United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 17, 1997 No. 102

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

With all the wonderful traditions that have blessed our lives, we pray, gracious God, that we will be more appreciative of the families who have nurtured us along the way and given us the very gift of life. For mothers and fathers, for grandparents and relatives, and for all those people who fostered our growth and looked to our care, we offer words of thanksgiving and gratitude. We recognize that as we give value to our family heritage and honor our own history, we strengthen our own lives and gain the power to share these same gifts with those who follow us. In Your holy name, we pray. 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 North Carolina [Mr. MCINTYRE] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MCINTYRE 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain 10 one-minutes on each side.

GOVERNMENT CANNOT BUILD PROSPERITY; ONLY FREE INDIVIDUALS CAN

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I often wonder if the other side has forgotten what motivated people from every corner of the globe to come to our shores throughout history. Indeed, the forefathers of the very same people who reflexively attack the idea of tax cuts as tax cuts for the rich came to America to escape government oppression, to escape the idea that government has a higher claim to the fruits of your labor than you and your family do.

America as a land of opportunity was not built into a rich and prosperous Nation by this way of thinking. In fact, America is a land of opportunity for reasons which are exactly the opposite of this way of thinking.

Government cannot build prosperity. Only free individuals can.

Americans became rich because free individuals had dreams, took risks, and worked hard to realize those dreams.

The other side might wish to remember that their rhetoric has absolutely nothing to do with making America more free, nothing to do with telling children to dream great dreams, and nothing to do with making a nation prosperous. It is very sad to see.

INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR PROVISION OF THE REVENUE RECONCILIATION ACT WOULD REDUCE AMERICAN WORKERS

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, our country is going through a major transition in employment relations. The temporary help industry is exploding. Workers can no longer count on working for the same employer for their entire lives. Now is the time for Federal policy to promote a high-wage/high-skill economy which values workers and encourages employers to invest in the skills and long-term productivity of working people.

But the independent contractor provision in the Revenue Reconciliation Act would reclassify and misclassify American working people as independent contractors without wage and benefit guarantees, without unemployment or worker's compensation, without prevailing wage, minimum wage, without protections or equal employment protections. It would reduce American workers.

The last time we had a system like the independent contractor provision, we had an America that was filled with company stores. We are not going back to that era.

We have to value American workers, invest in them, and give them an opportunity to support their families with decent wages and to have decent benefits.

CUT TAXES FOR WORKING FAMILIES

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

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important debates that will occur during this Congress is whether this Congress will send more money back to the people who work for a living and earn that money. As one might expect, we are hearing both sides in this debate talking about tax cuts.

But let's look at the record. Republicans have controlled Congress for the last two Congresses. In each of those Congresses we have passed tax cuts for working men and women in this country.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

For 40 years before that, the other side controlled this Congress. When they began their reign in 1955, Americans paid about 10 percent of their income in taxes.

Today, thanks to their pattern of continuing tax increases, for the first time in American history the average family spends more in taxes than they spend for food, clothing, and shelter combined.

When we look at the record, this shows which party has real credibility on this issue. The other side fights tax cuts today by calling them tax cuts for the rich. Who are the so-called rich that the liberals refer to? They are talking about foundry workers, schoolteachers, machinists, and police on the beat. This is who they deem to be the rich. This is why they intend to deny tax cuts.

This has to end. We have to give people back more of the money they have earned, and give families the freedom to spend that money on their children. Republicans will end the wrong-headed practice of taking money from working families and sending it to Washington.

That day of financing every liberal wish list at the expense of working families will be over, Mr. Speaker, when the Republican tax cut takes effect.

FAIRNESS TO FARMERS

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

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, today we will consider an issue of fairness to farmers who have invested for generations in their crops, and who for generations have fed their families, paid their bills, and put their kids through college when possible; farmers who, by the sweat of their brow on hot and humid days like today, are out there toiling in the sun; who suddenly might suffer a natural disaster at no fault of their own, as happened last year, when all eight counties in my district in southeastern North Carolina found that their crops were destroyed by hurricanes; small family farmers who should not bear the brunt of someone else's political agenda.

If we take away crop insurance from our tobacco farmers, we punish them for making an honest living from the soil of the Earth, we punish them by keeping them from getting bank loans, and we punish them again if disaster strikes. Do not do it. Do not take away their chance to make an honest living and be able to provide for their families.

THE GOP TAX BILL PROVIDES TAX RELIEF TO HARDWORKING MIDDLE-CLASS FAMILIES

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, this is the end of the week. By now we have heard all the exhaustive cries of our liberal friends over here that the Republican tax bill provides tax cuts for the rich and, as they will have us believe, the rich do not deserve a tax break.

However, a close look at who they label as ''rich'' is very revealing. In fact, it reveals a tale of deception on every American worker. According to a recent independent study, the Democratic definition of rich is the total income of any household making more than $56,200 a year. They contend, therefore, that 1.7 million union members are too rich to deserve tax cuts, 2.4 elementary and high school schoolteachers are too rich to deserve a tax cut, 8.1 million government workers, 4.2 million mechanics, repairmen, and construction workers, and the list goes on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats complain, and they claim that the only equitable way to provide tax relief to the American people is to allow those who pay no taxes to receive a bigger refund. Mr. Speaker, the Republican tax bill provides that much-needed tax relief to hardworking middle-class citizens of this country. I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill.

ORDINARY HARDWORKING AMERICANS WILL RECEIVE NO TAX RELIEF THROUGH THE REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Republican con games continue, convincing the American people they are getting a tax cut by giving a majority of the tax breaks to the richest people in America; complain that the Democrats are engaged in class warfare, while the Republicans practice it.

Yesterday I spoke about Al. He works in a factory, supports his wife and two kids on his $25,000 salary, and he gets absolutely nothing from the Republican tax bill.

Today I want to tell Members about Mary. Mary is a single mom. She will struggle to raise two kids on her own. Mary works 40 hours a week as a secretary for $12 an hour. That is a little less than $25,000 a year. Mary works hard and pays thousands of dollars in taxes. What does Mary get under the Republican tax bill? Nothing. Zero. Zip.

What do Speaker GINGRICH and the Republicans say about Mary? They say Mary is on welfare. Huge tax breaks for millionaires, nothing for Mary, nothing for Al. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans should come clean with the American people and tell the truth.

PORKER OF THE WEEK AWARD

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, an investigation by the inspectors general of the Department of Health and Human Services found that a $15.3 million training program based at the University of Mississippi, underwritten with Federal tax dollars, was only 8 percent effective. The goal of this program was to help participants earn the equivalent of a high school diploma, the GED.

Yet, for all the money spent, just 720 of the 4,300 participants even took the GED exam. Of those, only about half passed and went on to receive the GED diploma. The final price tag, now get this, for each GED diploma was $40,584. That looks like the cost of a 4-year stay at a State-run college, rather than a remedial education effort.

Why do we keep spending tax dollars on feel-good programs that are not working? It appears these folks could use a little education in the arithmetic category. They simply are not making the grade. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services gets my Porker of the Week Award.

A NATIONAL COMMITMENT TO REPLACING OUTDATED LIBRARY BOOKS

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

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Speaker, books have the power to bring the world to any child, but it is an obsolete world children see in 75 percent of the books in Chicago public school libraries.

Here is a sample of what students learn from many of these books. Russia is still part of the Soviet Union. The Berlin Wall is still standing. And some of these books boldly predict that one day man will actually walk on the Moon.

A recent study showed that 65 percent of the 100,000 public school libraries do not have adequate book collections. Recently the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] and I circulated a letter signed by 70 Members of Congress urging a strong new commitment to replacing outdated library books.

□ 1015

There is good news. Earlier this week a congressional subcommittee agreed to invest $350 million to help public school libraries. That is an investment, Mr. Speaker, that will help take our public school libraries out of the dark ages and bring them back to the future.

DRUGS IN FLORIDA

(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, over the last 4 years an increasingly permissive attitude, even a tolerance in some circles, of illegal drug use has regrettably developed. The lack of institutional leadership from the President and from the media on this issue is reflected in the dramatic increases in the use of marijuana and other drugs by our young people. Overall drug use by teens in America has more than doubled since 1992, more than doubled. We need real leadership and we need it now.

Today Speaker GINGRICH will join the Florida delegation in a hearing to look at the troubling reemergence of Florida as a major drug trafficking route. This hearing is an important step in fighting the complacency and focusing, once again, on winning the war on drugs rather than settling for a stalemate or a draw. I hope the administration will join us in renewing our effort to kick our Nation's drug habit. We could use the help in Florida.

REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are beginning to fear that they are not going to be able to win the President's support for their tax cut plan for the rich. So what do they do? They threaten to shut down the Government again.

Many Americans remember in the last session of Congress when the Republicans did not get their way and so they decided to shut down the Government. Now the Speaker fears he will not get his way with his tax cuts for the rich so he wants to hold the Government hostage once again.

Mr. GINGRICH told a meeting of Ways and Means Republicans Wednesday that the GOP-controlled Congress would not send any appropriation bills to the President for his signature until the President signs a Republican tax cut plan. This is according to two GOP sources that spoke to Congress Daily.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats have been working hard to push our plan that would truly benefit middle-income families. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership is not honoring the agreement they made with the American people. First they broke their promise to middle-class Americans, and now they want to shut the Government down again.

PROMISES AND ASSURANCES

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

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, this is going to be a big week for Americans. We want to talk about tax cuts and what we can do to help children. But Carol Browner, Director of the U.S. EPA, is at it once again. She has made her final ruling, with agreement by the White House, that there are going to be some new ozone rules.

They did not look at the sound science. We know that from George Wolf that heads up the subcommittee. They did not release the information when we asked for it. Now in fact they might have cut some deals across the country that some areas do not have to go under these new rules, but they will not tell us whether they have or have not.

We need the truth, Mr. Speaker. The American people need the truth. These policies are not going to help people with respiratory problems. They are simply going to throw people out of work.

Most important, Mr. Speaker, this is the United States. It is time, no matter where we stand on these issues, that we do not let unelected bureaucrats decide national law. The people send Members of Congress here to talk about national law. The Director of the U.S. EPA is trying to mandate that we will do a certain policy without addressing the give-and-take of talking to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to get behind the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] in his efforts.

NO TAX BENEFIT UNDER REPUBLICAN PLAN FOR MIDDLE-INCOME AMERICANS

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the real question this morning is, what do the schoolteacher, the police officer, the firefighter, the bus driver, and the single working mother have in common? No tax benefit under the Republican tax plan.

Many will say that absence makes the heart grow fonder. Let me say, not so. The Republicans have absented themselves from the 1994 Contract on America, which says that they would give a tax refund to those who pay income tax, those who receive an earned income tax credit, and those who pay payroll taxes. Not so.

They all signed it. They have all forgotten. Now they call the schoolteacher, the police officer, the firefighter, the bus driver, and the working mother, they are on welfare, because they do not want to give them a child tax credit.

Absence does not make the heart grow fonder for the working people of America. The Democratic alternative recognizes when you go to work every day as a bus driver, a schoolteacher, a single working mother, you deserve a tax credit for your child. That is the plan that is for all working Americans.

TAX CUTS

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I hope the American people that are observing this debate over taxes now realize why tax cuts come so slowly in this Congress. There are some elitists in this Chamber and a lot of egos that think that Washington can spend your money better than you can.

The tax bill currently before Congress is going to benefit every American, whether it is a $400 more in your pocket or $1,500 more in your pocket. Middle class working families are going to gain a little bit from this tax cut. But this tax cut is just a little bit. Compared to the $250 billion tax increase that we just had 4 years ago, this is an $85 billion net tax cut, just a portion of the huge tax increase that just happened a few years ago.

If we are going to have a country that has been as successful as we have, we have to get back to a system where we let the people keep more of the money in their pocket, where we reward the people that work hard, that try, that save, that invest, and the people that work hard are better off than those that do not.

IN SUPPORT OF TAX FAIRNESS FOR WORKING AMERICAN FAMILIES

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago the Republicans signed a contract with the working families of America and promised to provide them with tax relief. They proposed a law called the American Dream Restoration Act, which calls for a $500-per-child tax credit for families making up to $200,000. This was item 5 on their Contract With America.

Amazingly, the Republicans will give a $500-per-child tax credit to people making $200,000 but they want to deny this tax relief to families making $20,000. Yesterday the New York Times reported that the Speaker of the House might finally give the child care tax credit to all working families. Then he changed his mind.

My colleagues, what is going on here? Are the Republicans going to keep their promise or not? Are the Republicans going to make good on their contract they signed or is this just another case of promises made, promises broken?

BOGUS AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

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

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had the administration officially come forward with its national ambient air quality standards,

otherwise known as BAQS, bogus air quality standards.

Mr. Speaker, the administration tells us this is to save the children. But, Mr. Speaker, what do you tell the child whose family cannot afford a home because the so-called new air standards put the cost of those new homes beyond their family's means? What do you tell the child whose father is out of work because these so-called new air standards shut down his business? What do you tell the community that cannot build a new hospital because these new so-called standards cannot be met?

Mr. Speaker, America's children do not need weird science. They need homes, parents with jobs, new schools, new hospitals, all which would become endangered species if these so-called new standards are allowed to go into effect.

ROBIN HOOD IN REVERSE

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, it appears as though the Republicans are going to treat us to another episode of their favorite show, Robin Hood in reverse. He takes from the poor and the middle class to give to the rich. This is also known by the term ''tax relief for the rich.'' The issue is not whether there ought to be a tax refund. The issue is tax fairness.

If you look at the Republican tax package, 60 percent of the tax benefits go to the wealthiest 5 percent of Americans. They give millionaires $12,000 to $24,000 in tax relief through estate taxes and indexed capital gains, but when we suggest that teachers, bus drivers, entry-level policemen ought to get a child tax credit, they have the audacity to say that is welfare. No, that is tax fairness.

The working people, the working middle class in America ought to get the lion's share of the tax relief, not the wealthy millionaires who are collecting large capital gains tax breaks.

We believe in tax fairness. The Democrats are advocating a child tax credit for everyone. When they had their Contract on America, they said it was a good idea: Give working America a tax break. They reneged on that promise. Promises made, promises broken.

MEDICARE OVERPAYMENT

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

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, today the New York Times ran a very interesting article but a very sad article. It is entitled ''U.S. Overpaid $2.3 Billion Last Year'' in Medicare and it reads:

''In the first comprehensive audit of Medicare, Federal investigators said Wednesday that the government overpaid hospitals, doctors and other health care providers last year by $23 billion, or 14 percent of all of the money spent in the standard Medicare program.

''The books and records of the Medicare agency and its contractors were in such disarray that they could not be thoroughly audited,'' said the inspector general. She said that there was no way to tell how much money of the overpayment resulted from fraud.

Mr. Speaker, I think the buck stops with the President on this issue. I think before we get into the next cycle, I think the President absolutely must pay attention to this fraud and abuse in Medicare.

HOUSTON OILERS MOVE TO TENNESSEE

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

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Houston Oilers received the final agreement to leave Houston and become the Tennessee Oilers, playing in Memphis, TN, this year and later on in Nashville, TN.

As a long-time Houston Oiler fan, I am looking for a new professional team to adopt. I worked as a 13-year-old at the old Oiler football games at Jeppesen Stadium, now Robertson Stadium, on the University of Houston campus.

Today I am cleaning out some of my Oiler paraphernalia like a lot of people in Houston are doing. I want to present them to the gentleman from Nashville, TN [Mr. CLEMENT] and say, ''You can have this hat, you can have this glass that says Houston Oilers,'' even a bumper sticker from our local radio station that plays the Oilers and their games, and even a pin that says, ''Love You, Blue.''

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman [Mr. CLEMENT].

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I thank him for remembering Sam Houston and Davy Crockett and the countless volunteers that fought for Texas and independence. I have always heard all my life, if it had not been for Tennessee, there would not have been a Texas.

Well, we are not going to get Houston oil but we are going to get the Houston Oilers. We appreciate it very much. Payments are in full, and we deeply appreciate the gentleman realizing that we now have bought a great team. We want him to come see them play in the near future in Memphis and then in Nashville, TN. We have a lot to be proud of, and we will sure help the gentleman and work with him to get another team.

BOEING-McDONNELL DOUGLAS MERGER

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the European Commission's Merger Task Force voted to disapprove the Boeing-McDonnell Douglas merger. The Economic Community charged Boeing would have to make greater concessions if they would receive approval from the EC.

I have sent a letter, developed a letter to the EC and I have sent it to every congressional office. At this time I am urging every Member of Congress to send that letter and show solid support for keeping their nose out of our business.

CROP INSURANCE

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

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, later today there may be an amendment to take Federal crop insurance from the American tobacco grower, yet it will be left for wheat, rye, barley, and all the other crops. Some do want to destroy the American tobacco grower. In 1896 William Jennings Bryan said, ''If you destroy the American farmer, grass will grow in the streets of every city of the land.''

□ 1030

In 1997, if we destroy the American tobacco farmer, 350,000 good jobs will be lost. We will be buying Chinese cigarettes, we will be buying Brazilian cigarettes, and we will be wrecking our trade surplus that agriculture so richly provides this Nation.

Save crop insurance and help the American economy.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 858) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 858

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES
Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 102. Classified schedule of authorizations.
Sec. 103. Personnel ceiling adjustments.
Sec. 104. Community Management Account.
TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM
Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.
TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS
Sec. 301. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law.
Sec. 302. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities.
Sec. 303. Detail of intelligence community personnel.
Sec. 304. Extension of application of sanctions laws to intelligence activities.
Sec. 305. Administrative location of the Office of the Director of Central Intelligence.
Sec. 306. Encouragement of disclosure of certain information to Congress.
Sec. 307. Provision of information on violent crimes against United States citizens abroad to victims and victims' families.
Sec. 308. Standards for spelling of foreign names and places and for use of geographic coordinates.
Sec. 309. Sense of the Senate.
TITLE IV—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
Sec. 401. Multiyear leasing authority.
Sec. 402. Subpoena authority for the Inspector General of the Central Intelligence Agency.
TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES
Sec. 501. Academic degrees in intelligence.
Sec. 502. Funding for infrastructure and quality of life improvements at Menwith Hill and Bad Aibling stations.
Sec. 503. Misuse of National Reconnaissance Office name, initials, or seal.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1998 for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the following elements of the United States Government:

(1) The Central Intelligence Agency.

(2) The Department of Defense.

(3) The Defense Intelligence Agency.

(4) The National Security Agency.

(5) The Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.

(6) The Department of State.

(7) The Department of the Treasury.

(8) The Department of Energy.

(9) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(10) The Drug Enforcement Administration.

(11) The National Reconnaissance Office.

(12) The National Imagery and Mapping Agency.

SEC. 102. CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) SPECIFICATIONS OF AMOUNTS AND PERSONNEL CEILINGS.—The amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 101, and the authorized personnel ceilings as of September 30, 1998, for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the elements listed in such section, are those specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations prepared to accompany the conference report on the bill ___ of the One Hundred Fifth Congress.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.—The Schedule of Authorizations shall be made available to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives and to the President. The President shall provide for suitable distribution of the Schedule, or of appropriate portions of the Schedule, within the Executive Branch.

SEC. 103. PERSONNEL CEILING ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—With the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Director of Central Intelligence may authorize employment of civilian personnel in excess of the number authorized for fiscal year 1998 under section 102 when the Director of Central Intelligence determines that such action is necessary to the performance of important intelligence functions, except that the number of personnel employed in excess of the number authorized under such section may not, for any element of the intelligence community, exceed two percent of the number of civilian personnel authorized under such section for such element.

(b) NOTICE TO INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.—The Director of Central Intelligence shall promptly notify the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate whenever the Director exercises the authority granted by this section.

SEC. 104. COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Community Management Account of the Director of Central Intelligence for fiscal year 1998 the sum of $90,580,000.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN FUNDS.—Within such amount, funds identified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a) for the Advanced Research and Development Committee and the Environmental Intelligence and Applications Program shall remain available until September 30, 1999.

(b) AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL LEVELS.—The elements within the Community Management Account of the Director of Central Intelligence are authorized a total of 278 full-time personnel as of September 30, 1998. Personnel serving in such elements may be permanent employees of the Community Management Account element or personnel detailed from other elements of the United States Government.

(c) CLASSIFIED AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Community Management Account by subsection (a), there is also authorized to be appropriated for the Community Management Account for fiscal year 1998 such additional amounts as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a).

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF PERSONNEL.—In addition to the personnel authorized by subsection (b) for elements of the Community Management Account as of September 30, 1998, there is hereby authorized such additional personnel for such elements as of that date as is specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations.

(3) CONSTRUCTION.—Authorizations in the classified Schedule of Authorizations may not be construed to increase authorizations of appropriations or personnel for the Community Management Account except to the extent specified in the applicable paragraph of this subsection.

(d) REIMBURSEMENT.—During fiscal year 1998, any officer or employee of the United States or member of the Armed Forces who is detailed to the staff of an element within the Community Management Account from another element of the United States Government shall be detailed on a reimbursable basis, except that any such officer, employee, or member may be detailed on a non-reimbursable basis for a period of less than one year for the performance of temporary functions as required by the Director of Central Intelligence.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund for fiscal year 1998 the sum of $196,900,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. INCREASE IN EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS AUTHORIZED BY LAW.

Appropriations authorized by this Act for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for Federal employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in such compensation or benefits authorized by law.

SEC. 302. RESTRICTION ON CONDUCT OF INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

The authorization of appropriations by this Act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity which is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

SEC. 303. DETAIL OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY PERSONNEL.

(a) DETAIL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of a department or agency having jurisdiction over an element in the intelligence community or the head of an element of the intelligence community may detail any employee of the department, agency, or element to serve in any position in the Intelligence Community Assignment Program.

(2) BASIS OF DETAIL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Personnel may be detailed under paragraph (1) on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis.

(B) PERIOD OF NONREIMBURSABLE DETAIL.—Personnel detailed on a nonreimbursable basis shall be detailed for such periods not to exceed three years as are agreed upon between the heads of the departments or agencies concerned. However, the heads of the departments or agencies may provide for the extension of a detail for not to exceed one year if the extension is in the public interest.

(b) BENEFITS, ALLOWANCES, AND INCENTIVES.—The department, agency, or element detailing personnel to the Intelligence Community Assignment Program under subsection (a) on a non-reimbursable basis may provide such personnel any salary, pay, retirement, or other benefits, allowances (including travel allowances), or incentives as are provided to other personnel of the department, agency, or element.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on June 1, 1997.

SEC. 304. EXTENSION OF APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS LAWS TO INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

Section 905 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 441d) is amended by striking out ''January 6, 1998'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''January 6, 2001''.

SEC. 305. ADMINISTRATIVE LOCATION OF THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE.

Section 102(e) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) The Office of the Director of Central Intelligence shall, for administrative purposes, be within the Central Intelligence Agency.''.

SEC. 306. ENCOURAGEMENT OF DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN INFORMATION TO CONGRESS.

(a) ENCOURAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall take appropriate actions to inform the employees of the executive branch, and employees of contractors carrying out activities under classified contracts, that the disclosure of information described in paragraph (2) to the committee of Congress having oversight responsibility for the department, agency, or element to which such information relates, or to the Members of Congress who represent such employees, is not prohibited by law, executive order, or regulation or otherwise contrary to public policy.

(2) COVERED INFORMATION.—Paragraph (1) applies to information, including classified information, that an employee reasonably believes to evidence—

(A) a violation of any law, rule, or regulation;

(B) a false statement to Congress on an issue of material fact; or

(C) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety.

(b) REPORT.—On the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the actions taken under subsection (a).

SEC. 307. PROVISION OF INFORMATION ON VIOLENT CRIMES AGAINST UNITED STATES CITIZENS ABROAD TO VICTIMS AND VICTIMS' FAMILIES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the national interests of the United States to provide information regarding the murder or kidnapping of United States citizens abroad to the victims, or the families of victims, of such crimes; and

(2) the provision of such information is sufficiently important that the discharge of the responsibility for identifying and disseminating such information should be vested in a cabinet-level officer of the United States Government.

(b) RESPONSIBILITY.—The Secretary of State shall take appropriate actions to ensure that the United States Government takes all appropriate actions to—

(1) identify promptly information (including classified information) in the possession of the departments and agencies of the United States Government regarding the murder or kidnapping of United States citizens abroad; and

(2) subject to subsection (c), make such information available to the victims or, where appropriate, the families of victims of such crimes.

(c) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall work with the Director of Central Intelligence to ensure that classified information relevant to a crime covered by subsection (b) is promptly reviewed and, to the maximum extent practicable without jeopardizing sensitive sources and methods or other vital national security interests, made available under that subsection.

SEC. 308. STANDARDS FOR SPELLING OF FOREIGN NAMES AND PLACES AND FOR USE OF GEOGRAPHIC COORDINATES.

(a) SURVEY OF CURRENT STANDARDS.—

(1) SURVEY.—The Director of Central Intelligence shall carry out a survey of current standards for the spelling of foreign names and places, and the use of geographic coordinates for such places, among the elements of the intelligence community.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act the Director shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the survey carried out under paragraph (1).

(b) GUIDELINES.—

(1) ISSUANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall issue guidelines to ensure the use of uniform spelling of foreign names and places and the uniform use of geographic coordinates for such places. The guidelines shall apply to all intelligence reports, intelligence products, and intelligence databases prepared and utilized by the elements of the intelligence community.

(2) BASIS.—The guidelines under paragraph (1) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be based on current United States Government standards for the transliteration of foreign names, standards for foreign place names developed by the Board on Geographic Names, and a standard set of geographic coordinates.

(3) SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—The Director shall submit a copy of the guidelines to the congressional intelligence committees.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''congressional intelligence committees'' means the following:

(1) The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 309. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that any tax legislation enacted by the Congress this year should meet a standard of fairness in its distributional impact on upper, middle and lower income taxpayers, and that any such legislation should not disproportionately benefit the highest income taxpayers.

TITLE IV—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

SEC. 401. MULTIYEAR LEASING AUTHORITY.

Section 5 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 403f) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (e), by striking out ''without regard'' and all that follows through the end and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (f) as paragraph (g); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (e) the following new paragraph (f):

''(f) Notwithstanding section 1341(a)(1) of title 31, United States Code, enter into multiyear leases for lease terms of not to exceed 15 years, except that—

''(1) any such lease shall be subject to the availability of appropriations in an amount necessary to cover—

''(A) rental payments over the entire term of the lease; or

''(B) rental payments over the first 12 months of the term of the lease and the penalty, if any, payable in the event of the termination of the lease at the end of the first 12 months of the term; and

''(2) if the Agency enters into a lease using the authority in subparagraph (1)(B)—

''(A) the lease shall include a clause that provides that the lease shall be terminated if specific appropriations available for the rental payments are not provided in advance of the obligation to make the rental payments;

''(B) notwithstanding section 1552 of title 31, United States Code, amounts obligated for paying costs associated with terminating the lease shall remain available until such costs are paid;

''(C) amounts obligated for payment of costs associated with terminating the lease may be used instead to make rental payments under the lease, but only to the extent that such amounts are not required to pay such costs; and

''(D) amounts available in a fiscal year to make rental payments under the lease shall be available for that purpose for not more than 12 months commencing at any time during the fiscal year; and''.

SEC. 402. SUBPOENA AUTHORITY FOR THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Subsection (e) of section 17 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 403q) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (7) as paragraphs (6) through (8), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph (5):

''(5)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Inspector General is authorized to require by subpoena the production of all information, documents, reports, answers, records, accounts, papers, and other data and documentary evidence necessary in the performance of the duties and responsibilities of the Inspector General.

