognized: Ray Betha, Tom Blatnik, Devon Boyce, Lou Costantino, C.C. Cross, Dave Dozier, Chris Fischer, Colin Fitzpatrick, Bob Gray, Joyce Hamlett, Dorothy Harris, Logan Harris, Cookie Henry, Jimmy Hughes, Joe Jarboe, Jim Jenkins, Kevin Kelly, Sandra Landazuri, Nathaniel Magruder, Nicarsia Mayes, Brendan McGowan, George Omas, Susan Salb, Bill Sikes, Ruby Sims, and Rick Villa.

RELIGION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS; CURRENT LAW

HON. JOHN BRYANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1995

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the National Council of Churches, the Baptist Joint Committee, the National Association of Evangelicals, the American Jewish Congress, and many other national religious groups and other organizations have prepared a thorough report on current law relating to the freedom of religion and religious expression in the public schools.

The report, ''Religion In the Public Schools: A Joint Statement of Current Law,'' is very interesting and educational, and I commend it to my colleagues and the American people.

RELIGION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: A JOINT STATEMENT OF CURRENT LAW

The Constitution permits much private religious activity in and about the public schools. Unfortunately, this aspect of constitutional law is not as well known as it should be. Some say that the Supreme Court has declared the public schools ''religion-free zones'' or that the law is so murky that school officials cannot know what is legally permissible. The former claim is simply wrong. And as to the latter, while there are some difficult issues, much has been settled. It is also unfortunately true that public school officials, due to their busy schedules, may not be as fully aware of this body of law as they could be. As a result, in some school districts some of these rights are not being observed.

The organizations whose names appear below span the ideological, religious and political spectrum. They nevertheless share a commitment both to the freedom of religious practice and to the separation of church and state such freedom requires. In that spirit, we offer this stat÷ement of consensus on current law as an aid to parents, educators and students.

Many of the organizations listed below are actively involved in litigation about religion in the schools. On some of the issues discussed in this summary, some of the organizations have urged the courts to reach positions different than they did. Though there are signatories on both sides which have and will press for different constitutional treatments of some of the topics discussed below, they all agree that the following is an accurate statement of what the law currently is.

STUDENT PRAYERS

1. Students have the right to pray individually or in groups or to discuss their religious views with their peers so long as they are not disruptive. Because the Establishment Clause does not apply to purely private speech, students enjoy the right to read their Bibles or other scriptures, say grace before meals, pray before tests, and discuss religion with other willing student listeners. In the classroom students have the right to pray quietly except when required to be actively engaged in school activities (e.g., students may not decide to pray just as a teacher calls on them). In informal settings, such as the cafeteria or in the halls, students may pray either audibly or silently, subject to the same rules of order as apply to other speech in these locations. However, the right to engage in voluntary prayer does not include, for example, the right to have a captive audience listen or to compel other students to participate.

GRADUATION PRAYER AND BACCALAUREATES

2. School officials may not mandate or organize prayer at graduation, nor may they organize a religious baccalaureate ceremony. If the school generally rents out its facilities to private groups, it must rent them out on the same terms, and on a first-come first-served basis, to organizers of privately sponsored religious baccalaureate services, provided that the school does not extend preferential treatment to the baccalaureate ceremony and the school disclaims official endorsement of the program.

3. The courts have reached conflicting conclusions under the federal Constitution on student-initiated prayer at graduation. Until the issue is authoritatively resolved, schools should ask their lawyers what rules apply in their area.

OFFICIAL PARTICIPATION OR ENCOURAGEMENT OF RELIGIOUS ACTIVITY

4. Teachers and school administrators, when acting in those capacities, are representatives of the state, and, in those capacities, are themselves prohibited from encouraging or soliciting student religious or anti-religious activity. Similarly, when acting in their official capacities, teachers may not engage in religious activities with their students. However, teachers may engage in private religious activity in faculty lounges.

TEACHING ABOUT RELIGION

5. Students may be taught about religion, but public schools may not teach religion. As the U.S. Supreme Court has repeatedly said, ''[i]t might well be said that one's education is not complete without a study of comparative religion, or the history of religion and its relationship to the advancement of civilization.'' It would be difficult to teach art, music, literature and most social studies without considering religious influences.

The history of religion, comparative religion, the Bible (or other scripture)-as-literature (either as a separate course or within some other existing course), are all permissible public school subjects. It is both permissible and desirable to teach objectively about the role of religion in the history of the United States and other countries. One can teach that the Pilgrims came to this country with a particular religious vision, that Catholics and others have been subject to persecution or that many of those participating in the abolitionist, women's suffrage and civil rights movements had religious motivations.

6. These same rules apply to the recurring controversy surrounding theories of evolution. Schools may teach about explanations of life on earth, including religious ones (such as ''creationism''), in comparative religion or social studies classes. In science class, however, they may present only genuinely scientific critiques of, or evidence for, any explanation of life on earth, but not religious critiques (beliefs unverifiable by scientific methodology). Schools may not refuse to teach evolutionary theory in order to avoid giving offense to religion nor may they circumvent these rules by labeling as science an article of religious faith. Public schools must not teach as scientific fact or theory any religious doctrine, including ''creationism,'' although any genuinely scientific evidence for or against any explanation of life may be taught. Just as they may neither advance nor inhibit any religious doctrine, teachers should not ridicule, for example, a student's religious explanation for life on earth.

STUDENT ASSIGNMENTS AND RELIGION

7. Students may express their religious beliefs in the form of reports, homework and artwork, and such expressions are constitutionally protected. Teachers may not reject or correct such submissions simply because they include a religious symbol or address religious themes. Likewise, teachers may not require students to modify, include or excise religious views in their assignments, if germane. These assignments should be judged by ordinary academic standards of substance, relevance, appearance and grammar.

8. Somewhat more problematic from a legal point of view are other public expressions of religious views in the classroom. Unfortunately for school officials, there are traps on either side of this issue, and it is possible that litigation will result no matter what course is taken. It is easier to describe the settled cases than to state clear rules of law. Schools must carefully steer between the claims of student speakers who assert a right to express themselves on religious subjects and the asserted rights of student listeners to be free of unwelcome religious persuasion in a public school classroom.

a. Religious or anti-religious remarks made in the ordinary course of classroom