

of children with disabilities. I understand and support this policy objective. The proposed formula is more rational and meritorious than allowing local schools to identify disabled students.

I was concerned, however, that this formula would hurt States that legitimately had higher rates of disability. Fortunately, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities recognized the importance of protecting States, including small States like Delaware. The formula has been modified to prevent States from facing significant funding reductions which could have hampered their ability to provide a free and appropriate public education to disabled children.

The committee had an important opportunity to improve IDEA and build on its previous successes, and it worked in a bipartisan manner to achieve this goal. I want to commend the committee leadership and staff for its excellent work in drafting this bill, and I urge my colleagues to give this bill their support.

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking Chairman GOODLING and Chairman CUNNINGHAM for their thoughtful work on this bill. IDEA is one law where common ground has always been possible, but never easy. Today, we are closer to that common ground than many thought probable a month ago. All of those who have had a hand in bringing us to this point deserve to be commended.

When the markup of this bill was originally scheduled in our committee, I was concerned that we would have come away with a bill that no one was happy with, and I hoped that a postponement would give us time to reach bipartisan consensus. I sent a letter to Chairman GOODLING explaining my concern. Chairman GOODLING did postpone the markup from its originally scheduled time and today, after many hours of productive negotiations among the various groups with an interest in this bill as well as among those of us on the committee, we have a bill which is in many ways better than some thought possible.

I am particularly pleased that the chairman decided to continue the authorization for a discretionary grant program for professional development as well as the requirement that States establish a comprehensive system of professional development. Although there are a few specific points that I hope we can clarify in conference negotiations with the Senate, it is important that we have included these two provisions.

I have always believed that a strong system of professional development will fortify this bill. With changing technologies, methods of teaching, and the emerging and changing needs of today's children, a strong system of professional development is essential. We need to focus on developing and maintaining a force of qualified personnel to teach children with a wide range of special needs. Especially recognizing the considerable shortages of qualified special education teachers in some areas of this country, it is crucial that we take the lead at the national level by placing a high priority on providing for quality systems of professional teacher development.

But professional development is not only important to maintaining a quality special education teaching force. Training and retraining is also necessary for teachers whose classroom management problems are complicated. Teachers in today's classrooms are address-

ing situations that they were never educated to deal with. I have every confidence that today's teachers can deal with these situations, but we need to recognize that they need and want the proper training to do so.

I am confident that classrooms can be better life-learning environments when they contain many different children with many unique qualities and talents. However, a solid system of professional skills development is the key to making these classrooms good learning and teaching environments for everyone involved.

This kind of comprehensive professional development is important on many levels. Our committee has had to balance questions of how to discipline children with disabilities in this bill, but I believe that this would not be such a prevalent issue if we had the resources to train teachers appropriately. Children whose needs are understood and accounted for, and teachers who are trained to manage special difficulties that arise, will need for the discipline provisions of this bill. I think we would all like to see that happen.

Along with professional development, another key to making this bill work well is the ability to assess children's needs properly. I offered an amendment at the full committee level that was designed to add to the definition of evaluation in this bill to ensure that children's needs are properly assessed with technically sound instruments in all areas of their suspected disability before any decisions are made about how and where they can learn best. I am grateful that with a small amount of rewording, the chairman and I were able to come to an agreement on this amendment. It is now a part of the bill before us today. This was a fine example of bipartisanship and a willingness to find common ground.

I know that this bill is not perfect in everyone's eyes, and I know that many of us have deep reservations about the Federal Government sanctioning cessation of educational services for any child. However, I think most of us now agree that it is a strong piece of legislation that will go far to improve and enhance education for disabled children and learning environments for all children.

Thank you again to everyone who worked to make certain that the good that this law has done for disabled children over the past 20 years will continue.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GREENE of Utah). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3268, 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. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their re-

marks on H.R. 3268, IDEA Improvement Act of 1996.

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

There was no objection.

ANTARCTIC ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT OF 1996

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3060) to implement the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3060

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 "Antarctic Environmental Protection Act of 1996".

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ANTARCTIC CONSERVATION ACT OF 1978

SEC. 101. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

Section 2 of the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2401) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

"(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the Antarctic Treaty and the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty establish a firm foundation for the comprehensive protection of the Antarctic environment, the continuation of international cooperation, and the freedom of scientific investigation in Antarctica.

"(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to provide legislative authority to implement, with respect to the United States, the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty."

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

Section 3 of the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2402) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

"For purposes of this Act—

"(1) the term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

"(2) the term 'Antarctica' means the area south of 60 degrees south latitude;

"(3) the term 'Antarctic Specially Protected Area' means an area identified as such pursuant to Annex V to the Protocol;

"(4) the term 'Director' means the Director of the National Science Foundation;

"(5) the term 'harmful interference' means—

"(A) flying or landing helicopters or other aircraft in a manner that disturbs concentrations of birds or seals;

"(B) using vehicles or vessels, including hovercraft and small boats, in a manner that disturbs concentrations of birds or seals;

"(C) using explosives or firearms in a manner that disturbs concentrations of birds or seals;

"(D) willfully disturbing breeding or molting birds or concentrations of birds or seals by persons on foot;

"(E) significantly damaging concentrations of native terrestrial plants by landing aircraft, driving vehicles, or walking on them, or by other means; and

"(F) any activity that results in the significant adverse modification of habitats of any species or population of native mammal, native bird, native plant, or native invertebrate;

"(6) the term 'historic site or monument' means any site or monument listed as a historic site or monument pursuant to Annex V to the Protocol;