''(B) In the case of Government agencies, the Inspector General shall obtain information, documents, reports, answers, records, accounts, papers, and other data and evidence for the purpose specified in subparagraph (A) using procedures other than subpoenas.

''(C) The Inspector General may not issue a subpoena for or on behalf of any other element or component of the Agency.

''(D) In the case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued under this paragraph, the subpoena shall be enforceable by order of any appropriate district court of the United States.

''(E) Not later than January 31 and July 31 of each year, the Inspector General shall submit to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report of the Inspector General's exercise of authority under this paragraph during the preceding six months.''.

(b) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY FOR PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY.—Subsection (b)(3) of that section is amended by inserting '', or from issuing any subpoena, after the Inspector General has decided to initiate, carry out, or complete such audit, inspection, or investigation or to issue such subpoena,'' after ''or investigation''.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 501. ACADEMIC DEGREES IN INTELLIGENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2161 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 2161. Joint Military Intelligence College: master of science in strategic intelligence; bachelor of science in intelligence

''Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the President of the Joint Military Intelligence College may, upon recommendation by the faculty of the college, confer the degree of master of science in strategic intelligence and the degree of bachelor of science in intelligence upon the graduates of the college who have fulfilled the requirements for such degree.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 2161 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 108 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''2161. Joint Military Intelligence College: master of science in strategic intelligence; bachelor of science in intelligence.''.

SEC. 502. FUNDING FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND QUALITY OF LIFE IMPROVEMENTS AT MENWITH HILL AND BAD AIBLING STATIONS.

Section 506(b) of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–93; 109 Stat. 974) is amended by striking out ''for fiscal years 1996 and 1997'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''for fiscal years 1998 and 1999''.

SEC. 503. MISUSE OF NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE NAME, INITIALS, OR SEAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 21 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 426. Unauthorized use of National Reconnaissance Office name, initials, or seal

''(a) PROHIBITED ACTS.—Except with the joint written permission of the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence, no person may knowingly use, in connection with any merchandise, retail product, impersonation, solicitation, or commercial activity, in a manner reasonably calculated to convey the impression that such use is approved, endorsed, or authorized by the Secretary or the Director, any of the following:

''(1) The words 'National Reconnaissance Office' or the initials 'NRO'.

''(2) The seal of the National Reconnaissance Office.

''(3) Any colorable imitation of such words, initials, or seal.

''(b) INJUNCTION.—(1) Whenever it appears to the Attorney General that any person is engaged or is about to engage in an act or practice which constitutes or will constitute conduct prohibited by subsection (a), the Attorney General may initiate a civil proceeding in a district court of the United States to enjoin such act or practice.

''(2) Such court shall proceed as soon as practicable to the hearing and determination of such action and may, at any time before final determination, enter such restraining orders or prohibitions, or take such other action as is warranted, to prevent injury to the United States or to any person or class of persons for whose protection the action is brought.''

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of that subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

''426. Unauthorized use of National Reconnaissance Office name, initials, or seal.''.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOSS moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 858, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 1775 as passed by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill 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.

A similar House bill (H.R. 1775) was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to S. 858 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees:

From the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of the Senate bill, and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. GOSS, YOUNG of Florida, LEWIS of California, SHUSTER, MCCOLLUM, CASTLE, BOEHLERT, BASS, GIBBONS, DICKS, DIXON, SKAGGS, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. SKELTON and Mr. BISHOP.

From the Committee on National Security, for consideration of defense tactical intelligence and related activities:

Messrs. SPENCE, STUMP, and DELLUMS.

There was no objection.

CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1997

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 187 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 187

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. 1853) to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. 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 committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except on a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], 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, this is a very simple resolution. The proposed rule is an open rule providing for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. The resolution waives points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(L)(6) of rule XI relating to the 3-day availability of the report.

After general debate, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. Furthermore, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the name of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides the Chair may accord priority recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the 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. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, under the proposed rule, each Member has an opportunity to have their concerns addressed, debated, and ultimately voted up or down by this body. House Resolution 187 was reported out of the Committee on Rules by a unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 187, which is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1853, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997.

This act is named for the long-time chairman of the Education and Labor Committee who was a champion of educational opportunity for all Americans but especially for those who would not attend college but needed skills in order to find a meaningful place in America's work force.

The continued availability of secondary and postsecondary vocational educational opportunities in concert with high economic goals is critical to ensuring that this Nation is equipped with a work force that can be competitive and productive in today's global economy.

I am concerned, however, that the bill reported by the Committee on Education and the Workforce does not direct the funding toward those secondary school districts most in need of funding for their vocation and technical education programs. I am also concerned the reported bill eliminates the act's original emphasis on ensuring that women, minorities, the economically disadvantaged, and the disabled have access to quality vocational and technical programs.

It is especially unfortunate that the committee bill eliminates the set-asides currently in the act which were created to ensure that there would be programs to serve displaced homemakers, single parents, and pregnant women to help them enter into employment that has traditionally not been open to women. In today's working environment it is critical all students be offered the opportunity created by these programs.

However, since the Committee on Rules has recommended an open rule, I am hopeful that the House will adopt amendments which can address these concerns. These programs represent long-term investments in the health of the economy of the United States, and it would be penny-wise and pound-foolish to shortchange opportunities for those who would benefit the most.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 187 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. 1853.

□ 1039

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. 1853) to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, with Mr. EWING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 1853, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997. The legislation assists the 75 percent of the American people who do not complete a 4-year college degree. Our youth should receive a high-quality education whether they are bound for college, the military, further training or directly into the work force.

Before I go further, I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of the committee and the staff for their support in the development of this important piece of legislation. In particular I would like to recognize the hard work of the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], Chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families. It was through his diligent commitment to a strong vocational-technical education program and many long hours of negotiations which have brought us here today.

I would also like to recognize another Pennsylvanian, Mr. PETERSON, who has also given an enormous amount of time in crafting this legislation. Mr. PETERSON represents an area of Pennsylvania in which vocational-technical education is critical, and we appreciate his help and expertise in the area.

I want to thank the subcommittee ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], who worked very closely with the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] to develop a bipartisan effort, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the ranking member of the full committee for the bipartisan effort put into this piece of legislation.

The legislation enjoys a broad coalition of support, and I hope we will pick up more support as we go through this process and then through conference with the Senate.

For far too long we paid little attention to the 75 percent of youth who do not go on and complete some 4-year college degree. Our youth should receive a high-quality education no matter what they plan to do in the future.

In today's vocational-technical education programs, students need a very high-quality education for today's world. These students need strong academics and relevant skills in order to thrive in today's economy.

In H.R. 1853, we have three overarching goals: strengthening academics; broadening the opportunities for vocational-technical education students; and sending more money to the classroom.

The bill, first of all, sends 90 percent of the money down to the local level. Under current law only 75 percent gets there.

Second, we alter the way the funds are distributed to ensure they are more equitably distributed. We are trying to make sure limited Federal dollars for vocational-technical education follow vocational-technical education students fairly and equitably.

The legislation strengthens the academic component of vocational-technical education programs, and this is so important because in 1950, 60 percent of all the jobs that were available were jobs that were unskilled. But by the time we got to 1990, that figure dropped to 35 percent. And by the year 2000 it is projected that only 15 percent of all jobs available will be for unskilled people. That is why this legislation is so important at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached, I believe, a bipartisan agreement, which is what our committee generally does when it comes to education, nutrition and child care issues. I do want to point out that there is no one that is a stronger advocate for programs that help, for instance, displaced homemakers than the person speaking and I have fought for them since I came to the Congress. And because of that, I want to make sure we understand that we have taken care of these concerns. We do not need any amendments to take care of displaced homemakers or other special populations. We have made very clear what we expect from this legislation.

As my colleagues will notice, we ensure that members of special populations meet State benchmarks, established under section 114, and are prepared for secondary education, further learning and high-skill and high-wage careers. Then there is a financial audit that follows to make very, very sure that the vocational-technical education programs adhere to the requirements of the act, including those related to special populations.

We also make it very clear that each State that receives an allotment under section 102 shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary a report on how the State is performing on State benchmarks that relate to vocational-technical education programs, including special populations. The report submitted by the State, in accordance with subparagraph A, shall include a description of how special populations, displaced homemakers, single parents, single pregnant women participating in vocational-technical education programs have met the vocational-technical education benchmarks established by the State.

We also say that the funds provided under this act may support programs at the local level for displaced homemakers, single pregnant women, and individuals in nontraditional occupations that lead to high-skilled, high-wage end careers.

□ 1045

We also indicate that local funds can be used for programs for single parents, displaced homemakers, and single pregnant women. In all of those sections, we point out the need to serve special populations.

I hope that we can pass this legislation today with an overwhelming vote and send a message to the Senate that we are ready to do business with the other body.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Each year the Perkins Act helps over 10 million vocational students receive high-quality education, to receive jobs and skill training and to receive support services. That is our country's flagship vocational education program. We have worked with our Republican colleagues for several months to resolve differences concerning reauthorization of this act and have reached a fair compromise in the way States distribute vocational education funds to the local educational agencies.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman, for resolving these difficult issues.

The bill as reported by the committee would have resulted in a significant reduction in funding for existing vocational education programs in urban and rural areas. The bipartisan agreement reached on the formula that will be offered later by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] preserves formula allocations for existing vocational education programs for the first 3 years, and it provides for the gradual implementation of a formula based 60 percent on poverty and 40 percent on population.

Although some of us would have preferred maintaining the existing Perkins Act formula for all 5 years of reauthorization, this, however, is a fair, good faith compromise that will ensure the continuation of all local programs.

Mr. Chairman, the bill also strengthens the integration of academics and vocational education to ensure that vocational education programs are academically challenging.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill needs additional improvement with regard to women, especially for displaced homemakers and those entering nontraditional employment. Later this morning, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] will offer amendments which are designed to achieve gender equity in vocational education, and despite what was said, it is needed, Mr. Chairman.

I hope that our colleagues will support this amendment and support the reauthorization bill.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the subcommittee chairman, who was so instrumental in bringing the legislation to the floor.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman, for yielding me the time.

I want to say good morning to the Speaker and my colleagues and tell them that I am glad to stand before them today in very strong support of the very important Federal education statute, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997.

This bill reforms and reauthorizes, in my view, one of the most important Federal education statutes. It provides support for vocational and technical education programs, which are extremely important for meeting the needs, as I think the chairman has already mentioned, of the 75 percent of our young people who are not college bound, or who, if they go to college, will not complete college with a 4-year degree.

I worry a little bit that, particularly at this point in time, when we find ourselves debating a number of tax incentives, to make the third and fourth years of education more affordable, more accessible to young people, that we might look past the fact, again, that most of our young people are not college bound, or, if they go to college, they will not complete college with a 4-year degree.

Because we do have, I think, a very legitimate interest and a real Federal role in helping to prepare those young people for the work force. That is, I believe, in our national defense interest as a country. And, of course, we always have an interest at the Federal level in attempting to help to prepare and educate our young people to sustain our democracy.

So I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of our committee for their contributions to this legislation. I want to thank, in particular, of course, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman, for his strong leadership in the area of vocational and technical education over the years, not just at the Federal level, but also in support of some very well-established vocational institutions in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and in his congressional district.

Speaking of Pennsylvania, I want to thank a new member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON] for his help on this legislation. He was a cosponsor of H.R. 1853 and has worked with us very diligently to help ensure passage of the bill.

This bill is very much bipartisan in nature. And for that, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, my very good friend, and the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee which I chair.

We have tried to generate a broad base of support for this legislation and a bill that both sides of the aisle can support and that, hopefully, can be signed into law by the President. It is absolutely critical, my colleagues, that our young people receive a high-quality education, whether they are bound for college, whether they are going to enter the military, which is still the largest training institution in the world, or whether they are going to go directly into the work force.

Three themes resonate throughout this bill. You might call these three themes the ABC's of vocational-technical education: Strengthening academics, broadening opportunities, and sending more money to the classroom.

The first and most important goal, of course, is strengthening academics. And what we have tried to do in this legislation is combine strong academics with expanded vocational and technical education opportunities for young people.

The second theme, of course, is broadening opportunities for young people after high school. We heard testimony at a field hearing just across the Potomac River in northern Virginia at Thomas Jefferson High School in Fairfax County, VA, that there are currently 18,000 jobs, and these are high-wage, high-skill jobs, that are currently unfilled in northern Virginia because employers and business owners cannot find the job applicants to fill those positions.

We do not have an education system that prepares enough of our young people to be technologically capable for the work force and to have, if you will, the work force literacy skills, the entry skills that they will need to go out there and compete and succeed in the work force.

The average salary for those unfilled positions in northern Virginia, we heard, is over $45,000. That is the starting annual salary for those positions on average. If we are going to ensure that America meets the next century as a world leader, we have to focus on making sure that our citizens have the technological skills to compete in an ever-more global economy. If the global economy today is the size of a beach ball, the global economy of the 21st century, the brave new world just around the corner, is going to be the size a golf ball. What we are trying to do here is bring the Perkins vocational-technical education statute into the 21st century.

The last thing that I want to mention is that we are in this bill driving more money down to the classroom. My colleagues are going to see that theme, that effort, repeated in every major Federal education bill that we bring to the House floor in this session of Congress. We want to get more money down to the local level, into the classroom, and not into the hands of someone who does not know that child's name. That is our goal.

In this bill we send 90 percent of the funds to the local level. If we are going to see real change in vocational-technical education, it is not going to come from the Federal level, it is going to come from the local level, from teachers in the classroom making a difference. Change is going to come from schools like the new technology high school in Napa County, CA, in my district, which is preparing students to enter a high technology career or to go on to college.

We have worked very closely, as I mentioned earlier, with Members on the other side of the aisle trying to form a bipartisan agreement on this bill. We have made well over 60 changes to this legislation to date to accommodate the request of House Democratic

Members, members of the committee, 60 changes since the date of introducing the bill to passage of the bill by the committee.

In fact, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], the ranking member of the subcommittee, wrote me a letter on June 4 outlining several concerns he had with the discussion draft of the legislation, the bill that I had introduced; and I can now say that we have met the concerns of all the areas he addressed, including the substate formula.

The chairman explained the compromise that we have worked out on the formula. However, I wanted to point out for the record that we developed a substate formula in this bill which more equitably distributes funding throughout the States and more appropriately distributes money for students in vocational and technical education programs.

This formula does not take money away from cities or poor areas. And under our bill, I believe that almost all school districts will gain. H.R. 1853 is a good bill. It is a fair bill. It is a bill that is going to do a better job in preparing our young people for the educational and employment opportunities of the 21st century, and I urge its passage.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member of the full committee for yielding me time.

I am pleased to join the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], my ranking member, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the chairmen of the full committee and subcommittee, in bringing this bill before the House today.

H.R. 1853, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997 have been the subject of many hours of discussion between myself and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], with the aim of producing a bipartisan bill we can all support.

While not being absolutely perfect, this legislation has gained my support and I believe should gain the support of my colleagues due to the changes that have been made and the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Upon the expiration of general debate, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman, will present us with the manager's amendment to this bill, which deals with one of the most fundamental concerns the committee Democrats had during the markup.

That was the secondary substate formula. Instead of the reported bill's provision, which deemphasized poverty and allowed the States to withhold dollars which should go out by formula, the manager's amendment would incorporate a bipartisan compromise which affects the funding stream for existing vocational education programs.

This new formula gradually incorporates a slightly less targeted distribution method over a 5-year period. At the end of the five-year period, funds going down to the secondary school districts will go out based on a formula of 60 percent poverty, 40 percent population.

Unfortunately, the one issue that clouds a fuller bipartisan embrace of this legislation is its termination of programs ensuring gender equity. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the ranking member, mentioned a minute ago, my colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] will offer an amendment to rectify this situation.

I strongly urge careful consideration of this amendment. I would like to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the ranking member, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman, and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] for the work on this bill.

Dealing with the more difficult issues which this reauthorization presents took many hours of both Members' time and staff time. However, as we have done on other bills which we have passed out of the House during this Congress out of our committee, we put our partisan differences aside and reached an agreement that we could all support.

I urge the Members on my side to support this bill.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER], a very distinguished member of the subcommittee and the chairman.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak in favor of H.R. 1853, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments. As a businessman who had to hire many people through my business lifetime, the most frustrating thing that occurs is when a person requests to fill out an application for work but they do not have time and they ask to be able to take that application home with them. One knows then they cannot read or write, which one we do not know. But they still want a job.

Primary and secondary education did not provide what is necessary. That person is trapped in that never-never land of joblessness and unemployability. Job training is their only way out. Giving them some help through vocational and technical training gives them a chance.

Please vote for H.R. 1853.

□ 1100

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge passage of this legislation. While bringing bipartisan support for this bill has not been easy, it has come about, and I believe that is both significant and important.

There are several provisions of this bill that are commendable. The ''such sums'' authorizations, for instance, gives us room to seek a significant increase in funding for vocational education.

The separate authorization for tech prep is a noteworthy accomplishment. This is a highly successful and popular program. It has done well in appropriations and should certainly grow in the years ahead.

The provisions of the reserve for Indian programs are good, and I am especially encouraged that we have made bureau funded secondary schools eligible to receive funds under the within State allocation of the basic State grant.

We also permit private schoolteachers to participate in professional development programs in both Goals 2000 and the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, and I am especially glad that we permit the States and localities to do so in this legislation.

The formula regarding the within State allocation of funds has been improved and refined through this reauthorization process. While I certainly support the changes that have been made, I continue to believe that the formula can be further improved and targeted.

In another area, I regret very much that we have weakened current law with respect to sex equity. That is something I have been pushing for my 21 years here in the Congress, and I think that the role of the sex equity coordinator has been very important and I will be supporting the Mink-Morella amendment when that is offered.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a good bill, even though I believe there are several areas where it can be improved. I intend to support the floor amendments and will continue to work in the conference for improvements.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman of the full committee.

In section 103(c)(1) of the legislation now under consideration, secondary school programs in schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs will no longer be eligible to receive assistance under the reserve of funds for Indian programs. Am I correct in that assumption?

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

Mr. KILDEE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KILDEE. I understand, however, that the provision in question is included in this legislation in order to make it clear that the bureau funded schools with secondary vocational programs will be considered a local education agency eligible for funding

under the within State allocation of funds under the basic State grant.

Mr. GOODLING. That is also correct. In accordance with provisions of section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, bureau funded schools are local educational agencies. Thus they would qualify for funding under the basic State grant. Bureau funded schools will receive vocational education funding assistance from the within State allocation of funds and will qualify for such assistance in the same manner as would any other local education agency in the State.

Mr. KILDEE. The purpose of the language in section 103(c)(1), therefore, is to make bureau funded schools eligible for funding under the within State allocation of funds. Making such schools ineligible for funding under section 103(c)(1) removes any question of the source of funding, as well as any question of whether or not such schools are eligible to receive funding from more than one source. The intent of our language is to make clear that funding for bureau funded schools operating secondary programs will come as a result of the eligibility of those schools to receive assistance under section 202 of this legislation, which amends part B of title II of current law.

Mr. GOODLING. That too is correct. I would point out, however, that bureau funded schools that have operated adult education programs would remain eligible to receive funding under section 103(c)(1) pertaining to the reserve of funds for Indian programs. The provision making bureau funded schools ineligible to receive section 103(c)(1) funding applies only to secondary school programs at such schools.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that specific clarification, and I thank the gentleman for joining with me in this colloquy.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. It is much needed. I want to observe, too, with the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] and certainly the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the subcommittee chairman, that we have an excellent example here, maybe exhibit A, of how well we can work together on a bipartisan basis and better serve or genuinely serve the needs of the people. I think this is an excellent example of how we can move forward without partisan bickering.

I also want to say that this particular subject is very near and dear to me. I have always been devoted to vocational education, but I must say in the modern global economy and the acceleration of technology, this legislation is more important than ever. We can no longer ignore those students whose talents are wasted because they never go to college. It is not only a waste for them but it is a waste for the needs of our economy.

Excellent example—exhibit A of how well we can work on a bipartisan basis to better serve the genuine needs of the people. The modern acceleration of technology and increasing competition in the global economy require us to rethink our approach to education. We can no longer ignore * * * and therefore waste the talents of the vast numbers of students who never go to college. There exists a yawning gap between those students who are prepared and unprepared to enter our high-skills workplace.

As a result, our economy suffers. If we are to meet our work force demands we must have effective technology schools, such as Sussex Tech in Sussex County, NJ. Bergen technical school, Passaic and Warren County schools.

I have a particular longstanding interest in improving the relevance of vocational education. This legislation does this.

We need to continue to improve the national school-to-work system—a system that would emphasize technological developments.

This legislation makes several beneficial changes to vocational education. First of all, this bill eliminates set-asides which have prohibited a particular State's ability to adjust to its own special populations. With this change, a State can assess and address its own needs.

We need desperately to continue to improve the national school-to-work system, and this legislation does that in a very real way. It makes several beneficial changes to the vocational bill. It certainly eliminates set-asides which have prohibited a particular State's ability in the past to adjust to its own special populations. I think this represents progress. With this change, a State can assess and address its own needs.

The legislation also emphasizes sending funds to the local level. With the passage of this legislation, 90 percent of the funds will be headed to the local level to provide programs to prepare our youth for the technological age.

This legislation makes an important change to assist rural and suburban areas in the lowering of the minimum grant amount for local educational agencies and postsecondary institutions. This change is helpful because it will allow more schools to apply for grants, since they will be more likely to become eligible.

The legislation also emphasizes sending funds to the local level. With the passage of this legislation, 90 percent of the funds will be headed to the local level to provide programs to prepare our youth for the technological age. It makes important changes to assist rural and suburban areas as well as the urban areas, to get the needed minimum grant for local educational agencies and postsecondary institutions. This is a great improvement over the past.

This legislation also includes a provision which requires States to establish their own State benchmarks to measure their progress. The States are to annually submit a report to the Secretary on how they are preforming on their State benchmarks. I am a strong believer in benchmarks since they help provide oversight and they help determine the effectiveness of various programs.

This legislation will help us achieve the goal of providing our youth a higher level of technology training. This will provide greater access to a system that would allow these students to build a high-quality, high-value high-wage career.

School to work—relevant education for personal fulfillment and meet economic needs.

Mr. Chairman, may I conclude by simply saying that school-to-work is relevant education, not only for personal fulfillment of the students involved but also to meet our vast economic needs in the new brave world in which we are operating.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON], who has been very active in helping us put this legislation together.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the ranking members, for working together to put together a bill that I think will make a positive difference in vocational education in America.

I would also like to commend the staff, Becky Voslow, Sally Lovejoy, and Alex Nock, who worked tirelessly together. We all know, when doing compromises, who really does a lot of the hard work. I want to commend them for all their efforts.

I believe if this country is going to compete, if we are going to continue to be a manufacturing leader in the world, and I do not think we will be a strong country if we do not, we have to improve our ability to deliver vocational and technical education. I think this bill moves us in the right direction. It does not solve all the problems. I toured a plant in Blossburg, PA, in my district this week that is doing something very interesting. That plant employs about 1,000 people in one of the most rural parts of Pennsylvania and is growing fast. They have brought to Pennsylvania a Japanese technology, refined it; these things used to be made for Japanese cars, these parts, in Japan. They are now being manufactured in Pennsylvania. But that plant is high technology. There has been a huge investment made there. The workers there need skills and a good academic base. That is important in this country.

I recently also toured a plant in State College. If one buys a Japanese TV, there is a very good chance the picture tube came from State College, PA, because they are really becoming a dominant player in that market. Again, huge investment of capital and

very high tech jobs. They are not strong backs and strong arms that are needed but technical knowhow.

This bill moves more funds to the classroom, 15 percent more. I think that makes a big difference. We need to get the money in the classroom. Many of our arguments have been the Federal rules that we want to put down on the States. I come from State government. State government bureaucracies do not need us to tell them all the fine details of educating our youngsters. It is important that we allow them to be free. Because what we have when we have a lot of Federal rules, we have a Federal bureaucracy, and if we go into most State departments of education, the majority of the people working there are dealing with implementing the Federal rules. So we have all of this money wasted at the Federal level and at the State level that should be going to the classroom.

The other issue that we struggled over was the rural set-aside. I was disappointed in the great opposition for that because rural America is way behind urban America in vocational education. If this country is going to remain strong, rural America needs to have equity. We need to be able to train the young people. Many parts of rural America do not have vocational education. All we wanted to do was to have a 10-percent set-aside that allowed States to meet that need if they wanted to.

We were not against money for urban. Urban has always been the big winner when we look at the formula. We were disappointed but we do accept the compromise of five and give. But I would like to say to my urban friends, in the future, rural America, if we are not going to be an imposition on the welfare rolls, we have to be able to train our workers, and vocational education is one of the ways we need to do that.

I want to thank all of those that compromised. There may have been a little more compromise than I would have liked, but I am willing to accept it today and move this bill forward.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, while I commend and congratulate all of those who have hammered out this agreement, I have some concerns about it. There seems to be a theme that resonates throughout this Congress, and that theme is to take from the poor and give to the wealthy, well-to-do and the rich. It is the very theme that divides rather than unites. It is the theme that shatters millions of Americans' hope and faith in the American system. It seems to me that some portions of this compromise continues that theme. This compromise, while better than the original proposed formula, moves away from the emphasis on poverty to an emphasis on population in fiscal years 2001 and 2002. Under the current distribution formula for funds for school districts, the emphasis is 70 percent on poverty and 30 percent on population. I believe that this is a fair formula.

In my district, Mr. Chairman, I have thousands and thousands of disadvantaged, underprivileged individuals who need to catch up, individuals who need special attention. I do not believe that as we shift away from an emphasis on need to an across-the-board program, that this is in the best interests of rural America, nor is it in the best interests of inner-city urban America.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I want to commend the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Pennsylvania for their excellent work and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle that serve on this committee. My colleagues may have heard me applauding a few minutes ago when the gentleman from Pennsylvania made his remarks, because I regret the fact that the chairman reached, I think, the right conclusion in the face of opposition to cut the rural set-aside from 10 to 5 percent. I think that was inappropriate pressure from the other side of the aisle. I think they should not be anti-rural in their actions. Nevertheless, this bill has many important features that are positive.

H.R. 1853, for example, most importantly alters the amount of dollars spent at the local level. Under the current law, only 75 percent of Federal dollars currently are required to flow to the local school districts. This bill, of course, in a very important change, requires 90 percent of those dollars to go to the local level. Any true changes in vocational technical education must come from the local level, from teachers who are in the classroom, to make a difference.

Mr. Chairman, I am also pleased that this legislation contains two important components to assist rural communities and schools. Not as much as I had hoped but a big and important change, especially in the longer term. One provision, of course, encourages the States and permits them to set aside a portion of the funds flowing to the local level to target rural or nonmetropolitan areas. This provision provides States with discretion in the equitable distribution of funds throughout the State. An additional provision lowers the minimum grants for secondary and postsecondary programs, enabling more schools to qualify.

□ 1115

Mr. Chairman, I think that is a very important change, it is long needed, and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] very much for his diligent work on this.

Mr. Chairman, 75 percent of American youth do not complete a 4-year college degree. This bill appropriately changes the way funds are distributed from the Federal Government to the States by targeting the funds more directly to the youth and young adults up to age 24 which are served by the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act. This legislation broadens opportunities after high school for vocational-technical education students by ensuring that they receive a high-quality education which will allow them to continue on to college or further education, the military, training or directly into the work force.

