to encourage all of my colleagues, both Democrat and Republican to support the establishment of such a commission.

With the recent explosion in the number of casinos across the country, concerns have been raised about the effects of expanded gambling Advocates of legalizing gambling promise economic growth, jobs, and windfall of tax revenues. However, we must also consider the negative impacts which include regulatory costs, lost productivity and more importantly, the social costs.

This legislation would create a blue ribbon panel charged with the duty of conducting a comprehensive and objective study of gambling in the United States. Negative impacts of gambling on State and local economies, small businesses and families can no longer be ignored. Crime and social problems related to gambling could add to already overburdened criminal justice and social welfare systems. This issue is of particular concern to myself and my district because of largely unrestricted Indian gaming and its impact on the community. But this is more than a local issue. It is an issue of National social and economic importance.

Mr. Speaker, the States, local governments and citizens need unbiased and factual information about gambling. Gambling must be carefully studied to provide citizens with all the information they need when deciding whether to allow legalized gambling in their communities. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 497.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 497, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 497, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT OF INTERAGENCY ARCTIC RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE—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 Science:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 108(b) of Public Law 98–373 (15 U.S.C. 4701(b)), I transmit herewith the Sixth Biennial Report of the Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee (February 1, 1994 to January 31, 1996).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 5, 1996.*

REPORT ON DEFERRAL AND PROPOSED RESCISSIONS OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–182)

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 one revised deferral, totaling $91 million, and two proposed rescissions of budgetary resources, totaling $15 million.

The deferral affects the Department of State U.S. emergency refugee and migration assistance fund. The rescission proposals affect the Department of Agriculture and the General Services Administration.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 5, 1996.*

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 1 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 1 p.m.

□ 1301

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore. [Mr. ROGERS] at 1 p.m.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1996

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, last year the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights subpoenaed members of the Florida proposition 187 committee, a grassroots organization interested in curbing illegal immigration. The Commission went so for as to subpoena all of the group's internal documents, including reports, memos, and computer-generated printouts. In the words of one housewife who was paid a visit by a U.S. marshal, she felt intimidated and harassed by the Commission and felt like she was living in the land of the Gestapo.

By statute, the Commission is granted subpoena power to conduct fact-finding hearings on discrimination and racial tensions. But whose civil rights are they protecting? It certainly does not appear to be the rights of those Floridians who were exercising their constitutional rights of free speech and free association.

Regardless of any individual's personal beliefs or political associations, no one should be subjected to this type of intimidation by Federal agencies. It is for this reason that I am introducing the Civil Rights Commission Amendments Act of 1996 to prevent further fishing expeditions at the expense of law-abiding citizens. The bill would allow the Commission to subpoena only government officials, or in cases where a person's right to vote has been violated.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

[Mr. BILIRAKIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

PROMOTING GREATER EDUCATIONAL CHOICE

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to focus on a very serious debate that has been going on back here in Washington over the last several weeks. In fact, it is a debate that reminds me, the longer I serve in Congress, the more convinced I become that Washington just does not get it.

Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the fact that the District of Columbia appropriations spending bill is now held up in the other body under the threat of a filibuster, and for one simple reason. That is because Senate Democrats are opposed to the notion of giving low-income students, those students who come from low-income families here in the District of Columbia, educational choice.

The House version of the District of Columbia appropriations bill contains language that appropriates funds for a

demonstration program, the idea being to grant scholarships or educational vouchers to these particular students.

Bear in mind a couple of facts: One, the District of Columbia schools have the worst performance record of any inner-city school district in the country in terms of test scores and graduation rate. Only 56 percent of the students in the District of Columbia public schools graduate from those particular schools. Yet, our political opponents here in the Congress remain vehemently opposed to the notion of even trying or experimenting with school choice right here in our backyard in the District of Columbia public schools through the partnership that we are trying to create between the Congress and the District of Columbia public schools.