In addition, H.R. 1853 most importantly alters the amount of dollars sent to the local level. Under current law, only 75 percent of Federal dollars currently are required to flow to the local school districts. This bill requires 90 percent of the dollars to go to the local level. Any true change in vocational-technical education must come from the local level—from teachers who are in the classroom making a difference. The increased funding that H.R. 1853 sends to the local level in this Member's home State of Nebraska will result in a $52,000 increase for the Lincoln Public School System, a $3,000 increase for the York Public Schools, an increase of $1,600 for the Wahoo Public Schools, $700 more for the Homer Community Schools, a $2,200 increase for Nebraska City Public Schools, and $8,000 more in funding for the Norfolk Public Schools, just to name a few.

This Member is also pleased that H.R. 1853 contains two important components to assist rural schools. One provision enables States to set aside a portion of the funds flowing to the local level to target rural areas. This provision provides States with discretion in the equitable distribution of funds throughout the State. An additional provision lowers the minimum grant for secondary and postsecondary programs, enabling more small schools to qualify.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. This is an important reform bill, and it deserves to be supported.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE], a very important member of the committee.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] for yielding this time to me, and I do congratulate Chairman GOODLING and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] and the staff of this committee, which is rapidly becoming the committee that seems to work out very difficult legislation and bring it to the floor with a minimum amount of opposition and really do something to improve education in America, and I do rise in very strong support of this legislation.

We have to remember that about 75 percent of our Nation's youth does not receive a 4-year college degree, and in order to ensure that that percentage of our population is going to thrive in today's economy, in my judgment it is

imperative they receive a quality high school education, meaning relevant skills and strong academics, whether they are bound for college, the military, further training, or go directly into the work force.

In the past, vocational-technical education policy encouraged the development of specific occupational programs in areas such as trade and industry, business, and home economics. It targeted students with special needs such as displaced homemakers and single mothers, and today we realize mandating specific uses of dollars at the federal level does not necessarily add up to a quality vocational education.

It is time for Federal policy to give more discretion to States and local districts, which are and always have been the true laboratories of reform.

I just like to share my experiences in Delaware, which has an outstanding vocational education program. In fact, one of our State's three vocational-technical high schools, Sussex Technical High School in Georgetown, DE, was honored as a U.S. Department of Education blue ribbon school of excellence. This occurred after the school went through a paradigm shift similar to the paradigm shift we are seeing in the legislation we are considering today. It transformed itself from a center serving part-time students into a full-time technical high school offering a rigorous integrated program of academic and vocational studies to kids who actually choose to attend. In 1988, students from this school scored at the bottom of the heap on standardized tests, and enrollment had declined 35 percent in 10 years. After a massive restructuring effort in 1988, Sussex Tech became a full-time comprehensive high school with a challenging program of study organized around relevant career clusters. The result has been a dramatic improvement in SAT scores and in the number of students taking the SAT, a dropout rate of less than 2 percent, soaring enrollment in college prep level math courses and a 100-percent increase in percentage of students enrolling in postsecondary education.

The bill we consider today encompasses the main principles of this paradigm shift which I was able to witness in my own State. It strengthens the academics of vocational-technical education students, broadens the opportunities of vocational-technical education students and sends more dollars to the local level for vocational-technical education programs, and I encourage each and every one of us to support this very outstanding piece of legislation.

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I too rise in strong support of this legislation and in praise of the leaders of the committee and the fine staff.

The educational needs of our youth indeed have changed since 1917, which was when the Federal Government first began to support vocational education. Today, still, vocational-technical education programs fill a very critical need.

As my colleague from Delaware indicated, the programs prepare 75 percent of American youths who do not complete a 4-year degree for jobs requiring advanced training and knowledge. The programs demand a strong background in math and science, as they should, and students have to be prepared for the technical and competitive jobs that exist today.

I know this because I have frequently visited with students and teachers and wonderful facilities throughout my district who use and support these programs, and they strongly support it. The bill before us today builds on that success. It encourages stronger academics, greater opportunities for use after high school and targets more dollars to the classroom. In fact, 90 percent of the Federal dollars will be sent to the local level under this bill, and that is how it should be.

Finally, I am also pleased that the bill preserves the strength of the very popular tech prep program. In southwest Michigan this program has quickly become an integral part of students' learning experience.

Our businesses today are rightly demanding a better prepared work force. This bill helps in a major way, and I urge all members to support H.R. 1853.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HILLEARY], an important new member of our committee.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1853, and I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and his staff for their hard work. This legislation reforms and repeals a number of burdensome and arcane provisions, including set-asides for criminal offenders and unfunded mandates on local and State governments.

More importantly, H.R. 1853 sends more money directly to the local level, a 15-percent increase over current law. It reduces the amount of money that a State can hold for administrative purposes from 5 to 2 percent and ensures that Federal dollars are being used to support programs and not to sustain bureaucracies.

Another important provision of H.R. 1853 that is especially important for rural districts like mine in Tennessee protects the right of home schoolers to educate their children at home. Further, this legislation prohibits vocational-technical education programs from requiring individuals to choose or pursue a specific career path or measure.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation that will help educate some of our Nation's children who need it the most and preserve the right of every child in a vocational-technical education program to receive a well-rounded education.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I do that just to again thank the staff who worked so hard:

Becky Voslow, Mary Clagett, Vic Klatt, Sally Lovejoy; staff Republican members Mark Davis, Trent Barton with the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS]; Bob Moran with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON]; Democratic committee staff Alex Nock, June Harris, Mark Zuckerman, David Evans; Congressional Research Service for all the thousands of formula runs that they made trying to get one that would fit one of our colleagues on committee from New Jersey; it was very difficult to do; and Rick Appling and Wayne Riddle.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support of H.R. 1853, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997. Seventy-five percent of American youth do not complete a 4-year college degree. Vocational-technical education programs ensure that the necessary training and a high quality education is available to those individuals. Our society is increasingly reliant on workers who have technological skills and advanced training, making the support of these programs critical to our economy.

I am especially pleased that this legislation ensures that States, localities, and parents have maximum control over decisions affecting these programs and students—and makes certain that 90 percent of each State allocation goes to local districts.

By helping young people to acquire these necessary skills, we are improving the opportunities available for our youth and helping our businesses to compete in the technologically advanced, global economy.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank the chairman and members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce for their work with bringing the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act to the House floor today. I am pleased that H.R. 1853 includes language which enables Oregon to continue its integrated K–14 education and training system.

Oregon has a unique set of regional partnerships composed of secondary and postsecondary schools. Oregon's consortium structure increases student achievement and promotes high skill standards by making better professional technical programs available in a cost-effective manner to remote and sparsely populated areas.

Oregon's innovative programs continue to do an outstanding job preparing our students for the education and working challenges of the 21st century. It is my hope that other States will take a look at Oregon's regional consortiums, and consider this model to improve the teaching and learning of all our students.

I thank the chairman and members of the committee for including this important language for Oregon in H.R. 1853.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this important legislation to reauthorize the Carl Perkins Act. These programs are making great strides in improving technical education in my State of Oregon and across this Nation.

Most of my colleagues need no reminder that the high-tech industry has become one of the most important forces behind our surging, economy, and has produced millions of new manufacturing and information-technology jobs in this decade. In fact, the electronics and information technology industry employed more than 4 million American workers in 1995, and the average wage of a high-tech worker is nearly 60-percent higher than that of the average private sector worker. However, I am repeatedly told by high-tech companies in my State that we're still not educating enough workers with adequate science, math and engineering training to fill those jobs.

The Carl Perkins Act educates over 10,000 students each year through a variety of vocational education programs that have been shown to be highly successful in helping to prepare students for high-tech careers. In my State, the number of Professional Technical students is increasing by 9 percent annually and should reach 35 percent by the year 2000.

I am pleased that we have reached a reasonable compromise on the funding formulas and have partially restored the size of the minimum grants to local education agencies. While I do not believe that we should alter these formulas, it is beneficial that we have been able to reach a consensus and hopefully reauthorize spending on these vital programs. I commend and congratulate the distinguished chairman, the subcommittee chairman and the ranking members for their hard work in doing this.

I would like to mention my satisfaction with one measure in this bill that would allow secondary and postsecondary schools to join in consortia to allow professional technical education to be delivered in a continuum from grades 9 through 14.

Under a waiver granted by the Secretary of Education, Oregon has already developed 10 such regional consortia that serve half of the eligible students. These consortia are common sense and cost-effective means of improving vocational education. In establishing the consortia, we have not only increased the number of students involved in the programs, but have improved professional technical education by engaging the entire community, including local businesses, to provide continuous quality improvement.

I am pleased that we have been able to address this bill, and continue providing these important programs to advance the technical educations of so many students across the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for H.R. 1853, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Act Amendments of 1997. This important legislation reauthorizes and revises the current vocational education statute.

H.R. 1853 focuses on strengthening the academics of vocational training for those among our Nation's youth who do not earn a 4-year college degree. In doing so, it ensures the overall quality of vocational education and provides special populations with access to high quality vocational education.

As the Nation moves individuals from the welfare rolls to the work force, and as the Nation enters the 21st century, it is essential that welfare recipients and other disadvantaged Americans have access to the education and vocational training they need to effectively compete in the new job market.

Vocational programs are critical. As such, they broaden career opportunities for the 75 percent of high school students who do not earn college degrees. They also equip many of our Nation's disadvantaged and disabled populations to compete for high paying jobs, build careers, and raise the standard of living for their families.

In 1994 the U.S. Census Bureau reported that individuals with an associates degree earned an average of $2,000 more per year than those with only a high school diploma. According to the Department of Labor, the number of low-skilled jobs is expected to decline from 47 percent of the work force in 1993 to 27 percent in the year 2000—and—it is expected that nearly half of all jobs in the 21st century will require some post-secondary education.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments. It is vitally important that the Nation's new work force receive effective education and vocational training. Support of this legislation is one means of ensuring its accessibility.

Vote "yes" for H.R. 1818.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. 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 printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1853

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 "Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE OF ACT.—Section 1(a) of the Act is amended by striking "(a) SHORT TITLE.—" and further by striking "Vocational and Applied Technology" and inserting "Vocational-Technical".

(b) REFERENCES TO ACT.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a title, chapter, part, subpart, section, subsection, or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a title, chapter, part, subpart, section, subsection, or other provision of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technology Education Act as amended in subsection (a).

SEC. 3. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Section 1(b) is repealed.

SEC. 4. PURPOSE.

Section 2 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

"It is the purpose of this Act to develop more fully the academic, occupational, and technical skills of individuals participating in vocational-technical education programs. This purpose will be achieved through concentrating resources on improving vocational-technical education programs leading to academic and technical skill competencies needed to work in a technologically advanced society.".

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 3 of the Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "$1,600,000,000" and all that follows and inserting "$1,300,000,000, for fiscal year 1998 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years to carry out the provisions of titles I and II.";

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) TITLE I.—Of the amounts made available under subsection (a)—

"(1) 1.5 percent shall be reserved to carry out section 103, relating to Indian and Native Hawaiians programs; and

"(2) 0.2 percent shall be reserved to carry out section 101A, relating to the territories."; and

(3) by striking subsections (c) through (f).

TITLE I—VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES

SEC. 101. ALLOTMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I is amended by striking the matter preceding the text of section 101 and inserting the following:

"TITLE I—VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES

"PART A—ALLOTMENT AND ALLOCATION"

"SEC. 101. ALLOTMENT.".

(b) ALLOTMENT.—

(1) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 101(a) are amended to read as follows:

"(a) SPECIFIC POPULATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In each fiscal year, from amounts made available under section 3(a), the Secretary shall reserve—

"(A) 1.5 percent to carry out section 103, of which—

"(i) 1.25 percent shall be available to carry out section 103(c); and

"(ii) 0.25 percent shall be available to carry out section 103(i); and

"(B) 0.2 percent for the purpose of carrying out section 101A.

"(2) REMAINDER OF FUNDS.—From the remainder of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 3, the Secretary shall allot to each State for each fiscal year—

"(A) an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 percent of the sums being allotted as the product of the population aged 15 to 19 inclusive, in the State in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; and

"(B) an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 percent of the sums being allotted as the product of the population aged 20 to 24, inclusive, in the State in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States."

(2) Paragraph (3) of section 101(a) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (C);

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (D) as (A) and (B), respectively;

(C) in subparagraph (A), as redesignated, by striking clause (i), and inserting the following:

"(i) Notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B) and clause (ii), no State shall receive less than ½ of 1 percent of the amount available for each such program for each fiscal year under this subsection."; and

(D) in subparagraph (A)(ii), as redesignated, by striking "or part A, B, C, D, or E of title III".

(3) By amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) ALLOTMENT RATIO.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The allotment ratio for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of—

"(A) 0.50; and

"(B) the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income for the State by the per capita income for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands), except that—

''(i) the allotment ratio in no case shall be more than 0.55 or less than 0.40; and

''(ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 0.55.

''(2) ALLOTMENT RATIOS.—The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Secretary for each fiscal year between October 1 and December 31 of the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made. Allotment ratios shall be computed on the basis of the average of the appropriate per capita incomes for the 3 most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data are available.

''(3) DEFINITION.—The term 'per capita income' means, with respect to a fiscal year, the total personal income in the calendar year ending in such year, divided by the population of the area concerned in such year.

''(4) POPULATION DETERMINATION.—For the purposes of this section, population shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the latest estimates available to the Department.''.

SEC. 101A. THE TERRITORIES.

Section 101A of the Act is amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) RESTRICTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau shall not receive any funds under this part for any fiscal year that begins after September 30, 2001.''.

SEC. 102. WITHIN STATE ALLOTMENTS.

Section 102 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1) by striking ''at least'' and all that follows through the semicolon and inserting ''an amount equal to not less than 90 percent of the allotment shall be available for basic programs under part B of title II;'';

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively;

(D) in paragraph (2), as redesignated, by striking ''8.5'' and inserting ''8'' and further by adding after the semicolon ''and'';

(E) in paragraph (3), as redesignated—

(i) by striking ''5'' and inserting ''2'';

(ii) by striking ''of which—'' and all that follows through ''and'' at the end and inserting the following:

''which may be used for the costs of—

''(A) developing the State application;

''(B) reviewing local applications;

''(C) monitoring and evaluating program effectiveness; and

''(D) assuring compliance with all applicable Federal laws.''; and

(F) by striking paragraph (5);

(2) in subsection (b) by striking ''(a)(4)'' and inserting ''(a)(3)''; and

(3) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) RURAL RESERVE.—A State may reserve not more than 10 percent of the allotment made under section 102(a)(1) to use for grants to rural areas.

''(d) INCENTIVE AWARDS.—A State may reserve not more than 5 percent of the allotment made under section 102(a)(1) to make awards—

''(1) to a local eligible recipient that meets or exceeds the State benchmarks described in section 114;

''(2) to a local eligible recipient that meets or exceeds the average State graduation rate; or

''(3) to assist a local eligible recipient that has significantly failed to meet the State benchmarks described in section 114, or has a graduation rate that is significantly below the average State graduation rate.''

SEC. 103. INDIAN AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN PROGRAMS.

Section 103 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 103. NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAM.

''(a) INDIAN POLICY.—All programs assisted under this section shall be administered in a manner consistent with the principles of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.) and the government-to-government relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribal governments.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

''(1) ALASKA NATIVE.—The term 'Alaska Native' means a Native as such term is defined in section 3(b) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602(b)).

''(2) BUREAU FUNDED.—The term 'Bureau funded school' means—

''(A) a Bureau school;

''(B) a contract school; or

''(C) a school for which assistance is provided under the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988.

''(3) INDIAN, INDIAN TRIBE, AND TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The terms 'Indian', 'Indian tribe', and 'tribal organization' have the meanings given such terms in subsections (d), (e), and (l), respectively, of section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

''(4) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given such term in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a)).

''(5) NATIVE HAWAIIAN AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN ORGANIZATION.—The terms 'Native Hawaiian' and 'Native Hawaiian organization' have the meanings given such terms in paragraphs (1) and (3), respectively, of section 9212 of the Native Hawaiian Education Act (20 U.S.C. 7912).

''(6) TRIBALLY CONTROLLED COMMUNITY COLLEGE.—The term 'tribally controlled community college' has the meaning given such term in section 2(a)(4) of the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1801(a)(4)).

''(7) TRIBALLY CONTROLLED POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term 'tribally controlled postsecondary vocational institution' means an institution of higher education that—

''(A) is formally controlled, or has been formally sanctioned or chartered, by the governing body of an Indian tribe or Indian tribes;

''(B) offers a technical degree or certificate granting program;

''(C) is governed by a board of directors or trustees, a majority of whom are Indians;

''(D) demonstrates adherence to stated goals, a philosophy, or a plan of operation, that fosters individual Indian economic and self-sufficiency opportunity, including programs that are appropriate to stated tribal goals of developing individual entrepreneurships and self-sustaining economic infrastructures on reservations;

''(E) has been in operation for at least 3 years;

''(F) holds accreditation with or is a candidate for accreditation by a nationally recognized accrediting authority for postsecondary vocational-technical education; and

''(G) enrolls the full-time equivalent of not less than 100 students, of whom a majority are Indians.

''(c) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts reserved under section 101(a)(1)(A)(i), the Secretary shall make grants to Indian tribes, tribal organizations and Alaska Native entities to carry out the authorized programs described in subsection (d), except that such terms shall not include secondary school programs in Bureau funded schools.

''(2) SPECIAL AUTHORITY RELATING TO SECONDARY SCHOOLS OPERATED OR SUPPORTED BY THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.—An Indian tribe, a tribal organization, or an Alaska Native entity, that receives funds through a grant made or contract entered into under paragraph (1) may use the funds to provide assistance to a secondary school operated or supported by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to enable such school to carry out vocational-technical education programs.

''(d) AUTHORIZED PROGRAMS.—Funds made available under this section shall be used to carry out vocational-technical education programs consistent with the purposes of this Act.

''(e) GRANT APPLICATION.—In order to receive a grant under this section an entity described in subsection (c) shall submit an application to the Secretary and shall include an assurance that such entity shall comply with the requirements of this Act.

''(f) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary, in making grants under subsection (c), shall give special consideration to—

''(1) grants which involve, coordinate with, or encourage tribal economic development plans; and

''(2) applications from tribally controlled community colleges which—

''(A) are accredited or are candidates for accreditation by a nationally recognized accreditation organization as an institution of postsecondary vocational-technical education; or

''(B) operate vocational-technical education programs that are accredited or are candidates for accreditation by a nationally recognized accreditation organization and issue certificates for completion of vocational-technical education programs.

''(g) CONSOLIDATION OF FUNDS.—Each entity receiving assistance under this section may consolidate such assistance with assistance received from related programs in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C 3401 et seq.).

''(h) NONDUPLICATIVE AND NONEXCLUSIVE SERVICES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

''(1) to limit the eligibility of any entity described in subsection (c) to participate in any activity offered by a State or local entity under this title; or

''(2) to preclude or discourage any agreement, between any entity described in subsection (c) and any State or local entity, to facilitate the provision of services by such entity or to the population served by such entity.

''(i) NATIVE HAWAIIAN PROGRAMS.—From the funds reserved pursuant to section 101(a)(1)(A)(ii), the Secretary is directed to enter into contracts with organizations primarily serving and representing Native Hawaiian Programs which are recognized by the Governor of the State of Hawaii to plan, conduct, and administer programs, or portions thereof, which are authorized by and consistent with the provisions of this section for the benefit of Native Hawaiian Programs.''.

SEC. 104. TRIBALLY CONTROLLED POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

Part A of title I of the Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 104. TRIBALLY CONTROLLED POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

''(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, make grants pursuant to this section to tribally controlled postsecondary vocational-technical institutions to provide basic support for the education and training of Indian students.

''(b) USE OF GRANTS.—Amounts made available pursuant to this section shall be used for vocational-technical education programs.

''(c) ELIGIBLE GRANT RECIPIENTS.—To be eligible for assistance under this section a tribally controlled postsecondary vocational-technical institution shall—

''(1) be governed by a board of directors or trustees, a majority of whom are Indians;

''(2) have been in operation for at least 3 years;

''(3) hold accreditation with or be a candidate for accreditation by a nationally recognized accrediting authority for postsecondary vocational-technical education; and

''(4) enroll the full-time equivalent of not less than 100 students, of whom a majority are Indians.

''(d) APPLICATIONS.—Any tribally controlled postsecondary vocational-technical institution that desires to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary in such manner and form as the Secretary may require.

''(e) OTHER PROGRAMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as specifically provided in this Act, eligibility for assistance under this section shall not preclude any tribally controlled postsecondary vocational-technical institution from receiving Federal financial assistance under any program authorized under the Higher Education Act of 1965 or any other applicable program for the benefit of institutions of higher education or vocational-technical education.

''(2) PROHIBITION ON ALLOCATION OF GRANT AMOUNT.—The amount of any grant for which tribally controlled postsecondary vocational-technical institutions are eligible under this subpart shall not be altered because of funds allocated to any such institution from funds appropriated under the Act of November 2, 1921.

''(3) PROHIBITION ON CONTRACT DENIAL.—No tribally controlled postsecondary vocational-technical institution for which an Indian tribe has designated a portion of the funds appropriated for the tribe from funds appropriated under the Act of November 2, 1921, may be denied a contract for such portion under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (except as provided in that Act), or denied appropriate contract support to administer such portion of the appropriated funds.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section:

''(1) INDIAN.—The terms 'Indian' and 'Indian tribe' have the meanings given such terms in section 2 of the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978.

''(2) TRIBALLY CONTROLLED POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL INSTITUTION.—The term 'tribally controlled postsecondary vocational-technical institution' means an institution of higher education which is formally controlled, or has been formally sanctioned or chartered by the governing body of an Indian tribe or tribes which offers technical degrees or certificate granting programs.

''(3) INDIAN STUDENT COUNT.—The term 'Indian student count' means a number equal to the total number of Indian students enrolled in each tribally controlled vocational-technical institution, determined as follows:

''(A) REGISTRATIONS.—The registrations of Indian students as in effect on October 1 of each year.

''(B) SUMMER TERM.—Credits or clock hours toward a certificate earned in classes offered during a summer term shall be counted toward the computation of the Indian student count in the succeeding fall term.

''(C) ADMISSION CRITERIA.—Credits or clock hours toward a certificate earned in classes during a summer term shall be counted toward the computation of the Indian student count if the institution at which the student is in attendance has established criteria for the admission of such student on the basis of the student's ability to benefit from the education or training offered. The institution shall be presumed to have established such criteria if the admission procedures for such studies include counseling or testing that measures the student's aptitude to successfully complete the course in which the student has enrolled. No credit earned by such student for purposes of obtaining a high school degree or its equivalent shall be counted toward the computation of the Indian student count.

''(D) DETERMINATION OF HOURS.—Indian students earning credits in any continuing education program of a tribally controlled vocational-technical institution shall be included in determining the sum of all credit or clock hours.

''(E) CONTINUING EDUCATION.—Credits or clock hours earned in a continuing education program shall be converted to the basis that is in accordance with the institution's system for providing credit for participation in such programs.

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated not more than $4,000,000 for fiscal year 1998 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years to carry out the provisions of this section.''.

PART B—STATE ORGANIZATIONAL AND PLANNING RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 111. STATE ADMINISTRATION.

Section 111 of this Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking ''pursuant to section 113(b)(8), section 116, and section 117'';

(2) by striking subsection (a)(1)(B);

(3) in subsection (a)(1)(C), by striking ''consultation with'' and all that follows through the semicolon at the end of subsection (a)(1)(C) and inserting ''consultation with the Governor and appropriate agencies, groups, and individuals, including business, industry and representatives of employees involved in the planning, administration, evaluation, and coordination of programs funded under this Act;''; and

(4) by striking subsections (b) through (g) and inserting the following:

''(b) LIST OF PROGRAMS ASSISTED.—The State board shall make available to each Private Industry Council established under section 102 of the Job Training Partnership Act within the State a listing of all programs assisted under this Act.''.

SEC. 112. STATE COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

Section 112 of the Act is repealed.

SEC. 113. STATE APPLICATION.

Section 113 of the Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating such section as section 112;

(2) by striking ''plan'' in the section heading and inserting ''application'';

(3) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''(A)'' and further by striking all that follows after ''Secretary'' and inserting ''an application in such manner and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may require but which, at a minimum, shall be for a 5-year period.'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (B);

(C) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) The State board shall conduct public hearings in the State, after appropriate and sufficient notice, for the purpose of affording all segments of the public and interested organizations and groups an opportunity to present their views and make recommendations regarding the State application. A summary of such recommendations and the State board's response shall be included with the State application.''; and

(D) by striking paragraph (3); and

(4) by striking subsections (b) and (c) and inserting the following:

''(b) CONTENTS.—Each State application shall—

''(1) describe the vocational-technical education programs that will be carried out with funds received by the State under this Act, including a description of—

''(A) the secondary and postsecondary vocational-technical education programs to be carried out at the State level pursuant to section 201, including programs that will be carried out by the State to develop, improve, and expand access to quality, state-of-the-art technology in vocational-technical education programs;

''(B) the criteria that will be used by the State in approving applications of eligible recipients of funds under this Act; and

''(C) how such programs will prepare vocational-technical education students for opportunities in postsecondary education or entry into high skill, high wage jobs;

''(2) describe how the State will actively involve parents, teachers, local businesses (including small- and medium-sized businesses) and representatives of employees in the planning, development, and implementation of such vocational-technical education programs;

''(3) describe how funds received by the State through the allotment made under section 102 will be allocated among secondary school vocational-technical education, or postsecondary and adult vocational-technical education, or both, including the rationale for such allotment;

''(4) describe how the State will—

''(A) improve the academic and technical skills of students participating in vocational-technical education programs which includes strengthening the academic component of vocational-technical education programs through the integration of academics with vocational-technical education to ensure learning in the core academic subjects and provide students with strong experience and understanding of all aspects of the industry; and

''(B) ensure that students who participate in such vocational-technical education programs are taught to the same challenging academic proficiencies as are provided for all other students;

''(5) describe how the State will annually evaluate the effectiveness of such vocational-technical education programs and describe how the State is coordinating such programs to ensure nonduplication with other existing Federal programs;

''(6) identify the benchmarks that the State will use to measure the progress of the State, including a description of how such benchmarks will ensure continuous improvement for vocational-technical students in meeting such benchmarks;

''(7) describe how the State will—

''(A) provide vocational-technical education programs that lead to high skill, high wage careers for members of special populations, displaced homemakers, single parents, and single pregnant women; and

''(B) ensure that members of special populations meet State benchmarks established under section 114 and are prepared for postsecondary education, further learning, and high skill, high wage careers;

''(8) provide a financial audit of funds received under this Act; and

''(9) provide assurances that none of the funds expended under this Act will be used to acquire equipment (including computer software) in any instance in which such acquisition results in a direct financial benefit to any organization representing the interests of the purchasing entity or its employees or any affiliate of such an organization.

''(c) AMENDMENTS.—The State board may submit amendments to the State application, as necessary, during the 5-year period. Such amendments shall be submitted in accordance with section 113(c).''.

SEC. 114. SUBMISSION OF STATE APPLICATION.

Section 114 of the Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating such section as section 113;

(2) by striking ''**state plan approval**'' in the section heading and inserting ''**submission of state application**'';

(3) by striking subsections (a) and (b); and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(a) APPLICATION.—Each State application shall be submitted to the Secretary by not later than May 1 preceding the beginning of the first fiscal year for which a State application is to be in effect.

''(b) CONSULTATION.—The State board shall develop the portion of each State application relating to the amount and uses of any funds proposed to be reserved for adult vocational-technical education, postsecondary vocational-technical education, tech-prep education, and secondary vocational-technical education after

consultation with the State agency responsible for supervision of community colleges, technical institutes, or other 2-year postsecondary institutions primarily engaged in providing postsecondary vocational-technical education, and the State agency responsible for secondary education. If a State agency finds that a portion of the final State application is objectionable, such agency shall file such objections with the State board. The State board shall respond to any objections of such agency in submitting such application to the Secretary.

''(c) APPLICATION SUBMISSION.—A State application submitted to the Secretary under this section shall be approved by the Secretary unless the Secretary makes a written determination, within 90 days after receiving the application, that the application is in violation of the provisions of this Act.''.

SEC. 115. ACCOUNTABILITY.

Part B of title I is amended by inserting after section 113, as redesignated, the following:

''SEC. 114. ACCOUNTABILITY.

''(a) BENCHMARKS.—To be eligible to receive an allotment under section 102, a State shall develop and identify in the State application submitted under section 113 proposed rigorous and quantifiable benchmarks to measure the statewide progress of the State, which shall include, at a minimum, measures, of—

''(1) attainment of challenging State academic proficiencies;

''(2) attainment of secondary school diplomas or general equivalency diplomas; and

''(3) placement in, retention in, and completion of, postsecondary education or advanced training, or placement and retention in military service, or employment.

''(b) PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND SANCTIONS.—

''(1) STATE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PLAN.—If a State fails to meet its State benchmarks as described in the report submitted under subsection (c), the State shall develop and implement a program improvement plan in consultation with appropriate agencies, individuals, and organizations for the first program year succeeding the program year in which the State failed to meet its benchmarks in order to avoid a sanction as provided under paragraph (3).

''(2) LOCAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN.—If an eligible recipient fails to meet its State benchmarks, the eligible recipient shall develop a program improvement plan with appropriate agencies, individuals, and organizations for the succeeding program year.

''(3) SANCTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a State fails to meet the State benchmarks required under subsection (a), and has not implemented an improvement plan as described in paragraph (1), has not demonstrated improvement in meeting its benchmarks, or has failed to meet its benchmarks for 2 or more consecutive years, the Secretary may, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, or withhold from the State all, or a portion of, the State's allotment under this Act. The Secretary may waive the sanction due to exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances such as a natural disaster or a precipitous and unforeseen decline in the financial resources of the State.

''(B) FUNDS RESULTING FROM REDUCED ALLOTMENTS.—The amount of funds retained by the Secretary as a result of a reduction in an allotment made under subparagraph (A) shall be redistributed to other States in accordance with section 101.

''(c) REPORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) INFORMATION.—Each State that receives an allotment under section 102 shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary a report on how the State is performing on State benchmarks that relate to vocational-technical education programs. In preparing the report, the State may include information on such additional vocational-technical education benchmarks as the State may establish.

''(B) SPECIAL POPULATIONS.—The report submitted by the State in accordance with subparagraph (A) shall include a description of how special populations, displaced homemakers, single parents, and single pregnant women participating in vocational-technical education programs have met the vocational-technical education benchmarks established by the State.

''(2) INFORMATION DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary shall make the information contained in such reports available to the general public through publication and other appropriate methods which may include electronic communication.

''(3) BENCHMARK PERFORMANCE.—Each local recipient shall make available to the general public information regarding how the local recipient is performing in regard to the State benchmarks.''.

SEC. 116. PROGRAM EVALUATION.

Sections 115, 116, 117, and 118 of the Act are repealed.

TITLE II—BASIC STATE GRANTS FOR VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION

SEC. 201. STATE PROGRAMS.

(a) HEADING.—The heading for title II is amended to read as follows:

''TITLE II—BASIC STATE GRANTS FOR VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION''.

(b) PROGRAMS.—Section 201 of the Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''102(a)(3)'' and inserting ''102(a)(2)'';

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) REQUIRED USES OF FUNDS.—The programs described in subsection (a) shall include—

''(1) an assessment of the vocational-technical education programs carried out with funds under this Act that includes an assessment of how the needs of special populations are being met and how such programs will ensure that the benchmarks established under section 114 are being met;

''(2) developing, improving, or expanding the use of technology in vocational-technical education which may include—

''(A) training of vocational-technical education personnel to use State-of-the art technology, which may include distance learning;

''(B) providing vocational-technical education students with the academic and technical skills that lead to entry into the high technology and telecommunications field; or

''(C) encouraging schools to work with high tech industries to offer voluntary internships and mentoring programs;

''(3) professional development programs, including—

''(A) inservice and preservice training in state-of-the-art vocational-technical education programs and techniques; and

''(B) support of education programs for teachers of vocational-technical education in public schools and other public school personnel who are involved in the direct delivery of educational services to vocational education students to ensure that such teachers stay current with the needs, expectations, and methods of industry; and

''(4) support for vocational-technical education programs that improve the academic and technical skills of students participating in vocational-technical education programs by strengthening the academic component of such vocational-technical education programs through the integration of academics with vocational-technical education to ensure learning in the core academic subjects.'';

(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) PERMISSIBLE USES OF FUNDS.—The programs under subsection (a) may include—

''(1) technical support for eligible recipients;

''(2) support for tech-prep programs;

''(3) support for programs for single parents, displaced homemakers, single pregnant women, and individuals in nontraditional occupations that lead to high skill, high wage careers;

''(4) support for cooperative education;

''(5) support for vocational student organizations;

''(6) support for public charter schools operating secondary vocational-technical education programs;

''(7) support for vocational-technical education programs that offer experience in, and understanding of, all aspects of the industry for which students are preparing to enter;

''(8) support for family and consumer sciences programs; and

''(9) support for corrections vocational-technical education.''; and

(4) by adding after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) RESTRICTION ON USES OF FUNDS.—A State that receives funds under section 102(a)(2) may not use any of such funds to pay administrative costs.''.

SEC. 202. SECONDARY, POSTSECONDARY, AND ADULT VOCATION-TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

Part B of title II of the Act is amended to read as follows:

''PART B—SECONDARY, POSTSECONDARY, AND ADULT VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

''Subpart 1—Within-State Allocation

''SEC. 221. DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS TO SECONDARY SCHOOL PROGRAMS.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as otherwise provided in this section and section 223, each State shall distribute the funds received under this Act and available in fiscal year 1998 for secondary school vocational-technical education to local educational agencies within the State as follows:

''(1) From 70 percent of such funds, each local educational agency shall be allocated an amount that bears the same relationship to such 70 percent as the amount such local educational agency was allocated under section 1124 or such section's predecessor authority of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in the preceding fiscal year bears to the total amount received under such section by local educational agencies in the State in such year.

''(2) From 20 percent of such funds, each local educational agency shall be allocated an amount that bears the same relationship to such 20 percent as the number of students with disabilities who have individualized education programs under section 614(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act who are served by such local educational agency in the preceding fiscal year bears to the total number of such students served by local educational agencies in the State in such year.

''(3) From 10 percent of such funds, each local educational agency shall be allocated an amount that bears the same relationship to such 10 percent as the number of students enrolled in schools and adults enrolled in training programs under the jurisdiction of such local educational agency in the preceding fiscal year bears to the number of students enrolled in schools and adults enrolled in training programs under the jurisdiction of all local educational agencies in the State in such year.

''(b) ALLOCATION FOR SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—In fiscal year 1999, and the succeeding 3 fiscal years, each State shall distribute the funds available in any such fiscal year for secondary school vocational-technical education programs to local educational agencies within the State as follows:

''(1) POPULATION.—50 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 to 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency for the preceding fiscal year compared to the total number of such individuals who reside in the school districts served by all local educational agencies in the State for such preceding year.

''(2) INCOME.—50 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 through 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency from families with incomes below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) applicable to a family of the size involved for the fiscal year for which the determination is made compared to the number of such individuals in all the local educational agencies in the State.

''(c) WAIVER FOR MORE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary may waive the application of subsection (b) in the case of any State that submits to the Secretary an application for such a waiver that—

''(1) demonstrates that the formula described in subsection (b) does not result in a distribution of funds to local educational agencies within the State that have the greatest economic need and that an alternative formula would result in such a distribution; and

''(2) includes a proposal for such an alternative formula.

''(d) MINIMUM GRANT AMOUNT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no local educational agency shall be eligible for a grant under this part unless the amount allocated to such agency under subsections (a) and (b) is not less than $7,500. A local educational agency may enter into a consortium with other local educational agencies for purposes of meeting the minimum allocation requirement of this paragraph.

''(2) WAIVER.—The State shall waive the application of paragraph (1) in any case in which the local educational agency—

''(A)(i) is located in a rural, sparsely populated area, or

''(ii) is a public charter school operating secondary vocational-technical education programs; and

''(B) demonstrates that the agency is unable to enter into a consortium for purposes of providing services under this part.

''(3) REDISTRIBUTION.—Any amounts that are not allocated by reason of paragraph (1) or paragraph (2) shall be redistributed to local educational agencies that meet the requirements of paragraph (1) or (2) in accordance with the provisions of this section.

''(e) LIMITED JURISDICTION AGENCIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In applying the provisions of subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d), no State receiving assistance under this Act shall allocate funds to a local educational agency that serves only elementary schools, but shall distribute such funds to the local educational agency or regional educational agency that provides secondary school services to secondary school students in the same attendance area.

''(2) SECONDARY SCHOOL JURISDICTION.—The amount to be allocated under paragraph (1) to a local educational agency that has jurisdiction only over secondary schools shall be determined based on the number of students that were enrolled in such secondary schools in the previous year from the elementary schools involved.

''(f) ALLOCATIONS TO AREA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION SCHOOLS AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICE AGENCIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall distribute funds available for secondary school vocational-technical education programs to the appropriate area vocational-technical education school or educational service agency in any case in which the area vocational-technical education school or educational service agency and the local educational agency concerned—

''(A) have formed or will form a consortium for the purpose of receiving funds under this section; or

''(B) have entered into or will enter into a cooperative arrangement for such purpose.

''(2) ALLOCATION BASIS.—If an area vocational-technical education school or educational service agency meets the requirements of paragraph (1), then the amount that would otherwise be distributed to the local educational agency shall be allocated to the area vocational-technical education school, the educational service agency, and the local educational agency based on each school's or entity's relative share of students who are attending vocational-technical education programs (based, if practicable, on the average enrollment for the prior 3 years).

''(3) APPEALS PROCEDURE.—The State board shall establish an appeals procedure for resolution of any dispute arising between a local educational agency and an area vocational-technical education school or an educational service agency with respect to the allocation procedures described in this section, including the decision of a local educational agency to leave a consortium or terminate a cooperative arrangement.

''(g) CONSORTIUM REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) ALLIANCE.—Any local educational agency receiving an allocation that is not sufficient to conduct a program which meets the requirements of section 225 is encouraged to—

''(A) form a consortium or enter into a cooperative agreement with an area vocational-technical education school or educational service agency offering programs that meet the requirements of section 225;

''(B) transfer such allocation to the area vocational-technical education school or educational service agency; and

''(C) be of sufficient size, scope, and quality as to be effective.

''(2) FUNDS TO CONSORTIUM.—Funds allocated to a consortium formed to meet the requirements of this paragraph shall be used only for purposes and programs that are mutually beneficial to all members of the consortium and can be used only for programs authorized under this Act. Such funds may not be reallocated to individual members of the consortium for purposes or programs benefiting only one member of the consortium.

''(h) DATA.—The Secretary shall collect information from States regarding the specific dollar allocations made available by the State for vocational-technical education programs under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) and how these allocations are distributed to local educational agencies, area vocational-technical education schools, educational services agencies, and eligible institutions within the State in accordance with this section.

"SEC. 222. DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR POST-SECONDARY AND ADULT VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

''(a) ALLOCATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) and section 223, each State shall distribute funds available in any fiscal year for postsecondary and adult vocational-technical education programs to eligible institutions or consortia of eligible institutions within the State.

''(2) FORMULA.—Each eligible institution or consortium of eligible institutions shall receive an amount that bears the same relationship to the amount of funds available under such section as the number of individuals who are Pell Grant recipients or recipients of assistance from the Bureau of Indian Affairs and are enrolled in programs meeting the requirements of section 225 offered by such institution or consortium in the preceding fiscal year bears to the number of such recipients enrolled in such programs within the State for such year.

''(3) CONSORTIUM REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In order for a consortium of eligible institutions described in paragraph (2) to receive assistance pursuant to such paragraph, such consortium shall operate joint projects that—

''(i) provide services to all postsecondary institutions participating in the consortium; and

''(ii) are of sufficient size, scope, and quality as to be effective.

''(B) FUNDS TO CONSORTIUM.—Funds allocated to a consortium formed to meet the requirements of this section shall be used only for purposes and programs that are mutually beneficial to all members of the consortium and can be used only for programs authorized under this Act. Such funds may not be reallocated to individual members of the consortium for purposes or programs benefiting only one member of the consortium.

''(b) WAIVER FOR MORE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary may waive the application of subsection (a) in the case of any State that submits to the Secretary of Education an application for such a waiver that—

''(1) demonstrates that the formula described in subsection (a) does not result in a distribution of funds to the institutions or consortia within the State that have the highest numbers of economically disadvantaged individuals and that an alternative formula would result in such a distribution; and

''(2) includes a proposal for such an alternative formula.

''(c) MINIMUM GRANT AMOUNT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No funds provided to any institution or consortium under this section shall be for an amount that is less than $20,000.

''(2) REDISTRIBUTION.—Any amounts that are not distributed by reason of paragraph (1) shall be redistributed to eligible institutions or consortia of eligible institutions in accordance with the provisions of this section.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section—

''(1) the term 'eligible institution' means an institution of higher education as such term is defined in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, a local educational agency serving adults, or an area vocational education school serving adults that offers or will offer a program that meets the requirements of section 225 and seeks to receive assistance under this part; and

''(2) the term 'Pell Grant' means a recipient of financial aid under subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

"SEC. 223. SPECIAL RULES FOR VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

''(a) SPECIAL RULE FOR MINIMAL ALLOCATION.—

''(1) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 221 and 222 and in order to make a more equitable distribution of funds for programs serving the areas of greatest economic need, for any program year for which a minimal amount is made available by a State for distribution under section 221 or 222, such State may distribute such minimal amount for such year—

''(A) on a competitive basis; or

''(B) through any alternative method determined by the State.

''(2) MINIMAL AMOUNT.—For purposes of this section, the term 'minimal amount' means not more than 15 percent of the total amount made available for distribution under this part.

''(b) REDISTRIBUTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In any academic year that a local educational agency or eligible institution does not expend all of the amounts it is allocated for such year under section 221 or 222, such recipient shall return any unexpended amounts to the State to be reallocated under section 221 or 222, as appropriate.

''(2) REDISTRIBUTION OF AMOUNTS RETURNED LATE IN AN ACADEMIC YEAR.—In any academic year in which amounts are returned to the State under section 221 or 222 and the State is unable to reallocate such amounts according to such sections in time for such amounts to be expended in such academic year, the State shall retain such amounts for distribution in combination with amounts provided under this title for the following academic year.

''(c) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in section 221 or 222 shall be construed—

''(1) to prohibit a local educational agency (or a consortium thereof) that receives assistance

under section 221, from working with an eligible recipient (or consortium thereof) that receives assistance under section 222, to carry out secondary school vocational-technical education programs in accordance with this title;

''(2) to prohibit an eligible recipient (or consortium thereof) that receives assistance under section 222, from working with a local educational agency (or consortium thereof) that receives assistance under section 221, to carry out postsecondary and adult vocational-technical education programs in accordance with this title; or

''(3) to require a charter school that is a local educational agency to jointly establish its eligibility unless the charter school is explicitly permitted to do so under the State's charter school statute.

''(d) CONSISTENT APPLICATION.—For purposes of this section, the State board shall provide funds to charter schools that offer vocational-technical education programs that are public schools of the local educational agency in the same manner as it provides those funds to other schools of the local educational agency. Such program within a charter school shall be of sufficient size, scope, and quality as to be effective.

''SEC. 224. LOCAL APPLICATION FOR VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

''(a) APPLICATION REQUIRED.—Any eligible recipient desiring financial assistance under this part shall, in accordance with requirements established by the State board, submit an application to the State board. Such application shall cover the same period of time as the period of time applicable to the State application submitted under section 112.

''(b) CONTENTS.—The State board shall determine requirements for local applications, except that each application shall—

''(1) describe how the vocational-technical education programs required under section 225(b) will be carried out with funds received under this part;

''(2) describe how students participating in vocational-technical education programs carried out with funds under this Act will reach the State benchmarks as established under section 114;

''(3) describe how the eligible recipient will—

''(A) improve the academic and technical skills of students participating in vocational-technical education programs by strengthening the academic component of such programs through the integration of academics with vocational-technical education programs through a coherent sequence of courses to ensure learning in the core academic subjects; and

''(B) ensure that students who participate in such vocational-technical education programs are taught to the same challenging academic proficiencies as are provided for all other students;

''(4) describe how parents, students, teachers, business and representatives of employees are involved in the development and implementation of vocational-technical education programs assisted under this Act; and

''(5) provide assurances that the eligible recipient will provide a vocational-technical education program that is of such size, scope, and quality as to bring about improvement in the quality of vocational-technical education programs.

''SEC. 225. LOCAL USES OF FUNDS.

''(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Each eligible recipient that receives a grant under this part shall use such funds to improve vocational-technical education programs.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR USES OF FUNDS.—Funds made available under this part shall be used to provide vocational-technical education programs that—

''(1) strengthen the academic and technical skills of students participating in vocational-technical education programs by strengthening the academic component of such programs through the integration of academics with vocational-technical education programs through a coherent sequence of courses to ensure learning in the core academic subjects;

''(2) develop, improve, or expand the use of technology in vocational-technical education which may include—

''(A) training of vocational-technical education personnel to use State-of-the art technology, which may include distance learning;

''(B) providing vocational-technical education students with the academic and technical skills that lead to entry into the high technology and telecommunications field; or

''(C) encouraging schools to work with high tech industries to offer voluntary internships and mentoring programs;

''(3) provide professional development programs, including—

''(A) inservice training in state-of-the-art vocational-technical education programs and techniques; and

''(B) support of education programs for teachers of vocational-technical education in public schools and other public school personnel who are involved in the direct delivery of educational services to vocational education students, to ensure that such teachers stay current with the needs, expectations, and methods of industry;

''(4) support vocational-technical education programs that improve the academic and technical skills of students participating in vocational-technical education programs by strengthening the academic component of such vocational-technical education programs through the integration of academics with vocational-technical education to ensure learning in the core academic subjects; and

''(5) provide an assessment of the vocational-technical education programs carried out with funds under this Act, including an assessment of how the needs of special populations are being met, and how such programs will ensure that the benchmarks established under section 114 are being met.

''(c) PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES.—The vocational-technical education programs described in subsection (b) may be used for—

''(1) establishing agreements between secondary and postsecondary vocational-technical education programs in order to provide postsecondary education and training opportunities for students participating in such vocational-technical programs, such as tech-prep programs;

''(2) involving parents, business, and representatives of employees in the design and implementation of vocational-technical education programs authorized under this Act;

''(3) providing career guidance and counseling;

''(4) providing work related experience, such as internships, cooperative education, school-based enterprises, entrepreneurship, and job shadowing that are related to vocational-technical education programs;

''(5) programs for single parents, displaced homemakers, and single pregnant women;

''(6) local education and business partnerships;

''(7) vocational student organizations;

''(8) mentoring and support services;

''(9) leasing, purchasing, or upgrading of equipment; and

''(10) establishing effective programs and procedures to enable vocational-technical education program participants and their parents to participate directly in decisions that influence the programs, including providing information and assistance for informed effective participation.

''(d) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Each eligible recipient receiving funds under this part shall not use more than 2 percent of the funds for administrative costs associated with the administration of the grant.''.

SEC. 203. REPEAL OF PART C.

Part C of title II is repealed.

TITLE III—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 301. EVALUATION; RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATIONS AND DISSEMINATION.

(a) HEADING.—The heading for title III is amended to read as follows:

''TITLE III—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT''.

(b) PART A.—Part A of title III is amended to read as follows:

''PART A—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

''SEC. 301. EVALUATION; RESEARCH; DEMONSTRATIONS; AND DISSEMINATION.

''(a) SINGLE PLAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop a single plan for evaluation and assessment, research, demonstrations, and dissemination with regard to the vocational-technical education programs assisted under this Act.

''(2) PLAN.—Such plan shall—

''(A) identify the vocational-technical education programs the Secretary will carry out under this section;

''(B) describe how the Secretary will evaluate such vocational-technical education programs in accordance with subsection (b); and

''(C) include such other information as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(b) EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts made available under subsection (g), the Secretary shall provide for the conduct of an independent evaluation and assessment of vocational-technical education programs under this Act through studies and analyses conducted independently through grants and contracts awarded on a competitive basis.

''(2) CONTENTS.—Such evaluation and assessment of vocational-technical education programs shall include descriptions of—

''(A) the extent to which State, local, and tribal entities have developed, implemented, or improved State and local vocational-technical education programs;

''(B) the degree to which the expenditures at the Federal, State, local, and tribal levels address improvement in vocational-technical education programs;

''(C) the extent to which vocational-technical education programs succeed in preparing individuals participating in such programs for entry into postsecondary education, further learning, or high skill, high wage careers; and

''(D) the effect of State benchmarks, performance measures, and other measures of accountability on the delivery of vocational-technical education programs.

''(c) INFORMATION COLLECTION AND REPORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may collect and disseminate information from States regarding State efforts to meet State benchmarks described in section 114.

''(2) REPORT.—The Secretary shall gather any information collected pursuant to paragraph (1) and submit a report to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate.

''(d) RESEARCH.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants, on a competitive basis, to an institution of higher education, a public or private organization or agency, or a consortium of such institutions, organizations, or agencies to establish a national research center or centers—

''(A) to carry out research for the purpose of developing, improving, and identifying the most successful methods for successfully addressing the education, employment, and training needs of participants in vocational-technical education programs;

''(B) to carry out research to increase the effectiveness and improve the implementation of vocational-technical education programs, including conducting research and development and studies providing longitudinal information or formative evaluation with respect to vocational-technical education programs;

''(C) to carry out such other programs as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to achieve the purposes of this Act.

''(2) SUMMARY.—The Secretary shall provide an annual report summarizing the evaluations and assessments described in subsection (b), and the research conducted pursuant to this subsection, and the findings of such evaluations and assessments, and research, to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate.

''(e) DEMONSTRATIONS AND DISSEMINATION.—

''(1) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out demonstration vocational-technical education programs, to replicate model vocational-technical education programs, to disseminate best practices information, and to provide technical assistance upon request of a State, for the purposes of developing, improving, and identifying the most successful methods and techniques for providing vocational-technical education programs assisted under this Act.

''(2) DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a demonstration partnership project involving a 4-year, accredited postsecondary institution, in cooperation with local public education organizations, volunteer groups, and private sector business participants to provide program support, and facilities for education, training, tutoring, counseling, employment preparation, specific skills training in emerging and established professions, retraining of military medical personnel, retraining of individuals displaced by corporate or military restructuring, migrant workers, and other individuals who otherwise would not have access to such services, through multi-site, multi-State distance learning technologies.

''(B) PROGRAM.—Such program may be carried out directly or through grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, or through the national center or centers.

''(f) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given the term in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a)).

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1998 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years to carry out this part.''.

SEC. 302. TECH-PREP EDUCATION.

Part B of title III is amended to read as follows:

''PART C—TECH-PREP EDUCATION

''SEC. 321. TECH-PREP EDUCATION.

''(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The State board, in accordance with the provisions of this part, shall award grants to consortia on a competitive basis or on the basis of a formula determined by the State board, for tech-prep education programs.

''(b) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Each grant recipient shall use amounts provided under the grant to develop and operate a 4-year tech-prep education program.

''(c) CONTENTS OF PROGRAM.—Any such program shall—

''(1) be carried out under an articulation agreement between the participants in the consortium;

''(2) consist of the 2 or 4 years of secondary school preceding graduation and 2 years of higher education, or an apprenticeship program of at least 2 years following secondary instruction, with a common core of required proficiency in mathematics, science, communications, and technologies designed to lead to an associate degree or postsecondary certificate in a specific career field;

''(3) include the development of tech-prep education program components appropriate to the needs of the consortium participants;

''(4) include in-service training for teachers that—

''(A) is designed to train vocational-technical teachers to effectively implement tech-prep education programs;

''(B) provides for joint training for teachers in the tech-prep consortium; and

''(C) may provide such training in weekend, evening, and summer sessions, institutes, or workshops;

''(5) include training programs for counselors designed to enable counselors to more effectively—

''(A) provide information to students regarding tech-prep education programs;

''(B) support student progress in completing such programs; and

''(C) provide information on related employment opportunities;

''(6) provide equal access to the full range of technical preparation programs to individuals who are members of special populations, including the development of tech-prep education program services appropriate to the needs of such individuals; and

''(7) provide for preparatory services that assist participants in such programs.

''(d) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Each such program may—

''(1) provide for the acquisition of tech-prep education program equipment; and

''(2) acquire technical assistance from State or local entities that have successfully designed, established and operated tech-prep programs.

''SEC. 322. APPLICATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Each consortium that desires to receive a grant under this part shall submit an application to the State board, as appropriate, at such time and in such manner as the State board shall prescribe.

''(b) PLAN.—Each application submitted under this section shall contain a 5-year plan for the development and implementation of programs under this part.

''(c) APPROVAL.—The State board shall approve applications based on their potential to create an effective tech-prep education program as provided for in this section.

''(d) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—The State board, as appropriate, shall give special consideration to applications which—

''(1) provide for effective employment placement activities or transfer of students to 4-year baccalaureate degree programs;

''(2) are developed in consultation with business, industry, institutions of higher education, and representatives of employees;

''(3) address effectively the issues of dropout prevention and reentry and the needs of special populations.

''SEC. 323. REPORT.

''Each State that receives a grant under this part shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary a report on the effectiveness of their Tech-Prep programs, including how competitive grants were awarded within the State.

''SEC. 324. ALLOTMENT.

''The Secretary shall allot funds under this part in each fiscal year in the same manner as funds are allotted under section 101(a)(2).

''SEC. 325. AUTHORIZATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—From amounts made available under section 3(a), 10 percent shall be used to carry out this part for fiscal year 1998 and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

''(b) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—No State shall receive a grant of less than $200,000 under this part in any fiscal year.''.

SEC. 303. VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION AND OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION DATA SYSTEMS.

Part C of title IV is amended—

(1) by striking the part heading and inserting the following:

''PART B—VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION INFORMATION'';

(2) by redesignating sections 421 through 424 as sections 311 through 314, respectively.

(3) by amending subsection (e) of section 312, as redesignated under paragraph (2), to read as follows:

''(e) There are authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2002 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this part.'';

(4) in section 313(a)(1), as redesignated in paragraph (2), by striking ''421'' and inserting ''311''; and

(5) by adding at the end of such part the following new section:

''SEC. 315. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

''There are authorized to be appropriated for this part such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1998 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.''.

SEC. 304. REPEALS.

(a) TITLE III.—Part C of title III of the Act, as the Act was in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, is repealed.

(b) TITLE IV.—The heading for title IV and parts A, B, E, and F of such title of the Act are repealed.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

Title V of the Act is amended to read as follows:

''TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

''PART A—FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

''SEC. 401. PAYMENTS.

''The Secretary shall pay from its allotment under section 101 to each State for any fiscal year for which the State has a State application submitted in accordance with section 113 (including any amendment to such application) the Federal share of the costs of carrying out the State application.

''SEC. 402. FISCAL REQUIREMENTS.

''(a) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Funds received under this Act shall be used to supplement, not supplant, the amount of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available from non-Federal sources for vocational-technical education programs.

''(b) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—

''(1) DETERMINATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), no payments shall be made under this title for any program year to a State for vocational-technical education programs unless the Secretary of Education determines that the fiscal effort per student or the aggregate expenditures of such State for vocational-technical programs for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made, equaled or exceeded such effort or expenditures for vocational-technical education programs, for the second program year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made.