Despite their adamant opposition, we have a message, those of us who believe in real educational reform, we have a message for those in the other body and here in the House who have been fighting our plans to try to reform and improve the District of Columbia public schools, and for that matter, public education across the lands.

That is that voucher programs, the idea of promoting educational competition through a greater choice and the idea of giving parents the full range of choice across all competing institutions, that is an idea whose time has come. Voucher programs are moving ahead around the country, certainly in Wisconsin, where Milwaukee public schools have now expanded their particular educational choice or voucher program to include 15,000 inner-city students, and in my home State of California, which will have a statewide initiative on the November ballot providing for educational choice through a voucher system.

This is a terribly important debate going on back here in Washington. Let me tell the Members what is at stake here is nothing less than the success of the U.S. economy. According to a James Glassman article in last Tuesdays Washington Post, languishing wages, which is obviously an issue that keeps cropping up in the Republican Presidential primary, languishing wages, this idea of income stagnation in America, can be linked directly to a poor education and training system.

That deficiency begins in our primary and secondary schools, especially in our high schools, where high school test scores and a high school diploma have been watered down to the point of almost becoming meaningless in terms of predicting a student's ability to go on to a higher education institution, or to obtain a good-paying job in the workplace.

Therefore, we are trying to promote greater educational choice. We realize private schools cannot replace public schools, but we believe that the model for U.S. secondary education should be the U.S. higher education system, which is the best in the world. One of the reasons it is the best in the world is because we have robust competition between private and public universities, and that has raised the quality of both. How ironic that we have educational choice in preschool and in higher education. The only place we do not have it is in our primary and secondary schools.

Why is that? Really, U.S. News & World Report last week, I think, points up the reason why we do not have greater educational choice in this country. That is the militant opposition of the teachers unions, which have become the campaign arm of the national Democratic Party, and which are still operating based on an old-fashioned 1940's and 1950's industrial union model.

The largest union is the National Education Association, the NEA. The other union is the American Federation of Teachers. Both of these unions, according to U.S. News & World Report, are ''driving out good teachers, coddling bad ones, and putting bureaucracy in the way of quality education.'' Both of these unions are fiercely opposed to the idea of educational choice and promoting greater competition in education.

They also, of course, donate millions of dollars to the Democratic Party and their candidates. In fact, a second article in the Washington Post last week pointed out that the NEA, the National Education Association, is the largest union in the country, with 2.2 million members. They are the richest, with a nearly $800 million budget. They are also intertwined in Democratic politics, really the campaign arm of the National Democratic Party.

I will conclude, Mr. Speaker. I want to talk more about this in later special orders. I just want to conclude by quoting Stephen Jobs, the founder of Apple Computers, who said he has probably spearheaded giving away more computer equipment to the schools than anybody on the planet, but he has come to the inevitable conclusion that the problem is not one technology can solve, it is a political problem. The problems are unions. You plot the growth of the NEA and the dropping of test scores, and they are inversely proportional. He concludes: ''I am one of those people who believe the best thing we could ever do is go to the full voucher system.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. CHRISTENSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. DEUTSCH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. HUNTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT FOR EVERGLADES PRESERVATION LEGISLATION, AND ADDRESSING TOPICS WHICH CREATE HAVOC IN THE NATION

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the Congress for their excellent efforts on behalf of the Everglades in Florida, with their resounding 299 vote of support for the $210 million appropriation for our National Park, the Everglades.

Particularly I would like to thank the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Georgia, NEWT GINGRICH, for appearing in the well and debating this issue with me for the preservation of our endangered Everglades. I think Congress sent a message across America that this is a bipartisan effort to preserve and protect our environment, and I again applaud the Speaker and the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. ARMEY], and others who valiantly supported our efforts, as well as the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. DEUTSCH], and members of the Florida delegation, for their strong, steadfast belief that in order to preserve the quality of life of Florida, we must protect our natural resources, including our water supply.

I would also like to take a moment to commend the Caring Foundation in West Palm Beach, FL, headed by Larry and Betty Brown, who are dear friends of mine. They put on a performance