''(B) COMPUTATION.—In computing the fiscal effort or aggregate expenditures pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Education shall exclude capital expenditures, special one-time project costs, similar windfalls, and the cost of pilot programs.

''(C) DECREASE IN FEDERAL SUPPORT.—If the amount made available for vocational-technical education programs under this Act for a fiscal year is less than the amount made available for vocational-technical education programs under this Act for the preceding fiscal year, then the fiscal effort per student or the aggregate expenditures of a State required by subparagraph (B) for such preceding fiscal year shall be decreased by the same percentage as the percentage decrease in the amount so made available.

''(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the requirements of paragraph (1) (with respect to not more than 5 percent of expenditures required for the preceding fiscal year by any State) for 1 program year only, after making a

determination that such waiver would be equitable due to exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances affecting the ability of the State to meet such requirements, such as a natural disaster or an unforeseen and precipitous decline in financial resources. No level of funding permitted under such a waiver may be used as the basis for computing the fiscal effort or aggregate expenditures required under this paragraph for years subsequent to the year covered by such waiver. The fiscal effort or aggregate expenditures for the subsequent years shall be computed on the basis of the level of funding that would, but for such waiver, have been required.

"SEC. 403. AUTHORITY TO MAKE PAYMENTS.

''Any authority to make payments or to enter into contracts under this Act shall be available only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in advance appropriation Acts.

"SEC. 404. NATIONAL AND STATE FUNDING.

''Nothing in this Act shall be construed to permit, allow, encourage, or authorize any Federal control over any aspect of any private, religious, or home school, whether or not a home school is treated as a private school or home school under State law. This section shall not be construed to bar private, religious, or home schools from participation in programs or services under the Act.

"SEC. 405. FREEDOM TO CHOOSE.

''None of the funds made available under this Act shall be used to—

''(1) require any individual to choose or pursue a specific career path or major;

''(2) compel any individual to enter into a specific course of study which requires as a condition or completion, attainment of federally-funded or endorsed industry recognized skills or standards; or

''(3) require any individuals to meet or obtain federally-funded or endorsed industry recognized skills, certificates, or standards.

"SEC. 406. LIMITATION FOR CERTAIN STUDENTS.

''None of the funds received under this Act may be used to provide vocational-technical education programs to students prior to the seventh grade, except that equipment and facilities purchased with funds under this Act may be used by such students.

"SEC. 407. FEDERAL LAWS GUARANTEEING CIVIL RIGHTS.

''Nothing in this Act shall be construed to be inconsistent with applicable Federal laws guaranteeing civil rights.

"SEC. 408. AUTHORIZATION OF SECRETARY.

''For the purposes of increasing and expanding the use of technology in vocational-technical education instruction, including the training of vocational-technical education personnel as provided in title II, the Secretary is authorized to receive funds collected by the Federal Government from fees for the use of property, rights-of-way, and easements under the control of Federal departments and agencies for the placement of telecommunications services that are dependent, in whole or in part, upon the utilization of general spectrum rights for the transmission or reception of such services.

"PART B—STATE ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"SEC. 411. JOINT FUNDING.

''(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Funds made available to States under this Act may be used to provide additional funds under an applicable program if—

''(1) such program otherwise meets the requirements of this Act and the requirements of the applicable program;

''(2) such program serves the same individuals that are served under this Act;

''(3) such program provides services in a coordinated manner with services provided under this Act; and

''(4) such funds would be used to supplement, and not supplant, funds provided from non-Federal sources.

''(b) APPLICABLE PROGRAM.—For the purposes of this section, the term 'applicable program' means any program under any of the following provisions of law:

''(1) Section 123, title II, and title III of the Job Training Partnership Act.

''(2) The Wagner-Peyser Act.

''(c) USE OF FUNDS AS MATCHING FUNDS.—For the purposes of this section, the term 'additional funds' does not include the use of funds as matching funds.

"SEC. 412. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO INDUCE OUT-OF-STATE RELOCATION OF BUSINESSES.

''No funds provided under this Act shall be used for the purpose of directly providing incentives or inducements to an employer to relocate a business enterprise from one State to another State if such relocation would result in a reduction in the number of jobs available in the State where the business enterprise is located before such incentives or inducements are offered.

"SEC. 413. STATE ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.

''For each fiscal year for which a State receives assistance under this Act, the State shall provide from non-Federal sources for costs the State incurs for administration of programs under this Act an amount that is not less than the amount provided by the State from non-Federal sources for such costs for the preceding fiscal year.

"SEC. 414. LIMITATION ON FEDERAL REGULATIONS.

''The Secretary may issue regulations under this Act only to the extent necessary to administer and ensure compliance with the specific requirements of this Act.

"SEC. 415. STUDENT ASSISTANCE AND OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS.

''(a) ATTENDANCE COSTS NOT TREATED AS INCOME OR RESOURCES.—The portion of any student financial assistance received under this Act that is made available for attendance costs described in subsection (b) shall not be considered as income or resources in determining eligibility for assistance under any other program funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.

''(b) ATTENDANCE COSTS.—The attendance costs described in this subsection are—

''(1) tuition and fees normally assessed a student carrying the same academic workload as determined by the institution, and including costs for rental or purchase of any equipment, materials, or supplies required of all students in the same course of study; and

''(2) an allowance for books, supplies, transportation, dependent care, and miscellaneous personal expenses for a student attending the institution on at least a half-time basis, as determined by the institution.

''(c) COSTS OF VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION SERVICES.—Funds made available under title II may be used to pay for the costs of vocational-technical education services required in an individualized education plan developed pursuant to section 614(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and services necessary to meet the requirements of section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 with respect to ensuring equal access to vocational-technical education.

"PART C—DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 421. DEFINITIONS.

''Except as otherwise specified in this Act, as used in this Act:

''(1) ADMINISTRATION.—The term 'administration' means programs of a State necessary for the proper and efficient performance of its duties under this Act, including supervision, but does not include curriculum development programs, personnel development, or research programs.

''(2) ALL ASPECTS OF THE INDUSTRY.—The term 'all aspects of the industry' means strong experience in, and comprehensive understanding of, the industry that individuals are preparing to enter.

''(3) AREA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION SCHOOL.—The term 'area vocational-technical education school' means—

''(A) a specialized secondary school used exclusively or principally for the provision of vocational-technical education to individuals who are available for study in preparation for entering the labor market;

''(B) the department of a secondary school exclusively or principally used for providing vocational-technical education in not fewer than five different occupational fields to individuals who are available for study in preparation for entering the labor market;

''(C) a technical institute or vocational-technical education school used exclusively or principally for the provision of vocational-technical education to individuals who have completed or left secondary school and who are available for study in preparation for entering the labor market, if the institute or school admits as regular students both individuals who have completed secondary school and individuals who have left secondary school; or

''(D) the department or division of a junior college, or community college, that operates under the policies of the State board and that provides vocational-technical education in not fewer than five different occupational fields leading to immediate employment but not necessarily leading to a baccalaureate degree, if the department or division admits as regular students both individuals who have completed secondary school and individuals who have left secondary school.

''(4) COOPERATIVE EDUCATION.—The term 'cooperative education' means a method of instruction of education for individuals who, through written cooperative arrangements between a school and employers, receive instruction, including required academic courses and related instruction, by alternation of study in school with a job in any occupational field, which alternation shall be planned and supervised by the school and employer so that each contributes to the education and employability of the individual, and may include an arrangement in which work periods and school attendance may be on alternate half days, full days, weeks, or other periods of time in fulfilling the cooperative program.

''(5) DISPLACED HOMEMAKER.—The term 'displaced homemaker' means an individual who—

''(A) has worked primarily without remuneration to care for a home and family, and for that reason has diminished marketable skills; or

''(B) is a parent whose youngest dependent child will become ineligible to receive assistance under title I of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 not later than 2 years after the date of which the parent applies for assistance under this title.

''(6) EDUCATIONAL SERVICE AGENCY.—The term 'educational service agency' means a regional public multiservice agency authorized by State statute to develop and manage a service or program and provide the service or program to a local educational agency.

''(7) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.—The term 'eligible recipient' means a local educational agency, an area vocational-technical education school, an educational service agency, an institution of higher education (as such term is defined in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a))), and a consortium of such entities.

''(8) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term 'local educational agency' has the meaning given such term in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

''(9) OUTLYING AREA.—The term 'outlying area' means the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau.

''(10) REPRESENTATIVES OF EMPLOYEES.—The term 'representatives of employees' means—

''(A) individuals who have been elected by organizations, associations, or a network of similar institutions to represent the economic interests of employees at a significant segment of workplaces; or

''(B) individuals from organizations, associations, or a network of similar institutions, with expertise to represent, or experience representing, the interests of employees with respect to vocational-technical education.

''(11) SECONDARY SCHOOL.—The term 'secondary school' has the meaning given the term in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

''(12) SPECIAL POPULATIONS.—The term 'special populations' means individuals with disabilities, economically disadvantaged individuals, individuals of limited English proficiency, and individuals participating in nontraditional training and employment.

''(13) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Education.

''(14) STATE.—The term 'State' means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

''(15) TECH-PREP PROGRAM.—The term 'tech-prep program' means a program of study that—

''(A) combines at least 2 years of secondary education (as determined under State law) and 2 years of postsecondary education in a nonduplicative sequential course of study;

''(B) strengthens the applied academic component of vocational-technical education through the integration of academic and vocational-technical instruction;

''(C) provides technical preparation in an area such as engineering technology, applied science, a mechanical, industrial, or practical art or trade, agriculture, a health occupation, business, or applied economics;

''(D) builds student competence in mathematics, science, and communications through applied academics in a coherent sequence of courses; and

''(E) leads to an associate degree or a certificate in a specific career field and to high skill, high wage employment or further education.

''(16) VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION.—The term 'vocational-technical education' means organized educational programs that—

''(A) offer a sequence of courses that provide individuals with the academic knowledge and skills the individuals need to prepare for further education and careers in current or emerging employment sectors; and

''(B) include competency-based applied learning that contributes to the academic knowledge, higher-order reasoning and problem-solving skills, work attitudes, general employability skills, and occupation-specific skills, of an individual.

''(17) VOCATIONAL STUDENT ORGANIZATION.—The term 'vocational student organization' means an organization, for individuals enrolled in programs of vocational-technical education programs, that engages in programs as an integral part of the instructional component of such programs, which organization may have State and national units.''.

SEC. 402. REPEAL OF SMITH-HUGHES VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT.

The Act of February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929; 20 U.S.C. 11) (commonly known as the ''Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act'') is repealed.

SEC. 403. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided, the repeals and amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997.

The CHAIRMAN. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair will accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has had printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLING

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. GOODLING:

Page 3, after line 18, insert the following:

(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) NATIONAL PROGRAMS.—None of the funds made available under this section for programs authorized under titles I, II, and part C of title III, shall be used for any program authorized under part A of title III.

Page 3, line 19, strike ''(3)'' and insert ''(4)'' and strike ''(c)'' and insert ''(d)''.

Page 9, strike lines 12 through 14, and insert the following:

''(c) RURAL AND URBAN RESERVE.—A State may reserve not more than 5 percent of the allotment made under section 102(a)(1) to use for grants to rural areas and not more than 5 percent of such allotment to use for grants to urban areas.''.

Beginning on page 9, strike lines 15 and all that follows through page 10, line 2.

Page 10, after line 2, insert the following:

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) the term 'rural area' means an area that is not in a metropolitan statistical area;

''(2) the term 'urban area' means an area that serves a central city in a metropolitan statistical area; and

''(3) the terms 'central city' and 'metropolitan statistical area' have the same meanings given such terms in section 10952 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.''.

Page 16, after line 10, insert the following (and redesignate any subsequent subsections accordingly):

''(c) AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the sums appropriated for any fiscal year for grants under this section are not sufficient to pay in full the total amount which approved applicants are eligible to receive under this section for such fiscal year, the Secretary shall first allocate to each such applicant which received funds under this part for the preceding fiscal year an amount equal to 100 percent of the product of the per capita payment for the preceding fiscal year and such applicant's Indian student count for the current program year, plus an amount equal to the actual cost of any increase to the per capita figure resulting from inflationary increases to necessary costs beyond the institution's control.

''(2) PER CAPITA DETERMINATION.—For the purposes of paragraph (1), the per capita payment for any fiscal year shall be determined by dividing the amount available for grants to tribally controlled postsecondary vocational technical institutions under this part for such program year by the sum of the Indian student counts of such institutions for such program year. The Secretary shall, on the basis of the most accurate data available from the institutions, compute the Indian student count for any fiscal year for which such count was not used for the purpose of making allocations under this section.

Page 22, strike line 13, and insert the following:

(D) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) The State board shall, for secondary vocational-technical education programs, establish effective activities and procedures, by which parents, students, teachers, and area residents concerned will be able to participate in State and local decisions that influence programs under this Act, and ensure that such individuals are given access to the information needed to use such procedures.''.

Page 23, line 5, strike ''and''.

Page 23, line 9, strike the semicolon and insert ''in current and emerging occupations; and''.

Page 23, after line 9, insert the following:

''(D) how funds will be used to improve or develop new vocational-technical education courses.''.

Page 23, line 13, strike ''and''.

Page 23, line 14, before ''of'' insert '', and evaluation''.

Page 24, line 1, strike ''component'' and insert ''and vocational components''.

Page 24, line 5, after ''academic'' insert ''and vocational''.

Page 24, line 14, after ''describe'', insert '', to the extent practicable,''.

Page 25, strike lines 8 and 9 and insert the following:

''(8) describe what steps the State shall take to involve representatives of local school boards in the development of the State's benchmarks;

''(9) provide a financial audit of funds received under this Act which may be included as part of an audit of other Federal or State programs; and''.

Page 25, line 10, strike ''(9)'' and insert ''(10)''.

Page 27, strike line 11 and insert the following:

''(a) BENCHMARKS.—

''(1) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive an allot-''.

Page 27, strike lines 17 through 24 and insert the following:

''(A) attainment of challenging State academic and vocational proficiencies;

''(B) attainment of secondary school diplomas or general equivalency diplomas; and

''(C) placement in, retention in, and completion of, postsecondary education or advanced training, or placement and retention in military service, or employment.

''(2) EXISTING BENCHMARKS.—If a State has developed State performance indicators or benchmarks for skills according to challenging academic or vocational proficiencies consistent with this Act, the State may use such performance indicators or benchmarks in measuring the progress of vocational-technical education students.''.

Page 30, line 3, strike ''have met'' and insert ''have performed in meeting''.

Page 32, line 10, before the semicolon insert '', effective teaching skills based on research, and effective practices to improve parental and community involvement''.

Page 32, line 22 and page 33, line 2, after ''academic'' insert ''and vocational''.

Page 33, line 8, strike ''support for'' and insert ''establishing agreements between secondary and postsecondary vocational-technical education programs in order to provide postsecondary education and training opportunities for students participating in such vocational-technical education programs, such as''.

Page 33, line 23, strike ''and''.

Page 33, line 25, strike the period and all that follows and insert a semicolon.

Page 33, after line 25, insert the following:

''(10) support for education and business partnerships; and

''(11) support to improve or develop new vocational-technical education courses.''; and

Page 34, strike line 7 and insert ''**TIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS**.''.

Page 36, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 37, line 2, and insert the following:

''(b) SPECIAL DISTRIBUTION RULES FOR SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—

''(1) FISCAL YEARS 1999 AND 2000.—In fiscal years 1999 and 2000, each State shall distribute the funds available under this Act in such fiscal years for secondary school vocational-technical education programs to local educational agencies within the State as follows:

''(A) LESSER OR EQUAL AMOUNTS.—Each State shall distribute all funds allocated by the State for each such fiscal year for secondary school vocational-technical education programs in amounts less than or equal to the total amount of funds distributed pursuant to section 231(a) of this Act as such section was in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997 for such programs in fiscal year 1997 as follows:

''(i) 30 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 to 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency for the preceding fiscal year compared to the total number of such individuals who reside in the school districts served by all local educational agencies in the State for such preceding year.

''(ii) 70 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 through 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency from families with incomes below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) applicable to a family of the size involved for the fiscal year for which the determination is made compared to the number of such individuals in all the local educational agencies in the State.

''(B) GREATER AMOUNTS.—Each State shall distribute all funds allocated by the State for each such fiscal year for secondary school vocational-technical education programs in amounts greater than the total amount of funds distributed pursuant to section 231(a) of this Act as such section was in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997 for such programs in fiscal year 1997 as follows:

''(i) 40 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 to 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency for the preceding fiscal year compared to the total number of such individuals who reside in the school districts served by all local educational agencies in the State for such preceding year.

''(ii) 60 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 through 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency from families with incomes below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) applicable to a family of the size involved for the fiscal year for which the determination is made compared to the number of such individuals in all the local educational agencies in the State.

''(2) FISCAL YEAR 2001.—Each State shall distribute funds allocated under this Act in fiscal year 2001 for secondary school vocational-technical education programs to local educational agencies within the State as follows:

''(A) 35 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 to 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency for the preceding fiscal year compared to the total number of such individuals who reside in the school districts served by all local educational agencies in the State for such preceding year.

''(B) 65 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 through 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency from families with incomes below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) applicable to a family of the size involved for the fiscal year for which the determination is made compared to the number of such individuals in all the local educational agencies in the State.

''(3) FISCAL YEAR 2002.—Each State shall distribute funds allocated under this Act in fiscal year 2002 for secondary school vocational-technical education programs to local educational agencies within the State as follows:

''(A) 40 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 to 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency for the preceding fiscal year compared to the total number of such individuals who reside in the school districts served by all local educational agencies in the State for such preceding year.

''(B) 60 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 through 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency from families with incomes below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)) applicable to a family of the size involved for the fiscal year for which the determination is made compared to the number of such individuals in all the local educational agencies in the State.

Page 37, strike lines 7 through 11, and insert the following:

''(1) demonstrates that a proposed alternative formula more effectively targets funds on the basis of poverty (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)) to local educational agencies within the State than the formula described in subsection (b);''.

Page 37, line 20, strike ''$7,500'' and insert ''$10,000''.

Page 41, line 5, insert ''and'' after the semicolon.

Page 41, line 9, strike ''be'' and insert ''operate programs that are''.

Page 44, line 12, strike ''$20,000'' and insert ''$35,000''.

Page 47, line 8, strike ''that'' and insert ''which provides vocational-technical education programs and''.

Page 47, line 17, after ''Such'' insert ''vocational-technical education''.

Page 48, line 18, strike ''component'' and insert ''and vocational components''.

Page 48, line 22, after ''academic'' insert ''and vocational''.

Page 49, line 5, strike ''and implementation'' and insert '', implementation, and evaluation''.

Page 49, line 6, before the semicolon insert '', and how these individuals are effectively informed about, and assisted in understanding, the requirements of this Act,''.

Page 49, line 18, strike ''provide'' and insert ''support''.

Page 49, beginning on line 22, strike ''components'' and insert ''and vocational components''.

Page 50, line 2, after ''academic'' insert ''and vocational''.

Page 50, line 20, before the semicolon insert '', effective teaching skills based on research, and effective practices to improve parental and community involvement''.

Page 50, line 25, strike ''vocational'' and insert ''vocational-technical''.

Page 51, beginning on line 18, strike ''The'' and all that follows through ''subsection (b)'' on line 19, and insert ''Funds made available under this part''.

Page 52, line 4, strike ''and implementation'' and insert '', implementation, and evaluation''.

Page 52, line 7, after ''and'' insert ''academic''.

Page 52, line 18, strike ''and''.

Page 52, line 24, strike the period and insert a semicolon.

Page 52, after line 24, insert the following:

''(11) teacher preparation programs which assist individuals who are interested in becoming vocational-technical education instructors, including individuals with experience in business and industry;

''(12) improving or developing new vocational-technical education courses; and

''(13) support for family and consumer sciences programs.

Page 55, line 1, after ''expenditures'' insert ''of funds provided under this Act''.

Page 55, strike line 14 and insert the following:

''(c) COLLECTION OF INFORMATION AND REPORT.—''.

Page 56, line 19, after the semicolon insert ''and''.

Page 56, after line 19 insert the following:

''(C) to carry out research that can be used to improve teaching and learning in the vocational-technical education classroom;''.

Page 56, line 20, strike ''(C)'' and insert ''(D)'' and strike ''programs'' and insert ''research''.

Page 59, line 10, strike ''4-year'' and insert ''4 or 6-year''.

Page 62, line 22, strike ''$200,000'' and insert ''$250,000''.

Page 64, line 2, strike ''Part C'' and insert ''Parts C, D, E, F, G, and H''.

Page 64, line 4, strike ''is'' and insert ''are''.

Page 65, lines 5 and 14, strike ''program'' and insert ''fiscal''.

Page 65, line 21, strike ''similar windfalls,''.

Page 67, line 18, before the semicolon insert ''or to participate in any vocational-technical education program''.

Page 67, line 20, strike ''or'' and insert ''of''.

Page 67, line 22, strike ''or'' after the semicolon.

Page 67, line 24, after ''or'' insert ''federally''.

Page 67, line 25, strike the period and insert '', unless the participant has selected and is participating in a program or course of study that requires, as a condition of completion, attainment of an industry-recognized skill or standard; or''.

Page 67, after line 25, insert the following:

''(4) to require any individual to obtain a federally funded or endorsed certificate of mastery.''.

Page 68, after line 21, insert the following:

''SEC. 409. PARTICIPATION OF PRIVATE SCHOOL PERSONNEL.

''A State or local educational agency which uses funds under this Act for inservice and preservice vocational-technical education professional development programs for vocational-technical education teachers, administrators, and other personnel may,

upon request, permit the participation in such programs of vocational-technical education teachers, administrators, and other personnel in nonprofit private schools offering vocational-technical education programs located in the geographical area served by such agency.''.

Page 70, line 6, strike ''For'' and insert ''(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), for''.

Page 70, after line 11, insert the following:

''(b) EXCEPTION.—If the amount made available for administration of programs under this Act for a fiscal year is less than the amount made available for administration of programs under this Act for the preceding fiscal year, the amount the State is required to provide from non-Federal sources for costs the State incurs for administration of programs under this Act shall be the same percentage as the amount made available for administration of programs under this Act.

Page 73, after line 21, insert the following (and redesignate any subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

''(4) CAREER GUIDANCE AND ACADEMIC COUNSELING.—The term 'career guidance and academic counseling' means providing individuals with information access on career awareness and planning for their occupational and academic future which shall involve career options, financial aid, and postsecondary options.

Page 74, line 2, after ''related'' insert ''vocational-technical education''.

Page 77, beginning on line 13, strike ''through applied academics'' and insert ''(including through applied academics)''.

Page 78, line 2, strike ''employment sectors'' and insert ''occupations which require other than a baccalaureate or an advanced degree''.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, a manager's amendment, that would modify the within State secondary funding formula to distribute funds in 1998 by the current law formula, in 1999 and 2000 by a formula based 70 percent on poverty, 30 percent on population with a hold harmless at the 1997 funding level. Any additional funds above the 1997 level will be distributed by a formula based 60 percent on poverty, 40 percent on population. In the year 2001 all funds are allocated by a formula based 65 percent on poverty, 35 percent on population. And in the year 2002 all funds are allocated by a formula based on 60 percent poverty, 40 percent population.

The amendment will raise the minimum grant amount from $7,500 to $10,000 for secondary programs, and from $20,000 to $35,000 for postsecondary programs. It would modify the 10-percent rural reserve and would strike the 5 percent for incentive grant awards. The amendment would further modify the secondary alternative formula language to allow funds to be targeted to areas of greater poverty. The Chairman's amendment would raise the small State minimum grant award for technology prep to $250,000 and would insert language prohibiting the use of funds authorized for State grants to be used for national programs. Part C through H of title III are repealed. Language is added to increase the involvement of parents in vocational—technial education programs. Language asking States to describe how they will involve local school boards in the development of the State's benchmarks is included and the amendment would add language allowing nonprofit private schools who have secondary vocational-technical education programs, to be able to participate in vocational-technical education professional development activities. Finally, the amendment would make other modifying and technical changes to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Goodling amendment, the manager's amendment, because it does allow States to reserve 5 percent of their Federal funds to help rural areas improve vocational education, and unlike our urban Members, rural residents often do not have the option of hopping on a subway or a bus to get to their needed services. Sometimes we have to drive many, many miles to even to get the most basic of services.

Many of Nebraska's rural communities are grappling with some pretty dramatic State education funding changes. At risk of course is vocational education, which provides opportunities for young people to get the job skills and learn about the technologies in the business world.

In my State we have a very unique problem. We have a labor shortage. Our unemployment rate today is about 2.3 percent. Many businesses have wanted to expand or locate in my State only to find that we do not have enough skilled people for them to employ. That is why targeting vocational funds to rural areas might very well help attract and retain existing businesses.

So, Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], and the staff for all of the hard work that has gone into this legislation. I would encourage my colleagues to support the Goodling amendment as well as the bill.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I rise to discuss a provision of the amendment that is offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and a cornerstone of this amendment is the changes that it will make to the secondary substate former provisions which have been agreed upon in a bipartisan fashion, and the formula which is included in the reported bill strongly deemphasizes, in my estimation, poverty and allows the States to reserve up to 15 percent of local moneys for an undefined purpose and subsequently was completely unacceptable to us on our side of the aisle.

In contrast, the manager of the amendment will gradually institute a formula over a 5-year period which is slightly less targeted toward poverty than in current law but still is adequate. In doing this, the formula provisions will protect current funding streams to ensure that school districts, whether represented by a Democrat or a Republican, will continue to operate quality vocational education programs.

□ 1130

In addition, the amendment would ensure that States who wish to waive the provision of this formula would have to develop one that better targets poverty to gain the approval of the Secretary of Education. Coupled with this alternative formula provision is the ability of States to target both rural and urban areas through grants and increase minimum grant amounts for both secondary and postsecondary recipients.

While many, including myself, would have wanted to maintain the formula in current law, I believe both sides view this as a compromise which we could all support. We on this side support the gentleman's amendment, and I urge all my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out to my colleagues that we worked very diligently to arrive at this bipartisan compromise. This bipartisan compromise, as included in the manager's amendment, really is the result of weeks and weeks of very intensive negotiations. It came about as a result of literally a last-minute, 11th-hour proposal made by our Democratic colleagues yesterday.

However, I want to point out that what we have done here effectively is to meet halfway. Current law sends money down to local school districts for secondary programs on a formula that is based roughly on 30-percent population and 70-percent poverty. The 70 percent poverty factor is a proxy for the current title I variable and the 30-percent population factor is a proxy for the 20-percent IDEA and 10-percent population factors in current law.

In our committee bill we proposed splitting the funds for secondary programs on a 50/50 poverty-population formula. What the Chairman has proposed, and which has met with agreement on the other side of the aisle, is a new substate formula based 40 percent on population and 60 percent on poverty. This will be gradually phased in over the life of the bill.

However, what I want to stress to my colleagues and this is really critical in view of some of the amendments that may be coming up later today on this legislation, that any additional funds above the 1997 level would be distributed, beginning in fiscal year 1999, on a new formula which is based 60 percent on poverty, 40 percent on population.

So, that is to say, that to the extent we can have additional moneys going down to the local level and to the extent we can secure any additional appropriations for Perkins vocational-technical education programs, beginning in 1999 those moneys will go down to the local school district by a formula that is based 60 percent poverty—40 percent population.

If any amendment comes up later today that would effectively reduce the amount of money—reduce from the 90 percent of the funds that are going locally—then that amendment would have the effect of basically upsetting this very delicate agreement that we have arrived at in a bipartisan fashion with respect to the sub-State formula.

In the Chairman's manager's amendment, we have come up with an agreement that allows 10 percent of the funds to be targeted to rural and urban areas—a maximum of 5 percent for rural areas and 5 percent for urban areas. But we should not overlook the concerns we heard from some of our witnesses regarding suburban areas.

We all recognize the problems of urban cities, and I daresay that those urban school districts are fairly well represented on the Democratic side of the aisle. They have some very forceful and articulate advocates on our Committee. Suburban schools have many of the same problems that urban school districts face today, very similar problems in fact: drugs, gangs, youth violence. Those problems are being found, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON] pointed out, in rural areas and, as I am stressing now, in suburban areas as well as urban areas.

I mentioned in my opening remarks that we held a field hearing across the Potomac River in northern Virginia Fairfax County, VA is a county that most Members are familiar with because of its proximity to Washington, DC. I want to stress that whereas in 1990, 8.7 percent of the children in Fairfax County schools were considered living in poverty, today, in 1997, that number has risen to 18.3 percent—an average annual increase of 15 percent.

One other point I want to make and that concerns reducing the minimum grant amount. I am very glad that we were able, again, to arrive at a bipartisan agreement with our Democrat colleagues on this issue. We heard during our hearings that there is a need to try to spread this money more equitably around the country. A lot of the Perkins dollars simply are not getting into certain areas and communities of the country.

By lowering the minimum grant amount in current law from $15,000 to $10,000 for secondary programs, one effectively cutting the minimum grant amount by one-third. We are driving more money to more school districts at the local level, using those Federal taxpayer dollars to leverage State and local dollars that are going into public education specifically for vocational-technical education programs.

Again, I am pleased that our Democratic colleagues were able to arrive at an agreement with us on this particular issue, and I urge support of the manager's amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill before us, and in support of the amendment before us, but also in support of moving this bill from the House floor and our body to conference, where we hope it can even undergo further improvements.

I rise in support of this legislation for a number of reasons. One is because so many people today do not go on to graduate from a 4-year college or university and need this help through this particular legislation; second, because in a global economy where more and more businesses are doing their business overseas, where more and more of our workers are needing lifetime skills and not just learning between 18 and 22, we need to make sure that programs like this are targeted to the most vulnerable in our society and targeted for a lifetime of learning, not just for a particular couple of years or time period.

Those are very, very important reasons why we need the legislation. The world is changing. We need to target the help to help our businesses compete, to help our young people learn new skills, and to help them learn these skills for a lifetime.

I also think we have had a number of improvements in this bill through the subcommittee process and the full committee process and now with the administration amendments. We have maintained the tech prep program which is very critical for the State of Indiana and helps prepare some of our youngest, most talented and most vulnerable people to get the necessary skills in Indiana to stay in Indiana and contribute to the business, to the work force, to the plant, and ultimately, to the economy.

Second, we have been able to strengthen provisions addressing professional development in this bill so we continue to work with the teachers that need to enhance their abilities to teach young people in different ways as to the changing world and the changing machines and computers they are working with. That is a very key ingredient in this bill.

Third, we are training the personnel to use technology and long-distance learning capabilities more and more through the language in this bill. We have heard from testimony throughout the last couple of months that long-distance learning and E rate and a host of other things are going to be very, very important, not only to train young people but for equity in learning, to make sure that some of the schools that are in inner-city areas that cannot afford the long-distance learning machines and technology also get access to that technology.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, we need to do more there, more through enforcing the E rate that was recently passed by the FCC. We need to do more in terms of technology and getting this technology into schools that cannot afford it. We need to do more in terms of the fairness and the equity. But this is a beginning in this bill. I support that, and hopefully we can do more in conference.

Last, Mr. Chairman, I think one of my biggest concerns about this legislation is the funding mechanism. I want to make sure that we have the funding formula more and more oriented toward making sure that the most vulnerable people in our society, those that need this assistance and education the most, those people that are trying to get off welfare, that they get the skills for a good education and training to stay off those welfare rolls. We need a funding formula that drives this assistance in education and training to those people. Instead of making it population-based, we need to drive it more toward the poverty rate and those that need it.

We are starting to do that. I hope we do even more of that in the conference coming up with the Senate. It is similar to disaster assistance. If we had a disaster assistance bill on the floor that was supposed to go to those people in North Dakota that just experienced a disaster, but we said no, we are not going to base this on the disaster or the flooding, we are going to base it on the population so people in California and Florida will get it just as people in North Dakota will get it, that would not make a whole lot of sense.

So let us try to drive this formula, the funding formula, in conference more and more toward those in poverty, those that need it; those schools that really need the resources to address those people to get the education and training, both for their dignity, for their futures and their family's futures, but also to help fix the welfare problem that we have in this society today, too.

We are making great strides. We need to continue to be fair and equitable. I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation and continue to improve it in conference.

Mr. PAYNE. I move to strike the requisite number of words, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment, and overall stand to support the vocational education bill which is so important as part of our Federal education system. This act provides our students with the tools to be prepared for a trade or career directly following high school.

As has been indicated, every student is not going on to college. The intention of these programs is to teach young people a trade while allowing students to be academically prepared for postsecondary education. Giving our students viable options for the future is very critical for the economic and social development of our Nation.

It is for that reason that I am pleased that the concern that I raised during the committee markup regarding reserves for only rural districts has been addressed. I appreciate the subcommittee chair for allowing the position that I had that the bill before the House today includes a 5-percent reserve for

both urban and rural areas who display need.

The additional pool of funds will allow students in regions of our country, where a college education is unfortunately just not economically an option, to have vocational education programs best suited for their future.

I would also like to offer my sincere strong support for the Mink-Morella-Sanchez-Woolsey amendment to provide a hold harmless for programs serving displaced homemakers, single parents, and pregnant women, and programs that promote gender equity.

Opponents of this provision claim that States can offer these programs at the present time if they decide to do so. However, prior to when the Perkins Act required the States to have gender equity programs, only 1 percent, let me state it again, only 1 percent of State grants went to displaced homemakers and supportive services. The history of this provision proves that these programs will not be funded if the Mink amendment is not included in this bill. So I urge Members of the House to support this very important amendment.

Sadly, this will leave members of our population who are struggling to support families and to stay off of welfare, as we talk of from welfare to work, this will not give the opportunity to women to be trained in specific fields. It will also leave young women in high schools across the country with little encouragement to participate in vocational education programs that increase the chance of them attaining a job with a future when they graduate.

As we attempt to move this country from welfare to work, I find it strange that job training programs such as the Perkins Act would ignore the female population that constitutes a large majority of people who are currently relying on public assistance who will have to move to work.

□ 1145

Therefore, I urge my colleagues in the House on both sides to fully support the Mink-Morella-Sanchez-Woolsey amendment and vote for its passage.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I would like to share my strong support for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out two things. We are hearing a lot about where the money should go. Keep in mind now, we are talking about 75 percent of the population that has been pretty well ignored because they do not receive a 4-year college degree. We have to make sure that that 75 percent is ready to enter the high tech jobs that are out there, if we are going to remain competitive.

I would also like to point out that with the formula contained in the bill, the nine largest cities in the country, receive anywhere from a 12.7-percent to 17.2-percent increase. But we are talking about 75 percent of our population that we really have to deal with and deal with promptly if we are going to remain competitive in this United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MRS. MINK OF HAWAII

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

Page 21, line 4, strike ''(b)'' and insert ''(c)''

Page 21, line 6, strike ''(b)'' and insert ''(c)''.

Page 21, line 10, strike the periods and end quotation marks and insert a semicolon.

Page 21, after line 10, insert the following:

(5) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(1) by striking ''section 221'' and inserting ''paragraph (3) of section 201(c); and

(ii) by striking ''section 222'' and inserting ''paragraph (4) of section 201(c)''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (J).

Page 33, after line 12, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

''(4) sex equity programs,''.

Page 34, after line 5, insert the following:

''(e) HOLD HARMLESS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of the part or section 102(a), to carry out programs described in paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (c), each eligible recipient shall reserve from funds allocated under section 102(a)(1), an amount that is not less than the amount such eligible recipient received in fiscal year 1997 for carrying out programs under sections 221 and 222 of this Act as such sections were in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997.

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise today together with my colleagues the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD] to offer this amendment which seeks to preserve existing programs serving the needs of girls and women in our vocational educational system.

The bill in its current form represents a major setback for girls and women in our educational system. It eliminates important provisions of current law which target programs for displaced homemakers, single parents and pregnant women, and programs to ensure gender equity and train women for nontraditional careers. It eliminates the equity coordinator now required in every State to assist vocational education programs in meeting the needs of girls and women in these special categories, and eliminates a 10.5 percent set-aside which is required under current law.

The amendment we offer today does not fully restore these provisions but assures that it will continue to receive the support at the current level. It maintains a vocational education equity coordinator and provides a hold-harmless for the displaced homemaker, single parent and gender equity programs at the fiscal year 1997 level. We have heard in the manager's amendment how the expectation is that there will be increased funding because of the bipartisan support for this program, and the formula is based upon the assumption that the funding will increase to the year 2002.

Under our amendment we do not have a 10 percent set-aside. All we are asking is that the current funding which has been allocated to these four programs be maintained at the level that is being experienced in the local communities.

Over 13 years ago Congress made sure that the special needs of women and girls were attended to by this set-aside, and numerous analyses have been made about the effectiveness of this program. GAO and other sources have reported that this is a program that has provided that assistance which was absent prior to this set-aside. There is evidence to indicate that only 1 percent of the program recipients were women in these categories.

So I hope that my amendment will be agreed to. It is especially urgent because of the changes that were made in the welfare program. We are now putting emphasis on work and on work training. The only education program in the bill that was passed last year which meets the criteria of work activity is vocational training. Vocational training is recognized by all persons as the one means by which people who are not able to find a job, get a job, improve themselves, get into a situation where they can actually sustain their families with their income.

So it is extremely important, at this stage of correlating the existing law to the new changes under welfare, that we not abandon the support that has been given to displaced homemakers, single parents, single pregnant women and others in this category. They need that continued support.

We are restructuring this program. We are creating new ways in which to orient the funding of the program. It seems to me that in this period of transition it is critical that we hold harmless a program of this sort. Otherwise it will get lost.

Notwithstanding what the majority Members, including the Chair of the full committee, have said, suggesting that the bill before us is adequate, I would like to point out that the bill does not in any way make sure that single parents, displaced homemakers, single pregnant women, or individuals

seeking nontraditional employment can be served. Although the State application must include a description of how the State will serve these categories of people, the application is only a planning document. There is no enforcement mechanism that would sanction the States if they did not actually do what they said in their application.

The State leadership activities only allow a State to provide support for these programs; that they may choose to spend all of their money on required activities and absolutely none on the programs for displaced homemakers, single pregnant women, and sick single parents.

The accountability provisions which have been referred to do not include a benchmark for measuring services to this group of disadvantaged persons. A State can report that only one single displaced homemaker was served and would meet the requirements of the benchmarks.

I ask the House to consider the progress that we have made in addressing the special needs of these individuals in probably the most disadvantaged group in our society and in view of the fact that the welfare bill, which we voted and made into law, singles out the single parents on welfare and says that the policy of this country is that all of these individuals should work, work off their welfare or work into a job situation; in order to work into a job situation, have specifically said that the work requirement could be met by the work activity definition of vocational education.

That being the case, this Congress and this House in particular has recognized the significance of vocational education. Women, after all, constitute half the population. They should have special attention. In view of what we did in the welfare bill, it seems to me to abandon them now, offer them no protection of at least sustaining the efforts that have been put in place, would be a dramatic reversal of the emphasis that we have put on serving this population.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and continue the programs that are in existence.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I must stand in opposition to this amendment for my dear colleague from Hawaii. We so often agree on some of these gender issues, but on this, as I did in the committee markup, I must oppose the amendment.

I agree with the direction of this legislation and that is to move away from any type of set-aside and, therefore, cannot support the amendment.

This amendment, in my assessment, would severely limit the authority given to the States which is one of the prime reforms of this legislation; that is, the authority given to the States, to local school districts and post-secondary institutions that under this bill would determine their own priorities for reform and for funding.

I think there are benefits, enormous benefits to putting more decisionmaking at the local level, as long, and I must stress this to my colleagues that do not understand this legislation or have not read it yet, as long as we have the backup and enforcement mechanisms that are required. I believe the legislation does this.

To address the concerns that special populations would not be accommodated under this legislation, for any of our colleagues who question that, I have to refer them to page 29 where there is an explicit statement about special populations. This statement refers to how the State has to take certain actions in accordance with this legislation. Those actions include all kinds of populations and specifically displaced homemakers, single parents and single pregnant women.

Further, the legislation does include the necessary enforcement mechanisms and penalties, as I read it. If the State application fails to show how the State will ensure that the special populations meet or exceed State benchmarks, then the Secretary of Education would disapprove the application. Further, if the State fails to meet its own benchmarks, then the Secretary and the Department of Education can intervene to bring the State up to a minimum adequate level of performance. That is explicit in the legislation.

In addition, the Secretary and the department could also sanction the State by withholding all or part of the State grant. So I am really not quite sure where the author of this amendment, how the author of the amendment is able to say that there are no enforcement mechanisms.

I am more than reasonably assured that we are protecting the special populations and at the same time gaining the benefits from the knowledge, the direct knowledge of those at the local level who best know how to target these programs. That is one of the essential reforms of this bill. To adopt this amendment would deny that and reinstate set-asides.

I do not believe that we need set-asides or quotas. We need equity, we need outreach, and we need nondiscrimination. The Secretary and the Department of Education have the explicit authority in this legislation to maintain those principles.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise on behalf of our bipartisan amendment to H.R. 1853, the sex equity amendment. Our amendment will preserve programs that eliminate sex bias in vocational education and job training programs. This assistance is vital to displaced homemakers, single parents, and to pregnant women attempting to enter the work force.

Let us face it, young women are being tracked into vocational education that leads to low wage, traditionally female occupations. I remember when I was graduating from high school and I went to see my counselor. With a straight A average, I was told to go to the local community college. I said I wanted to be a doctor. My counselor said, ''Why don't you become a nurse?''

Sadly, 10 years later my younger sister went to the same counselor at the same high school, and she also had practically a straight A average, and she was told the same thing: ''Stay close to home. Go to school for a 2-year degree that will get you a job that will let you start working right away.''

We need to stop this. The current 10.5 percent set-aside in Perkins dollars is designated to reverse this detrimental trend. More importantly, these specialized programs move displaced homemakers and single parents from welfare to work, something most of us agree needs to be done.

This amendment will preserve the specialized job training programs by requiring local entities to maintain current funding for the next fiscal year. Each State will also be required to maintain its sex equity coordinator, and that is very important because it allows somebody to talk to young women about good-paying jobs and following a program that will allow them to be good breadwinners.

□ 1200

This approach will ensure that these programs are maintained by providing States and local entities maximum flexibility in meeting the vocational education needs of women.

Since we are all interested in reducing the number of women and families on welfare, our primary goal should be to increase the employability and the earning potential of women, especially women with children. The programs that we have now do this. They succeed in promoting self-sufficiency for women.

So let us not take a step back but, instead, let us work toward maintaining and advancing these programs.

I am especially concerned that programs to help young single mothers will remain intact. My district in Orange County has the highest incidence of teen pregnancy. When a young lady makes a good decision to keep a child but wonders how she will support it, it is important that we have programs in place to assist teen mothers to graduate from high school with the ability to find and maintain employment that is essential to getting these families out of that welfare and low-poverty cycle.

If we are to break that cycle, that dependency that haunts teenage mothers, then we must help these young women to graduate from high school with the skills necessary to gain good, meaningful, long-term employment.

Funding sex equity and single parent programs now is an investment in our young people. Small grants combined

with local community efforts can help to make a tremendous impact on programs for young women. Please vote for our amendment.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, during my tenure in the House, I have always supported programs that would ensure that women have access to nontraditional jobs. For women who are seeking job training services, the bottom line is a livable wage. Nontraditional jobs pay better, they offer greater benefits. For displaced homemakers and single parents, nontraditional jobs can be a pathway to economic self-sufficiency and family stability.

I also believe that, we know the old adage, if it ain't broke don't fix it, we have a situation that is not broken, that appears to be working, that this bill will help to enhance, so let us not change it. It is because of my interest in the self-sufficiency of women that I have joined with my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] to offer this amendment to preserve programs for displaced homemakers, single parents and pregnant women.

The amendment does not add any cost to the bill nor does it seek to restore the current law set-aside at the State level for these programs. It merely requires that localities currently funding such programs continue to do so at the same level as fiscal year 1997.

The amendment also restores the vocational education equity coordinator required in each State to oversee and evaluate equity programs for displaced homemakers and single parents in vocational education, which is current law.

It is essential that we preserve these programs, I believe, to ensure that women and girls have access to higher wage, higher skilled jobs that traditionally are reserved for men.

Programs and services to displaced homemakers and single parents have received very high marks. A national assessment of past program participants found a majority rated the program that they attended as excellent or very good. Three out of four customers who participated in other government programs, such as the welfare system, the Job Training Partnership Act or Job Corps rated the displaced homemaker or single parent programs as much better or better. Nearly all of the participants agreed that they would recommend the program to a friend.

In Pennsylvania, participants enrolled in the displaced homemaker programs terminated or reduced their need for public assistance, resulting in savings to the State of nearly $2 million a year.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the members of the committee, the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY]. I want to also commend the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

All of this committee have done an excellent job on this particular bill. I know they have put a lot of hard work into it, and this is a bill that directs funds for vocational education programs into the local level.

I also appreciate the efforts of the chairman and the committee to protect programs for displaced homemakers, single parents, and pregnant women. However, history, as well as anecdotal information, collected by the National Coalition for Women and Girls on Education, makes it clear that without reserves States will not continue these services.

Before designated funds were in place, States and localities spent only 0.2 percent of their vocational funding on specialized programming for women and girls. Unless language is written with more specific wording, programs for this special population may not continue. I think they will not continue in many instances.

Some displaced homemaker programs have already been put on notice by State directors of vocational and technical education that, if Congress eliminates the reserves, they will not be funded. This is an ominous warning about States' commitment to equity without firm Federal guidelines.

Our amendment ensures that these successful programs will continue. It would also provide States with the flexibility they need to meet the needs of the girls and women in their vocational education and job training programs.

Mr. Chairman, women comprise close to half of the civilian work force. By the year 2000, more women than men will be entering the work force. The failure to incorporate women into all areas of the work force penalizes not only women but the entire American economy.

U.S. productivity and competitiveness in the international marketplace will depend more and more upon industry's ability to encourage, incorporate, and nurture the skills and knowledge, energy, and creativity of women workers.

Our amendment is not an option, it is a necessity, so I urge a ''yes'' vote on this important amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Some years ago, when we were reauthorizing vocational education, we found, when we got almost to the end of the markup, that we had set-asides totaling 120 percent. Obviously, funding for programs can only total 100 percent but we had included set-asides for 120 percent, which meant that so many programs were created that were so small, that no one really could do much of anything with the money they were getting. So we had to go back to the drawing board, and fortunately we were able to eliminate an awful lot of those set-asides.

Now, today, we are back, and what we would do with this amendment is make sure that there is less money for local school districts to do exactly what these Members want to do. In the formula under our bill we force this money down to the local level, 90 percent of it, for local priorities.

Now, let me tell my colleagues what the amendment does, on the other hand. Let us say a State gets only $4 million. Only $4 million. Well, the first $60,000 goes off the top for a sex equity coordinator. Then that person has to have five, six, maybe eight other people that have to help that sex equity coordinator. Another $60,000, $100,000, $200,000 goes off the top and never gets down to the local level to help the people we are trying to help. I again point out, we are talking about 75 percent of our population, including displaced homemakers, who we need to serve in this legislation.

Now, it was mentioned that this amendment would be better than the job training services provided to displaced homemakers under the Job Training Partnership Act. This is no any longer true. As a matter of fact, we have approximately $1.5 billion in the job training bill that we passed in May through which displaced homemakers may receive assistance. We have defined displaced homemakers as dislocated workers under that legislation and increased the emphasis for serving this population under that bill. We have also expanded services for displaced homemakers in our reconciliation bill under its welfare-to-work provisions with another $3 billion.

We have to understand there is 75 percent of our population that has not been served well; that must be served if we are going to remain a competitive nation. And if we do not remain a competitive nation, then there is no use to talk about education or training because there will be no jobs out there.

In my district we have many jobs available for those who have skills. There are very few jobs for unskilled laborers any longer, and in the year 2000 there will be less. So we have to deal with this 75 percent. We cannot require a little set-aside here and a little set-aside there.

As I mentioned, if we do it the way we now have it in the manager's amendment, we are forcing 90 percent of the money down to the local level.

Now, I ask who, more than I, have led the fight over the years to make sure that we are serving the needs of displaced homemakers? Not any woman that I know, as a matter of fact, and that is why this legislation is filled with references requiring services for special populations.

We start out on page 24 and we say describe how the State will ensure that members of special populations meet State benchmarks established under section 114 and are prepared for postsecondary education, future learning,

high skill, high wage careers. Then we have an auditor that comes in and makes darn sure that, as a matter of fact, the State is doing what they said to the Secretary they are going to do.

We go on then and indicate that each State that receives an allotment under section 102 shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary a report on how the State is performing on State benchmarks. And, under that, special population, the report submitted by the State in accordance with the subparagraph, shall include a description of how special populations, displaced homemakers—we even spell them out—are served under our legislation.

And then we go to the local level, and we say ''support for programs for single parents, displaced homemakers, single pregnant women and individuals in nontraditional occupations that lead to high skill, high wage careers.'' And again, we mention the local level on page 52 and say, ''programs for single parents, displaced homemakers and single pregnant women.''

We have spelled it out over, and over, and over, again that the State will serve special populations, displaced homemakers, single pregnant women and single parents, probably far better than they have been served in the past. If the State does not, then the State will be in serious trouble as far as their State allocation is concerned.

So I would hope that we do not start this business now of having set-asides until we weaken everything so there is not enough money to do anything well and no flexibility for local governments and States to serve those in most need.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, assuming over 50 percent of the 75 percent of individuals not going to college are women, if we really want to reduce the number of families on welfare, we should thank our colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] for offering this amendment.

I am personally very proud to support girls and women in vocational education, and I am proud of the coauthorship of this amendment with my colleague from Hawaii, and the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD].

Clearly, this amendment proves that the real welfare reform for families, those who are on welfare, will get off the rolls if we take care of women and their children. This amendment prevents families not only from being on welfare and helping them get off of welfare, it prevents them from going on welfare in the first place.

The Mink amendment is real welfare reform. It does that because it preserves vocational education programs that give women the skills they need to get jobs that pay a livable wage. Also, it provides women with the ability to support themselves and their families. These programs train displaced homemakers, single parents and single pregnant women for nontraditional careers, such as blue collar jobs, jobs that men usually hold, jobs that pay better than the traditional jobs women often take.

The data of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Mr. Chairman, shows that young women who graduate from high school and go right into the job market earn less, 25 percent less, than their male counterparts. The reason for this? Again, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, it is that these young women are overrepresented in low-paying occupations.

The Mink amendment does not require any local community to start any new program to train women for nontraditional jobs, it just maintains and holds harmless what is in place today.

□ 1215

It simply says if we already have a program for displaced homemakers for single parents or for single pregnant women, we can and should continue the program.

We know these programs work. The Department of Labor in Florida showed that over 70 percent of the women who participated in their programs in 1992 and 1993 doubled their income after completing the program. A study of the participants in Oregon's program showed that the graduates had expanded employment opportunities, increased salaries, and reduced dependency on public assistance.

In 1992, less than 7 percent of all working women were employed in nontraditional occupations. Yet those women earned 20 to 30 percent more than women in more traditional jobs if they were in the nontraditional occupations.

The Morella-Woolsey-Sanchez-Millender-McDonald sex equity amendment is good welfare prevention and good welfare reform, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for it.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, as a former director of gender equity programs for the Los Angeles Unified School District, I would like to correct something that the previous speaker spoke on with reference to women, single parents, displaced homemakers, teen pregnancy programs.

As the director of those programs, I know from the absolute experience that we provided the majority of the money to those programs to help the women, the young women who were pregnant, parents as well as displaced homemakers in these programs. The majority of the money did go down to the local level to help them, and we want to just make sure the RECORD reflects this statement and correction of that statement, because I do know the value and necessity for providing quality vocational programs for single parents and displaced homemakers.

I also know the need for equity coordinators to oversee, coordinate, and evaluate equity initiatives in vocational education. I had four equity coordinators working under me, and I do know that they made evaluations of the program on an annual basis.

Under current law, a 10.5-percent set-aside is required at the State level for these programs. Our amendment would not restore the set-aside but simply require that localities currently funding such programs continue to provide funding for these programs at the same level as the fiscal year 1997. Our amendment would also restore the requirement that a vocational education equity coordinator exist in every State.

The Vocational Education Reauthorization Act that Congress has deemed essential in helping women escape domestic violence and become self-sufficient for the past 13 years has indeed been a model program and one that is sorely needed. I do not see nor understand why we would not want to maintain a program at the current level that has proven to be one of the most successful programs in this country.

The 1996 GAO study ''Employment Training: Successful Projects Share Common Strategy'' reported that the single parent/displaced homemaker program funded through the Florida program is one of the most successful training programs. Most of the 1,300 single parent/displaced homemaker program participants and program coordinators follow the Florida model.

In Oregon, during the same year, the long-term success rate of these single and displaced homemaker programs was remarkably high. The employment rate soared from 28 percent to 71 percent, and the median wage rate increased from $6 per hour to $7.45 per hour. In addition, Mr. Chairman, the dependence on AFDC of the program participants fell from 29 percent to 15 percent.

Studies all over the country, from Arizona to Georgia, demonstrate the vast improvement in increased salaries for women participants, a higher rate of employment of women in nontraditional jobs, and more women living independently from welfare assistance. And these numbers do not even mention the vast ways in which the vocational education has improved the self-esteem of these women and enhanced the lives of their families.

The single and displaced homemaker programs are exceeding the goals they were designed to meet. This is not the time for us to close down these programs. If anything, we should be expanding these programs to ensure that

we reach even more women in need of a quality education program, especially in light of the welfare reform bill that was passed by the majority in this House.

But that is not what this amendment does. The Mink-Morella-Sanchez-Woolsey-Millender-McDonald amendment requires that local recipients of vocational education funds spend at least as much as they spent in fiscal year 1997 on programs for displaced homemakers, single parents, single pregnant women and programs which promote gender equity.

We need this amendment to ensure that the doors to education and employment opportunities remain open for single and displaced women. This amendment will maintain the gender equity coordinator position and continue to create opportunities for women that they should have. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation, I would like to urge the majority to withdraw its opposition to this amendment. This is a very conservative amendment seeking to hold onto the status quo. We are only asking that you continue to do what we were doing before.

The chairman before talked about the high-technology world that we are into already and how it is critically necessary that we be able to train people for this high-technology world. Here is a whole pool of people out there who can qualify, that we are ignoring in the traditional approach to vocational education, and too many people at the State and local level are still trapped in the traditional approach. They will not look at the pool of females who are available for some of these areas.

It has been mentioned that we ought to open up blue collar jobs to women, and that is good and well, but we do not need to go that far. We have a massive number of jobs being opened every day in the world of the Internet and the world of computer repair and computer maintenance, technicians, mechanics. We have a revolution going on in our school system that we are not fully aware of, that will require large numbers of new kinds of personnel.

I have an article that was in the New York Times today about teachers being trained, we need to spend more money to train teachers, and another article about training teachers how to make use of educational technology, computers, and telecommunications apparatus that may be available in the future. We have a $2.2 billion universal fund that is going to allow for discounts to go to schools so that more schools can get telecommunications services and be wired for the Internet. We have a whole category of people out there that this bill really did not take into full consideration.

I appreciate the fact that the subcommittee chairman did incorporate language that would recognize the fact that we have a telecommunications and technology revolution underway. We should be doing more to recognize that in this legislation. It really did not do that.

And certainly in opposing this bill, which seeks to keep open a new channel that has been opened already, to allow us to take full advantage of the great pool of people out there who are being ignored for these various technician and mechanical applications of high technology that are being opened, and we are going to ignore it if we do not do that.

We do not have much monitoring of anything in education anymore. If my colleagues have been out there, they know that nothing is being monitored and enforced. If my colleagues take a step backwards and do not keep this provision in there, it will be a sign to the traditionalists and to the sexists to continue doing things the way they were doing them before we had this provision put into law. So we need to keep going forward and understand where we are in this revolution.

I was visiting a Citibank processing center several years ago, where they process their paperwork and bills and so forth, a massive center of people doing high-technology computerized processing, and I noticed most of the people in there were women. They pointed out the fact that women, particularly those who did not have college educations, who are intelligent but do not have a college education, were the best employees for that kind of repetitive job which required a high degree of focus and accuracy. They did not want college-educated women because they got bored, their minds wandered.

There is a certainly category, the kind of people we are talking about here, who could fill those jobs if they were given the opportunity, but if we do not open up the vista, if we do not have the people in charge of vocational and technical education.

I want to emphasize that vocational education does not mean what it used to mean. We are not talking about automobile mechanics, we are not talking about plasterers, we are not talking about various kinds of people only. We are talking about the full range of jobs that are opening up in our society, which is a high-technology society which requires people who are good technicians, good mechanics, and they have good pay in these areas also.

My son is employed in the computer area, and the industry is training people at improvising all along to meet its needs. The jobs pay very well, and women can do those jobs as well as men. But even in this new area, most of the people that are there are men because there is a mind-set that starts with vocational education and career guidance in the schools that we have to break.

The Mink amendment breaks that mind-set. The Mink amendment wants to continue what we started before to break that mind-set. We want the traditionalists to understand that the Federal Government is not taking a back seat. We see things from the national and international level that local people do not see. They deserve to have our vision projected. The mandates are really often ways to open up their minds to see new vistas.

We see a global economy. We see the great need. We know that there 80,000 jobs out there already not being filled, related in some way to computers and telecommunication and technology. We should provide more leadership by maintaining what we have already. Let us vote positive for the Mink amendment.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I will not take the whole 5 minutes because I do not want to be redundant. I simply want to recall an adage that is worth its weight in gold, and that is, Come and let us reason together.

We have had a lot of dialog in terms of welfare reform. Yet, to oppose the amendment of the honorable gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] would in fact eliminate a set-aside and provide a setback for the most vulnerable and fragile segment of our society that we seek to assist in the amendment of the gentlewoman.

I would simply say, very briefly, that we need to envision welfare reform as providing an opportunity for people to become self-sufficient by providing them an apparatus to develop the right kind of vocational education and skills to enable them to move out into the world of work.

This is not a spendthrift kind of amendment. It is an investment in the most fragile infrastructure of our society. I would encourage unanimous support of the Mink amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands [Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN].

(Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana [Ms. CARSON] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK]. I want to commend and associate myself with her remarks and those of the other sponsors of the amendment, my esteemed colleagues, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD], and others who have spoken for this amendment.

The amendment offered by my colleagues is needed to preserve the important existing programs which serve

the needs of girls and women in our vocational system. It seeks to retain a minimum level of support for programs for girls and women in this system, to retain an equity coordinator, and to eliminate sex bias in vocational education as well as in access to programs and training which would eventually lead to better-paying jobs for women.

□ 1230

Some have argued that this kind of investment is already covered in the bill. But, Mr. Chairman, it has been demonstrated that wherever these programs were not specifically federally mandated, they were dropped.

At no prior time in this country's history has it been more important for us to make sure that our women, who make up the vast majority of single households, are still locked out of the vast majority of jobs, have been locked into lower salaries and who have been given no other choice but to turn to AFDC, now TANF, to enable them to raise their children, be given every opportunity to learn a nontraditional trade, to develop a better-paying skill and thus move into the job market with hope for a better future not only for themselves but for their children.

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, to support the education of our young women, to support job opportunities for single parents and for mothers to be, and to therefore restore hope for these women and for their children.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. This is a good amendment. This amendment is fundamentally about equal rights and equal access. Simply put, this amendment ensures that displaced homemakers, single mothers, pregnant women, and others traditionally underserved by vocational education will have access to vocational education and job training.

Vocational education has become a cornerstone of our democracy. Vocational education provides millions of American citizens with the opportunity to become independent. Vocational education provides individuals with real skills so that they can succeed in today's workplace. In fact, thousands of women in my district have benefited from these vocational programs. For example, the Chicago Women In Trade's [CWIT] Organization located in my district is now in its 10th year and is supported by sex-equity funds. CWIT has been successful in training over 450 women, many single parents, and helping them move from low-income jobs to high wage careers.

These vocational programs for women have been funded since 1984, and have been very successful. These programs have helped women find real jobs. When women find meaningful jobs that is good for America. It helps to lower the welfare roles, and enables women and families to escape domestic violence. More importantly, it empowers women and gives them real independence.

I urge my colleagues not to go backward, to draconian methods of denying women the opportunity to vocational opportunities. Rather let's move forward and restore gender equity to vocational programs.

Let's support this amendment as it is good for America.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment as well as the legislation overall. I feel that although it is not a perfect piece of legislation, we can move this on to conference. The Senate has some different provisions in it, but as a new member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I am proud to see the cooperation and bipartisan effort that went into crafting this deal, even though there were a lot of 11th-hour maneuverings which got us to this point.

I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] for the hard work they put into it, as well as the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] on this legislation, but I do feel that there is still some more work that needs to be done and improved in this piece of legislation.

We have heard a couple of comments today about the substate formula and the minimum local grants and the effect that is going to have on a lot of needy students. I feel that the change of the formula, especially in the final couple of years, will undermine the key Federal role in assisting the neediest rural students in western Wisconsin, the district that I represent. I think this formula change sends a bad message to them. But also the formula change, combined with reducing the minimum grant from $15,000 to $10,000, would dilute the effectiveness of Federal funds. Again, this provision could endanger many of the consortia in my district in western Wisconsin where we have an effective system that allows local school districts to pool their vocational education funds.

I am also concerned that the legislation severely cuts the funding for State-level activities. Vocational education institutions in western Wisconsin rely on State agencies to maintain a detailed performance of accountability and to supply them with analyzed statewide information on student success and program performance for their local planning. Performing these tasks at the system level is the most effective way to assist the local improvement.

But I find the elimination of the special job training and just to hold harmless on already existing gender equity programs to be the most disturbing aspect of this legislation here today. The barriers that continue for women in those nontraditional fields remain a troubling national problem. This will only be compounded now with the full implementation of welfare reform across the country. By reducing support for women seeking to gain access to high-skilled training for high-wage careers, this bill once again overlooks the needs of a disadvantaged population. We must retain a minimum level of support for programs for girls and women in vocational education. I think this amendment goes a long way at addressing this need.

That is why I strongly urge my colleagues here today to give welfare reform a chance and to support the Mink-Morella-Sanchez-Woolsey amendment.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIND. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

(Mrs. TAUSCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. TAUSCHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this important amendment that maintains current funding levels for programs that benefit girls and women and promote gender equity in our vocational education system. These vital programs train women for higher wage jobs so they can become self-sufficient and stay off welfare. They also promote high-skill, high-technology training in nontraditional fields for girls and women. These programs address the special needs of vocational training for displaced homemakers, single moms and single pregnant women.

As the mother of a 6-year-old daughter, I want her to have the same career opportunities that will be available to my 6-year-old nephew. We must not forget our daughters, nieces, and granddaughters and the legacy we pass on to them.

This amendment makes sense and these programs deserve our support. Please vote to maintain the funding for these important programs which offer a way up the ladder for women determined to improve their lives and that give our young girls the chance to feel the thrill of professional achievement and personal success.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I support all the previous speakers and all that they have said as it relates to this fine piece of legislation. I want to first commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman, as well as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], our ranking member, for all their hard work over the years to work on and retain the Perkins Act which has helped several million women across this country.

I am a former teacher in the public school system in the Detroit public schools. I taught business classes and vocational classes. I saw the peak as young women and men gained the skill necessary to compete in America's job market. I know the importance of vocational education and the skills that it requires and offers to young people to move and matriculate as they become parents.

Most of my colleagues know that this is the 25th year of title 9. Title 9 was

instituted in 1972 and this year we celebrate the 25th anniversary of title 9. In title 9's experience, millions of women and men, particularly women, have shared across this country in higher education experiences as a result of the title 9 experiences, and many of them in their vocational education training.

As has been already said, vocational education has increased employment opportunities. Vocational education has also increased wage earning for millions of Americans. It has reduced AFDC caseloads across America and has had millions of dollars in savings. This is not a time to cut back. We must mandate States that they continue in their support of vocational education training.

I come from the State of Michigan. I served in that legislature for several years. I served on the education committee there and know of the commitment after the enactment of the vocational education ruling, after the Perkins Act mandated the 10 percent, that many children were able, through the mandate from the Federal Government, to participate in vocational education programs to prepare them for the world of work.

I commend the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] and the other sponsors for bringing this amendment forward. We have got to keep the commitment to the States. The 10 percent is just a minuscule amount. I wish we could increase that amount, but to eliminate it totally is unfortunate. This amendment asks that we retain the level of funding for 1997 and beyond, that that level of funding not decrease.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we support the Mink amendment.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KILPATRICK. I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I rise in strong support of the Mink amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is no time to turn tail and run after 13 years of bipartisan support for special attention to the most vulnerable women in America on vocational education opportunities. That is not only because we are in the throes now finally of welfare reform, but because vocational training is where women have been most shortchanged and where there has been the most discrimination.

Vocational training has been a major element in discrimination against women in the workplace. It is only fair to specially target some of our funds toward these most vulnerable of women, displaced homemakers, single parents, single pregnant women. These are the women most in need. These are the women most likely to be trapped into discriminatory job opportunities. These are the women most likely to be overlooked.

This amendment assures that there will be special outreach to these women, and if there is not special outreach, then for many of them it simply will not happen.

We will not need the sanctions if we get the outreach. We will not get the outreach without this amendment. In many ways I regard this amendment as akin to a nondiscrimination provision. Where we have had the breakthroughs for women is in professional jobs like law and medicine and accounting and business. In jobs where women can make as much or more money as a welder or machinist is where we need to put our attention and where we need to do the most outreach.

The call on vocational training funds will be enormous. These funds are going to go to the most enlightened and the most educated. Those are not the women covered by this amendment.

The remedy for poverty, Mr. Chairman, is very simple. It is a job. But it is not every job. As those seeking to get off welfare now understand, it is not most jobs for which most of the most vulnerable women have the training. I approach this in many ways as a nondiscrimination provision. Government money has been used to reinforce existing job patterns. What we do with this amendment is to use government money to get us out of those patterns. Remember, this amendment ought to be seen as the counterpart to the horrendous budget cuts that these women themselves have received, 97 percent of the people on AFDC are women and children. They have $53 billion in cuts; 85 percent of the people on Medicaid are women and children. They have $72 billion in cuts. And it goes on and on that way.

The way to make sure that these cuts do not harm these single mothers, these displaced homemakers, and these single pregnant women is to give them the best opportunities for jobs. For them, the best opportunities are in vocational training. If we take away this opportunity after so many years of bipartisan support, we undermine what we have been trying to do.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Mink-Morella-Sanchez-Woolsey amendment to the vocational education reauthorization bill.

These gender equity programs have been highly successful throughout the Nation and have dramatically increased the number of women who participate in vocational education programs.

We have studies that indicate that women who participate in these programs are able to increase their earning capacity in nontraditional occupational fields and successfully eliminate their cyclical dependency on public assistance.

A recent GAO study of employment training programs found that the 1,300 displaced homemaker and single-parent programs in operation throughout the Nation are among the most successful programs of this type.

In Oregon, for example, these programs increased the employment rates for participants from 28 to 71 percent, increased hourly earnings by an average of $1.45, and reduced AFDC dependency from 29 to 15 percent.

The study documented similar increases in earnings and placements in nontraditional jobs and reductions in welfare rates in other States as well.

Clearly, the need to ensure equal access to training programs is even more important today than it was when the gender equity provisions were originally enacted by Congress.

For example, the passage of last year's welfare reform legislation places severe restrictions on the ability of poor women and their children to continue to receive welfare.

Since the majority of women on welfare are women with children, it is imperative to provide them real opportunities to earn higher wages in highly skilled jobs to support themselves and their children.

The failure to continue to protect vocational training could severely limit single parents, single pregnant women, and displaced homemakers' ability to find employment and will increase the likelihood that they and their children will remain in poverty or become homeless.

We simply must not abandon the Federal commitment to gender equity in vocational education by eliminating minimum guarantees of funding for gender equity programs.

The gender equity provisions of the Mink amendment strike a reasonable compromise between set-aside programs and assurances that States will continue to allocate resources to gender equity programs.

□ 1245

I urge my colleagues to support the Mink-Morella-Sanchez-Woolsey amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Mink amendment to ensure that States continue to operate vocational educational programs for women and girls.

Last year we passed a welfare reform law designed to help individuals become self-sufficient. Many of those struggling to get off welfare are single parents and displaced homemakers. Unfortunately, traditional vocational training programs do not focus on the unique obstacles faced by women trying to raise a family. If we truly value families, we must value those programs that allow parents to provide for those families.

The Mink amendment will preserve important programs that help assure equitable education and employment opportunities for women and girls. The Perkins programs for displaced homemakers, single parents, and sex equity have been very successful. For more than a decade these programs have

helped women move into careers that provide higher wages, better benefits, and the possibility of advancement. Not surprisingly, women in nontraditional occupations earn 20 to 30 percent more than those in traditionally female occupations. We must protect and support programs that help women move into these higher paying jobs. That is how we end welfare dependency and increase family incomes.

I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, that under this bill programs would ignore the needs of women. My colleagues will recall that last month we celebrated the 25th anniversary of title IX, which prohibits gender discrimination in education. We have made progress in promoting gender equity in education since the title IX law was passed in 1972, but we have not put an end to discrimination entirely. We must not undermine the mission of title IX by eliminating the role played by gender equity coordinators in vocational education. The Mink amendment will keep this important activity alive.

When we discussed these programs some time ago, I spoke about Kelly Miles, a single mother of three from New York City who was on public assistance for many years. Through a nontraditional employment training program for women, Kelly was able to move off welfare and begin a career as an electrician. She is a wonderful example of what women can achieve through these very important programs.

The programs preserved by the Mink amendment help us reach thousands of Kelly Miles, women who want to be self-sufficient but need to develop the tools to get there. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Mink amendment.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the question do we need the Mink amendment to deal with displaced home workers, single parents, and single pregnant women? In my view, the answer is no. In this bill it is not mentioned once, it is not mentioned twice, it is not mentioned three times. It is in there four times. From the plan to the benchmarks to all the goals, it is listed again and again as one of our top priorities.

What happens when we have too many Federal rules? Less money to the classroom, more money for bureaucrats. Do we need more bureaucrats in this issue? I do not think we do.

In Pennsylvania I was chairman of Health and Welfare for 10 years and served on that committee for 19 years in both the House and the Senate. I was very much a part of Pennsylvania's historic welfare reform bill, which preceded the Federal bill but paralleled it.

Every incentive that is needed to help this population is a part of welfare reform because it is the majority of welfare recipients who are in this position. Welfare to work money targets this population appropriately. In the job training bill we made it much easier to use the money for this population, and in this bill we outline it not once, but four times, that this is a population that needs to be served.

In many States, and I know in Pennsylvania we have a very strong displaced homemaker program, vocational schools often have expanded their programs to utilize those State dollars because the need was there. I think we are assuming here at the Federal level that local districts, that States, are not aware of this problem. Everything that is happening in America leads us to serving this population. If States are going to meet the targets in the Federal bill, they must serve this population or they will not.

So for us today to over and above the four-time limits in the bill to say that every school district must prove to the State and to the Federal Government that they spent no less money, that is really more bureaucracy than if we had a set-aside. That means potentially 10,000 to 16,000 school districts will have to be evaluated, and, my colleagues, I do not believe that is necessary. If I thought it was necessary, I would support the Mink amendment.

I think it is important that we follow the lead of this bill of getting money to the classroom. All the incentives are in place to serve this population, and this bill highlights it not once, but four times. I ask for defeat of the Mink amendment. It is not necessary.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the opportunity to, even though I know we are under the 5-minute rule, close debate on this particular amendment. First of all, let me just say that I worry that this debate has turned into an exercise in political correctness, and let me tell my colleagues why I say that. We did not hear from a single witness, nor to the best of my knowledge, did we receive any correspondence in support of maintaining any kind of set-asides to serve special populations. What the Mink amendment would do is essentially replace a State mandate with a local mandate. It would replace a State set-aside with a local set-aside and reduce the flexibility that we want to give local schools to provide vocational-technical education programs. And that is very much in keeping with a longstanding American tradition of decentralized decisionmaking in public education.

In fact, as I mentioned, we did hear from Paul Cole, one of our witnesses and the vice president of the American Federation of Teachers. He testified in support of eliminating set-asides before our Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families, and I quote from Mr. Cole's testimony.

''Federal legislation should eliminate set-asides at State and local levels. For instance, funding formulas for special populations are harmful when they provide an incentive for schools to retain students in these categories because the funding depends on it.''

And Mr. Cole's statement is very consistent with the report that was done by the Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, entitled ''National Assessment of Vocational Education Final Report to Congress,'' and I quote from that report.

''There are two major risks in broad-brush efforts to include more and more special population students in vocational education. The first is that factors other than the students' best interest will become more prominent in placement decisions. For example, recruiting special needs students in order to keep vocational enrollments up, and thus maintain staff positions, is a familiar practice, and it often complements a desire in comprehensive schools to get hard-to-educate students out of regular classes.'' That is a practice that is called in some areas of the country ''dumping'' or ''tracking students.'' ''In situations such as this some students will benefit from participation in vocational programs, but others will not.''

The report goes on to say, ''The second risk is that vocational programs, especially those in area schools, will increasingly become special needs programs separated from the mainstream of secondary education, an outcome opposite to the integration of academic and vocational curricula envisioned by Perkins.''

So the other thing I want to point out is I know that the gentlewoman from California [Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD] who wants me to yield has some concerns as to whether or not we are building sufficient safeguards into the legislation to ensure that these special populations will continue to be served. I want to go right to the bill because I suspect a number of people who have spoken on the other side of the aisle on the Mink, et al. amendment have not actually looked at the bill. So I am going to read from it.

''Each State application shall describe how the State will ensure that members of special populations meet State benchmarks, and each State will provide vocational technical education programs that lead to high skill, high wage careers for members of special populations, displaced homemakers, single parents, and single pregnant women.''

These are adequate assurances.

Now I was asked about accountability. Let us talk about accountability for just a moment. Under the accountability section, ''Each State that receives funding under this bill shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary of Education a report on how the State is performing on State benchmarks that relate to vocational-technical education programs.''

In preparing the report, the report submitted by the State ''shall include,'' again the operative word, ''shall''—a description of how special populations, displaced homemakers, single parents, and single pregnant

women participate in vocational technical education programs and, again, have met the vocational-technical education benchmarks established by the State.'' This is mandatory, not permissive or optional.

And what happens if the State fails to meet those benchmarks? Very clearly, right here, colleagues, in the bill, ''If a State fails to meet the State benchmarks, the Secretary of Education may withhold from the State all or a portion of the State's allotment under this Act.''

We have taken real concrete steps to address Members' concerns in this legislation. I submit to Members that the language in the bill now negates the need for the Mink amendment. I implore my colleagues, do not replace a State mandate with a local mandate, do not replace a State set-aside with a local set-aside. Support the legislation as it is presently drafted. Vote ''no'' on the Mink amendment. Just say no to more mandates for local schools.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the logic from the gentleman from California, and I wondered whether or not if we follow that logic through if the idea would be that if we built more prisons somehow we would end up with more crime. The truth of the matter is that simply because we try to solve a problem by fixing it, by assisting in the solution of the issue, by having people work in various school systems and the like to solve a problem of gender inequity does not mean that the inequity is going to be perpetuated; it means that we are trying to solve it.

I mean, the fact of the matter is that when young people in my district and across the country ask me what the great issues of the day that I believe are out there, I say, ''Listen, you look at the people sitting in this room in a particular high school, look at the young women in this high school.'' The fact is that if they go out and get the same job, work in the same number of hours as a young man doing the same kind of activity, they are going to get paid 69 cents for every dollar that the man gets, and the fact is that it is time that we take into consideration the kind of gender prejudice that exists in America.

Mr. Chairman, that is all that we have done in the Congress in the past. That is what we are asking that this bill, and I think the Mink amendment, which is supported on a bipartisan basis by the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] and the like, that recognizes what we want to maintain is the effort that has been recognized by the Congress of the United States to end the kind of gender prejudice that exists throughout our country.

The fact is that anyone who has looked at where jobs are and young women are targeted in terms of what the kinds of jobs that they are going to be able to pursue is that not only is the pay gap currently that 6 out of 10 women are employed in the traditional female roles. One reason for the pay gap that currently exists is that 6 out of 10 women are employed in the traditional female fields of service, technical jobs, sales and administrative support.

□ 1300

In contrast, two-thirds of the men worked as managers, operators, professionals, and craft workers. All we are trying to do in this legislation, and I think the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] deserves a great deal of credit, is to try to maintain the fact that we want to ensure that there is in fact a small set-aside to eliminate the kind of gender gap that has existed in our system, and do everything we can to make certain that that gap is eliminated on the fastest possible basis.

Mr. Chairman, I know we are running out of time.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise really in support of the Mink amendment. My office keeps a scorecard on the legislative attempts to take programs and benefits away from women. Unfortunately, we are chalking up another attack today. It is not as if we are asking for new funding. All we want is continued funding at this year's level, and the continuation of programs that work. Displaced homemakers, single parents, pregnant women, and some girls in vocational schools are all populations at risk. Why shut them out? Why, at the same time we are trying to get women off welfare rolls, are we eliminating the very programs that will help them get off welfare rolls?

In Oregon a recent study documented its long-term success in increasing employment rates from 28 percent to 71 percent. Wages increased; 14 percent of the women on welfare got off welfare. There is so much to fix, Mr. Chairman, that is broken. Let us not try to fix what is not broken. Let us continue funding for this program.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mink amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong support to Congresswoman MINK's amendment. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment asking for financial support for programs that benefit girls and women. This is essential to help secure a future for millions of female citizens.

Young adults need vocational education and job training because this will provide them the skills needed to succeed in today's workplace. We must provide women with these opportunities because only then will we contribute to lowering the number of women receiving welfare assistance, enabling them to become self-sufficient and independent. Struggling homemakers, single mothers, and teenage women will have an opportunity to live productively and comfortably by having the chance to become educated in employment areas where there is high demand for skilled workers.

Vocational education and job training are directly linked to the reduction of welfare. If we want women to get off welfare, we need to provide meaningful job programs to train them. The participation in these programs results in higher wages and an increased number of work hours for women. I am asking you to support programs that train women for nontraditional jobs—like masons, computer programmers, and plumbers.

Displaced homemakers and single parent programs are crucial to the well-being of the disadvantaged. It is crucial that we provide funding for these programs. Displaced homemakers and single parent programs specialize in individually targeted pre-employment training and counseling services. Women will benefit from life skills development, career exploration, job training and placement, and support services.

In my State of Texas, 52 percent of displaced women rated the displaced homemaker or single parent program as much better than any other government program in which they have participated. Texas needs financial support of these programs. These programs help all women:

There are 1.2 million displaced homemakers in Texas: 47 percent of displaced homemakers are under 50 years old; and 39 percent of displaced homemakers are African-American, Asian, and Hispanic.

There are 561,342 single mothers in Texas: 61 percent of Texan single mothers are between the ages of 25–44; 47 percent of single mothers are African-American and Hispanic; and 53 percent are nonminority.

I urge all of you to support this amendment: you will be building the foundation for displaced homemakers, single parents, and individuals training for nontraditional occupations.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KLUG) having assumed the chair, Mr. EWING, 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. 1853) to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the

further consideration of H.R. 2160, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2160) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, the Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make a 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 259, nays 165, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

YEAS—259

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Young (FL)

NAYS—165

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Boswell
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Edwards
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—10

Boehlert
Conyers
Forbes
Gonzalez
Houghton
Molinari
Roukema
Schiff
Smith (TX)
Young (AK)

□ 1329

Messrs. SKAGGS, HILLIARD, RUSH, ROTHMAN, OWENS, DICKS and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. MOLLOHAN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. KINGSTON

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLUG). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 188, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

AYES—238

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook

Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—188

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Poshard
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—8

Forbes
Furse
Hastert
Petri
Roukema
Schiff
Souder
Young (AK)

□ 1350

Mr. WAXMAN and Ms. SLAUGHTER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to table the motion to reconsider the vote was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1352

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. 2160, with Mr. LAHOOD, (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 Wednesday, July 16, 1997, all time for general debate had expired.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to speak out of order for 1 minute.)

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Rules is planning to meet next week to grant a rule which may limit the amendments offered to the legislative branch appropriation bill. Members who wish to offer amendments to the bill should submit 55 copies of their amendment, together with a brief explanation, to the Committee on Rules in H–312 of the Capitol.

Amendments should be drafted to the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on Appropriations. Copies of the text will be available for examination by Members and staff in the offices of the Committee on Appropriations over here in H–218 of the Capitol.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, for the purposes of those of us who may have amendments and want to discuss those amendments, could the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman, give us some idea of the criteria that the committee might use in limiting amendments?

Mr. SOLOMON. Reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Hoyer), my good friend, that we would probably follow the previous precedent as set by both the Republican leadership in the past and the Democratic leadership before that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, because I may not be as good a historian as he is, could he give me some idea what that precedent calls for?

Mr. SOLOMON. Reclaiming my time, we, first of all, are bound by a budget agreement with our President. We could not have any amendments that are going to increase the spending. That would probably be limited.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman would yield further, so that we can cut spending?

Mr. SOLOMON. Reclaiming my time, I would think so, sure.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, would the committee allow for any and all amendments to cut spending without limitation to be made in order?

Mr. SOLOMON. Reclaiming my time, I do not know. But we would certainly take that under consideration, along with the ranking minority members and other members of the Committee on Rules.

As long as we have the attention of the membership, if I might, there have been a couple procedural votes here concerning the possibility of the rule on the foreign operations appropriation bill that will come on the floor next week.

During testimony before the Committee on Rules, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], my very, very good friend, testified on behalf of a pro-choice position that she would, and I went back and looked at the testimony, that she would ask us if we would please make in order an alternative viewpoint to the Mexico City-Chris Smith amendment.

And I always want to treat the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] very fairly, because she is a very close personal friend of mine. And we did, after consultation with the pro-choice side of the issue, agree to make in order an amendment. And that is really what my good friend, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], asked for.

I think now there is some kind of an understanding, and we are sorry that there is a misunderstanding. But we truly did try to be fair to both the pro-life position and the pro-choice position. So I really would just urge us to proceed on that because of the agreement that we had made previously.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think, in fairness to the chairman, it is important to point out that the reason that my colleague has had so many women objecting to proceeding under regular order today and the reason he has had

so many of us join them is because we have seen what we regard as a routine action on the part of the Committee on Rules to systematically deny to ranking minority members on committees, ranging from the Committee on Armed Services, to the Subcommittee on Agriculture, to the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, to the Subcommittee on the Interior. We have seen routinely requests of ranking minority members denied and then amendments put in order which do extensive rewrite of authorizations.

And, so, I think that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] needs to understand that the unhappiness extends far beyond that one amendment. We believe there must be an understanding about how amendments are or which amendments are made in order when asked for by ranking members on all committees. And it is not just that one message which is causing the problem.

Mr. SOLOMON. Reclaiming my time, let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] that, other than the situation with our good friend from California [Mr. DELLUMS], I do not know of any other situation.

I would be glad to sit down and review those with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. In the meantime, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], and then we have to get on with regular business.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, since the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chair of the Committee on Rules, referenced my name and what possibly occurred in the Committee on Rules, I would like the privilege of responding to him.

First of all, our bill, the foreign operations bill, is one that we worked very hard, under the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], to produce a bipartisan product that has reached so much agreement. We came through our full committee in only 40 minutes of debate, which is probably record time, and we are prepared to come to the floor with strong bipartisanship.

The amendments made in order by the Committee on Rules did violence to that bipartisanship and makes this rule unacceptable. One of the issues involved is the international family planning issues. But that is only one of the complaints that we have about the bill.

The Democratic women in the House have provided great leadership on the international family planning issue. And yet, when it was time for an alternative to the Smith amendment, which was made in order, and that is fair, when it was time for an alternative to be made in order, in a back-room deal on the Republican side of the aisle, with not one Democrat or Democratic woman present, an alternative was given to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], without the participation of the women, especially the Democratic women in the House.

Now, first of all, it is all authorizing on an appropriations bill. The Smith amendment is. But if you are going to go down that route, then we thought it would be appropriate that there be an alternative, and that is what I asked for in my testimony, a bipartisan alternative that we could present.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] knows full well and the Republican leadership knows full well that the alternative that they allowed in this bill, the Republican alternative they allowed, failed on this floor a matter of weeks ago.

The difference between what we wanted to propose and what they allowed is that the amendment they allowed is a loser. It is a loser. And they know it. And that is why they could not accommodate our fresher approach to a bipartisan amendment that we would present.

□ 1400

That is why the Democratic women of the House today are saying that we want to be heard on this subject. You cannot keep us from the table. One way or another, we will get our point across that this is an important issue to us, that we have taken the lead on it over and over again, and that we will be heard on this subject.

With all due respect to my good friend, who I do consider a distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, perhaps we had a misunderstanding. But the misunderstanding springs from the fact that a bipartisan alternative is not one that is plotted out in the backroom on the Republican side without the participation of the Democrats, particularly the Democratic women. I am the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. There are not many women ranking members and I insist on the respect the ranking member is due.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has expired.

Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent for further time?

Mr. SOLOMON. Yes, Mr. Chairman, very briefly.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman please yield to me as a member of the Committee on Rules?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has the time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I was simply requesting that he yield to me.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has the time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, we do have to get up to the Committee on Rules to deal with a very important bill in just a moment. I just want to say that the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] has certainly explained her position and she is sincere in it, but I would just have to read back her testimony.

It says:

> If, however, the Rules Committee chooses to make legislative amendments in order, I would request that I would be allowed or someone would be allowed to offer perfecting amendments to the Smith amendment, in particular, again, if Mr. SMITH's amendment imposes the Mexico City language.

Mr. Chairman, I very sincerely took her testimony at heart. We were going to make in order an amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, namely:

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 233, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

AYES—191

Abercrombie	DeFazio	Hilliard
Ackerman	DeGette	Hinchey
Allen	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Andrews	DeLauro	Holden
Baesler	Dellums	Hooley
Baldacci	Deutsch	Hoyer
Barcia	Dicks	Jackson (IL)
Barrett (WI)	Dingell	Jackson-Lee (TX)
Becerra	Dixon	Jefferson
Bentsen	Doggett	John
Berry	Dooley	Johnson (WI)
Bishop	Doyle	Johnson, E. B.
Blagojevich	Edwards	Kanjorski
Blumenauer	Engel	Kaptur
Bonior	Eshoo	Kennedy (MA)
Borski	Etheridge	Kennedy (RI)
Boswell	Evans	Kennelly
Boucher	Farr	Kildee
Boyd	Fattah	Kilpatrick
Brown (FL)	Fazio	Kind (WI)
Brown (OH)	Filner	Kleczka
Capps	Flake	Klink
Carson	Foglietta	Kucinich
Clay	Ford	LaFalce
Clayton	Frank (MA)	Lampson
Clement	Frost	Lantos
Clyburn	Gejdenson	Levin
Condit	Gephardt	Lewis (GA)
Conyers	Gonzalez	Lipinski
Costello	Green	Lofgren
Coyne	Hall (OH)	Lowey
Cummings	Hall (TX)	Luther
Danner	Harman	Maloney (CT)
Davis (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Maloney (NY)
Davis (IL)	Hefner	

Manton
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—233

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Berman
Brown (CA)
Forbes
Furse
Kasich
Markey
Ney
Oxley
Schiff
Young (AK)

□ 1419

Mr. PETRI changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. DICKS changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, and not to exceed $75,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $2,836,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed $11,000 of this amount, along with any unobligated balances of representation funds in the Foreign Agricultural Service, shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Secretary.

EXECUTIVE OPERATIONS

CHIEF ECONOMIST

For necessary expenses of the Chief Economist, including economic analysis, risk assessment, cost-benefit analysis, and the functions of the World Agricultural Outlook Board, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1622g), and including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $5,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $4,844,000.

NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

For necessary expenses of the National Appeals Division, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $25,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $11,718,000.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $5,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $5,986,000.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $4,773,000.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $4,283,000: *Provided,* That the Chief Financial Officer shall actively market cross-servicing activities of the National Finance Center.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration to carry out the programs funded in this Act, $613,000.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92–313, including authorities pursuant to the 1984 delegation of authority from the Administrator of General Services to the Department of Agriculture under 40 U.S.C. 486, for programs and activities of the Department which are included in this Act, and for the operation, maintenance, and repair of Agriculture buildings, $123,385,000: *Provided,* That in the event an agency within the Department should require modification of space needs, the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer a share of that agency's appropriation made available by this Act to this appropriation, or may transfer a share of this appropriation to that agency's appropriation, but such transfers shall not exceed 5 percent of the funds made available for space rental and related costs to or from this account. In addition, for construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities as necessary to carry out the programs of the Department, where not otherwise provided, $15,000,000, to remain available until expended; and in addition, for necessary relocation expenses of the Department's agencies, $2,700,000, to remain available until expended; making a total appropriation of $141,085,000.

HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Department of Agriculture, to comply with the requirement of section 107(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9607(g), and section 6001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6961, $20,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That appropriations and funds available herein to the Department for Hazardous Waste Management may be transferred to any agency of the Department for its use in meeting all requirements pursuant to the above Acts on Federal and non-Federal lands.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For Departmental Administration, $25,731,000, to provide for necessary expenses for management support services to offices of the Department and for general administration and disaster management of the Department, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations in this Act for travel expenses incident to the holding of hearings as required by 5 U.S.C. 551–558.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations to carry out the programs funded in this Act, including programs involving intergovernmental affairs and liaison within the executive branch, $3,668,000: *Provided,* That no other funds appropriated to the Department in this Act shall be available to the Department for support of activities of congressional relations: *Provided further,* That not less than $2,241,000 shall be transferred to agencies funded in this Act to maintain personnel at the agency level.

OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry on services relating to the coordination of programs involving public affairs, for the dissemination of agricultural information, and the coordination of information, work, and programs authorized by Congress in the Department, $8,138,000, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $10,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed $2,000,000 may be used for farmers' bulletins.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $63,128,000, including such sums as may be necessary for contracting and other arrangements with public agencies and private persons pursuant to section 6(a)(9) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, including a sum not to exceed $50,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; and including a sum not to exceed $95,000 for certain confidential operational expenses including the payment of informants, to be expended under the direction of the Inspector General pursuant to Public Law 95–452 and section 1337 of Public Law 97–98: *Provided,* That funds transferred to the Office of the Inspector General through forfeiture proceedings or from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund or the Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund, as a participating agency, as an equitable share from the forfeiture of property in investigations in which the Office of the Inspector General participates, or through the granting of a Petition for Remission or Mitigation, shall be deposited to the credit of this account for law enforcement activities authorized under the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the General Counsel, $27,949,000.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RESEARCH, EDUCATION AND ECONOMICS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Economics Research Service, the National Agricultural Statistics Service, the Agricultural Research Service, and the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, $540,000.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Economic Research Service in conducting economic research and analysis, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621–1627) and other laws, $71,604,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225).

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the National Agricultural Statistics Service in conducting statistical reporting and service work, including crop and livestock estimates, statistical coordination and improvements, marketing surveys, and the Census of Agriculture notwithstanding 13 U.S.C. 142(a–b), as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621–1627) and other laws, $118,361,000, of which up to $36,140,000 shall be available until expended for the Census of Agriculture: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

For necessary expenses to enable the Agricultural Research Service to perform agricultural research and demonstration relating to production, utilization, marketing, and distribution (not otherwise provided for); home economics or nutrition and consumer use including the acquisition, preservation, and dissemination of agricultural information; and for acquisition of lands by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed $100, $725,059,000: *Provided,* That appropriations hereunder shall be available for temporary employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $115,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further,* That appropriations hereunder shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed one for replacement only: *Provided further,* That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided the cost of constructing any one building shall not exceed $250,000, except for headhouses or greenhouses which shall each be limited to $1,000,000, and except for ten buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed $500,000 each, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building or $250,000, whichever is greater: *Provided further,* That the limitations on alterations contained in this Act shall not apply to modernization or replacement of existing facilities at Beltsville, Maryland: *Provided further,* That the foregoing limitations shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a): *Provided further,* That funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing or operating any research facility or research project of the Agricultural Research Service, as authorized by law.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STENHOLM

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STENHOLM: Page 11, line 16, insert before the period the following: ": *Provided further,* That the item under the heading "AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE" in title I of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996 (Public Law 104–37; 109 Stat. 304), is amended by striking the penultimate proviso, relating to conveyance of the Pecan Genetics and Improvement Research Laboratory".

Mr. STENHOLM (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment repeals a provision in Public Law 104–37, the Fiscal Year 1996 Agricultural Rural Development and Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, directing the conveyance of the Pecan Genetics and Improvement Research Laboratory in Brownwood, TX, from the Agricultural Research Service to Texas A&M University.

Due to outstanding liability questions, the conveyance of the Brownwood Pecan Station cannot take place at this time. This amendment does not require any additional funds. I have consulted with both the ARS and Texas A&M, and both are amenable to this amendment. I urge its adoption.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. Chairman, we have read the amendment, it has a lot of merit, and we accept it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] that we have read his amendment and are agreeable on this side. I understand that the gentleman has a particular problem in that the State cannot accept this facility because of cleanup requirements and that the State of Texas cannot, therefore, take this facility, and it is going to revert back to the department.

One of my concerns when we first read the amendment was that there be sufficient funding in the legislation for cleanup purposes which, as I understand it, total around $3 million.

Will the gentleman confirm that for me, please?

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, the ARS has spent $100,000, roughly, studying the dump and has found it to be a typical dump with a little methane gas and other benign chemicals, and therefore to do what Federal regulations would require the State of Texas, Texas A&M University would be very remiss to spend $3 million cleaning up something that they consider would not be necessary to meet any health reasons.

So the State of Texas cannot by law accept a gift of land that contains a garbage dump. So this language striking the provision is required for ARS to

reverse the existing statutory language directing the conveyance. That is all simply that the amendment does.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, the bill that we are debating today includes additional funds for the department for hazardous waste management, and it appears to me in reading the legislation that we would be able to accommodate this particular site with the appropriated dollars in the bill. So our major concern regarding funding has been met in the legislation, and we would agree to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Stenholm amendment to be Agriculture appropriations bill on the conveyance of the Brownwood, Texas Pecan Station. The Stenholm amendment repeals a provision in Public Law 104–37, the Fiscal Year 1996 Agriculture Appropriations Act, directing the transfer of the land from the Agriculture Research Service to Texas A&M University. Because of certain outstanding liability issues, the transfer of this land from ARS to Texas A&M cannot take place at this time.

Mr. Chairman, this is a noncontroversial amendment supported by both ARS and Texas A&M University. It is also an amendment that does not require any additional funds.

I support the continued efforts of the Agriculture Research Service's pecan breeding program because it is the only breeding program in the world producing improved pecan varieties. Varieties produced by this program are the foundation of the improved pecan industry worldwide, setting standards of yield and quality. Pecan breeding and genetics are the most important tools for improving pecan profitability for U.S. producers in a global market. Chemical pest management in pecans has failed to provide long-term solutions to insects and diseases, regardless of the funds used. Consequently, breeding and selection is the best option for the future.

As I stated earlier, Texas A&M, in my district, is supportive of this amendment. The Texas A&M Agriculture Program, through the Texas Agriculture Experiment Station has long had strong ties to the ARS Pecan Station at Brownwood. This amendment would in no way diminish the relationship with the university, the experiment station, or the pecan station.

I am pleased to support Congressman STENHOLM's efforts and I urge the passage of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 232, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

AYES—189

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—232

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Berman
Fattah
Forbes
Ford
Furse
Goodling
Markey
McHugh
Neumann
Radanovich
Schiff
Stearns
Young (AK)

☐ 1453

Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. MOLLOHAN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. DEUTSCH and Ms. MCKINNEY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to carry out research related to the production, processing or marketing of tobacco or tobacco products.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities as necessary to carry out the agricultural research programs of the Department of Agriculture, where not otherwise provided, $59,000,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided*, That funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing any research facility of the Agricultural Research Service, as authorized by law.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

For payments to agricultural experiment stations, for cooperative forestry and other research, for facilities, and for other expenses, including $168,734,000 to carry into effect the provisions of the Hatch Act (7 U.S.C.

361a–361i); $20,497,000 for grants for cooperative forestry research (16 U.S.C. 582a–582a7); $27,735,000 for payments to the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University (7 U.S.C. 3222); $31,654,000 for special grants for agricultural research (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)); $17,327,000 for special grants for agricultural research on improved pest control (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)); $106,744,000 for competitive research grants (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)); $4,500,000 for the support of animal health and disease programs (7 U.S.C. 3195); $650,000 for supplemental and alternative crops and products (7 U.S.C. 3319d); $500,000 for grants for research pursuant to the Critical Agricultural Materials Act of 1984 (7 U.S.C. 178) and section 1472 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3318), to remain available until expended; $3,000,000 for higher education graduate fellowships grants (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(6)), to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); $4,350,000 for higher education challenge grants (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(1)); $1,000,000 for a higher education minority scholars program (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(5)), to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); $2,500,000 for an education grants program for Hispanic-serving Institutions (7 U.S.C. 3241); $4,000,000 for aquaculture grants (7 U.S.C. 3322); $8,000,000 for sustainable agriculture research and education (7 U.S.C. 5811); $9,200,000 for a program of capacity building grants (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(4)) to colleges eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890 (7 U.S.C. 321–326 and 328), including Tuskegee University, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); $1,450,000 for payments to the 1994 Institutions pursuant to section 534(a)(1) of Public Law 103–382; and $8,882,000 for necessary expenses of Research and Education Activities, of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; in all, $420,723,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CALLAHAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALLAHAN: On page 12 line 17 strike ''31,654,000'' and insert ''32,154,000'' and on page 13 line 24 strike ''420,723,000'' and insert ''421,223,000''.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides $500,000 to Auburn University to work in cooperation with Faulkner State Community College and Alabama Southern Community College's Center for Excellence in Forestry.

These projects are unique, joint efforts that focus on water quality and habitat loss in the gulf coastal region and forestry in the Southeast. The main efforts of the research will focus on nonpoint source pollution, watershed management, and the reduction of chemical discharge from wood and pulp processing.

I would also like to speak for a couple of seconds regarding some report language that appears in the report accompanying this bill.

In full committee, the chairman offered on my behalf some report language that supported the School of Forestry building complex at Auburn University. The language included a sentence that the committee recommends that up to $4.75 million be made available for this project.

I recognize this language is in an account that has no money and, therefore, has no standing. I do not intend for that language to give Auburn University an edge on any other university project. I would hope that in conference that all facilities be judged on their merit only.

I should like to thank the chairman for giving me this opportunity to present this amendment, and appreciate the assistance and cooperation of my good friend from New Mexico, as well as the cooperation from our good friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, we have seen the amendment, and we accept it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], our good friend, for the cooperation that he has exhibited since the time that we were in the subcommittee and the full committee, it truly is appreciated, and for his remarks concerning his report language amendment in full committee.

□ 1500

I concur with his assessment that the report language he references has no standing since there is no funding in the Cooperative State Research Facilities account.

I would like to note for the RECORD that the subcommittee received numerous, numerous requests from Members on both sides of the aisle for funding for research buildings, and I am sure that all these proposals have merit, and should funding be made available in this account, I would expect that each proposal that qualifies for these funds would be judged on their merits.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to say that I thank the gentleman and supported his amendment, especially because it is done within the context of the additional money that was included within the subcommittee allocation. So it is within the budget constraints that we are forced to abide by, and I want to thank the gentleman for working with us on this and we accept his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful that the Appropriations Committee has reported continued funding for the Agricultural Development in the American Pacific [ADAP] project and the Tropical and Subtropical Agricultural Research Programs, both conducted by the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service within the USDA.

With committee provisions reporting ADAP funding at $564,000, as in previous years, the American Government demonstrates its continuing commitment to provide funds and grants to its communities in the Asia-Pacific region. These include not only Guam, but also Hawaii, the Northern Marianas Islands, American Samoa, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Freely Associated States.

ADAP funds a number of activities for the Asia-Pacific communities. These include financing research of regional agricultural problems common to members of the five land-grant institutions in the American-affiliated Pacific, strengthening market information systems, producing instructional materials development and distribution, and providing scholarships for land-grant faculty and staff.

I commend the committee's continued support for ADAP, however, I am disappointed with the decreased funding it has reported for the Tropical and Subtropical Agricultural Research Programs. Not only does this program impact Guam, it also affects Hawaii, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. For the people of Guam, the Tropical and Subtropical Research Programs fund numerous activities. These include financing research contributing to the establishment of energy and labor efficient irrigation and fertigator systems, watermelon disease control, modeling crop production systems, market surveys, and the biological control of pests in order to increase productivity.

Although I have stressed the benefits Guam receives from these programs, I also point to the implications the Tropical and Subtropical Research Programs have on the neighboring regions. Knowledge and expertise culled from these studies not only improve Guam's local agricultural industry, they are disseminated throughout Micronesia, Asia, and Africa.

American tropical and subtropical regions face agricultural needs unique to other areas. Continued support for the Tropical and Subtropical Research Programs are necessary steps to improving not only the livelihood of the people of Guam, but also other tropical regions of the world.

I will continue to actively support funding for ADAP and the Tropical and Subtropical Agricultural Research Programs. These programs are fundamental vehicles for improving standards of living not only on Guam, but also other tropical regions of the United States.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my appreciation to Chairman SKEEN and Ranking Member KAPTUR for including $364,000 in this appropriation for multi-commodity research at the Food Innovation Center, located in my district.

This is a joint project of Oregon State University and the Oregon Department of Agriculture dedicated to the development and marketing of new food products. This funding will assist in creating family-wage jobs in Oregon in the food processing industry.

This outstanding facility created for enhancing entrepreneurship brings together the incredible agricultural productivity of the Pacific Northwest and the expertise of our business community. The Food Innovation Center's focus on increasing the value-added component of the Pacific Northwest's agricultural sector helps derive more income from the vast array of commodities produced there.

Oregon agriculture continues to break productivity and income records. We can do even better by utilizing the cost-effective investment that the Food Innovation Center is. If we in Oregon were to add value to our raw agricultural products at the national average level, 20,000 jobs would be created. The Food Innovation Center helps us move toward that goal.

I thank the subcommittee for its support of this tremendously cost-effective private-public partnership.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 17-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 344, noes 73, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 285]

AYES—344

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Carson
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cubin
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rangel
Redmond
Reyes
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Schaefer, Dan
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
White
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)

NOES—73

Aderholt
Baesler
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Callahan
Campbell
Cardin
Castle
Chenoweth
Coburn
Cook
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
Dreier
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Etheridge
Everett
Fawell
Fowler
Frelinghuysen
Ganske
Goode
Gordon
Goss
Green
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hilleary
Hobson
Houghton
Johnson (CT)
Kingston
Lewis (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McIntyre
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickett
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Royce
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer, Bob
Scott
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Solomon
Stearns
Stump
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Traficant
Walsh
Watkins
Weller
Whitfield

NOT VOTING—17

Berman
Fattah
Forbes
Furse
Gutknecht
LaTourette
Manton
Martinez
McHugh
Moran (VA)
Oxley
Payne
Schiff
Souder
Stokes
Tauzin
Young (AK)

□ 1522

Mr. GOSS changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROGAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. RIGGS, 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. 2160) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 21, 1997

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon of Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, JULY 22, 1997

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, July 21, 1997, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, July 22, 1997, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

BALANCE THE BUDGET WITH TAX RELIEF, CONTINUED ECONOMIC GROWTH

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, with all the discussion about balancing the budget and providing tax relief, people are concerned. Well, why is it necessary and is it even consistent to give tax relief while we are trying to balance the budget? After all, people are

paying taxes, more revenues are coming in, and it is easier to balance the budget that way.

But there is a part of that argument that I think is overlooked if we look at just first glance. What I am speaking of is, if we give people tax relief, we are going to have economic growth, we are going to have more jobs, more people working, more people paying tax revenues, and this growth will decrease the deficit faster than just mere cutbacks in spending. We need to have both, but spurring economic growth is the key part of deficit reduction.

Let us look at the picture of taxes. In the 1950's, the average middle-class Federal tax burden was about 6 percent. In the 1970's, it was 16 percent. In 1994, it was 23 percent. But by 1995, the total tax burden was up to 39 percent, 24 percent of that being in Federal income tax alone. That is up from 5 percent in the 1950's.

□ 1530

Members can see what a huge portion of family income taxes take. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the higher the tax rate of middle-class Americans, the less time they have together as families, because when we had a 39-percent tax burden, what that is saying is that the second income of the family just goes to pay taxes. Mom and dad are both working. The second income goes to pay the taxes, 39 percent. Do your own math in your own house.

The tax relief that we are trying to get passed and we are working on a bipartisan basis with the President on it, gives tax relief to people who earn between $20,000 and $75,000. Seventy-six percent of the tax relief package goes to middle-income families making between $20,000 and $75,000. Of that, 90 percent of it goes toward education, the HOPE scholarship to make it more affordable through a deduction program and a tax credit program to send kids to college. Then $150 billion of it goes to the $500-per-child tax credit. There is a big disagreement at this point with the President on it. We are trying to work out our differences. The President wants to give that $500 tax credit to people who do not pay Federal income taxes, whereas the Republican plan says now you only give tax relief to those who pay income taxes.

It is a very important thing; because if you take a woman, say a single mother named Susan, she has a 14-year-old and a 16-year-old, under the Republican plan, Susan would get a $1,000 tax relief check from the government, $1,000 less in taxes. Under the Clinton plan, she would get zero, because the President's proposal is to say that once the child turns 12, no tax relief.

But what is worse is if you had a man out there who had three or four kids and he was not paying Federal income taxes, he could get $2,000 or $2,500 worth of tax relief even though he is not paying the taxes. He still, if he is eligible, is going to get all kinds of welfare-type benefits, like Medicaid and public housing and welfare cash benefits from the DFACS or temporary assistance to needy families. He will get food stamps, WIC, and so forth. But the check comes from Susan and her 14-year-old and her 16-year-old. That is not fair to single working women around America.

If you want to know more about this tax program, I would recommend that you look it up on the International Web. Get beyond the Republican versus Democrat debate. The Democrats have a web page, too. I do not know what their web page number is, but this is the Republican web page. If you will look it up, it is http://hillsource.house.gov and you can figure out what the tax relief would be for you.

Again, why is it important to give middle-class Americans tax relief? Because if you have more money in your pocket because we as a Federal Government have confiscated less of it, what Susan will do with her $1,000 is she will buy more shoes, go out to eat more, maybe buy more clothes, do whatever, she will have more consumable income. When she does that, because 58 million Americans will be able to do that, businesses will expand, jobs will be created, less people will be on welfare, more people will be paying taxes and just like Kennedy and Reagan proved, tax cuts actually increase the revenue because of the economic growth.

SUPPORT THE SPACE PROGRAM

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to speak about our space program and the recent successes that it has had. They really, truly have been spectacular. They have drawn the attention of the whole world. As all of us know, there are some risks associated with going up into space. It is not a business for those who are risk averse but the payoffs are tremendous and we have seen that with all the tremendous breakthroughs in science and technology that came from our Apollo program and Mercury and Gemini programs. Those were really the pioneers, those were the men and women who first got involved, led the race to the Moon and we learned a great deal, a tremendous amount.

Then we were able to follow on from all that with the current reusable launch vehicle that we have, the space shuttle program, a program that has shown and demonstrated its tremendous durability and its tremendous versatility with the ability to go up into space and retrieve satellites and fix those satellites and then redeploy them back out into space.

Of course, right now we are currently involved with the shuttle-Mir program. We all know there are some serious concerns about the Mir and its ability to survive, but we have learned a great deal from men in space, from the cooperative effort there.

But really what I did want to talk quite a bit about and acknowledge the tremendous work of NASA and particularly the people at JPL and everybody that was involved in this program, the tremendous success of the Mars Pathfinder program. Indeed, I think it has captured the imagination of men and women, young and old all around the globe. I just wanted to share with my colleagues today some of these tremendous photographs that have been made available to me by NASA officials.

This is a photograph taken by the rover after it went off the ramp there. You can see here these tracks in the Martian soil. You can look back and see the Pathfinder vehicle right there on the surface of Mars where it landed. Then this is a shot taken by the Pathfinder of the Sojourner vehicle. It is really a tremendous photograph, tremendous detail. You can see the tremendous detail in the soil and in the rocks.

There is our little rover, Sojourner. An amazing vehicle. It survived very nicely the landing on Mars and it has been roving around using solar power. These are the solar panels on the top of the Sojourner and it collects solar energy and it is able to travel around on the surface of Mars, analyzing rocks. It is really going to provide our scientists a tremendous amount of information about Mars, Mars history, and it is already revealing that Mars may have at one time had a climate much more similar to Earth's than what it is right now.

I would also like to share, Mr. Speaker, with my colleagues here an artist's rendering of our international space station, something that we definitely need to get up in space soon to replace the Mir with all its associated problems. But this is going to be a great, tremendous opportunity for people from Europe and Japan, and hopefully if the Russians can get it together, they will be able to stay involved in it, and where people from all over the world will be working together doing tremendous scientific research.

Where do we go from there is the question. We all want to see the space station up there and flying in space, but what is next? We need to go on from there. We do not want to just stop at that point. Here I have for you some artist's renderings of some very exciting concepts. This would be for a lunar base and the possibility of having something like this in the future truly does exist. For example, one of the potential uses of going back to the Moon is to actually collect solar energy on the surface of the Moon and beam it, using microwaves, to the Earth. This would be an inexhaustible source of solar energy that could be used well into the future. It would eliminate fossil fuel usages and nuclear power

plants. Definitely a cheap and inexhaustible source of energy.

But this is really what I wanted to spend a little bit of time talking about today, and, that is, maybe someday the possibility of going on to Mars with a manned mission. There are people within NASA as well as within the American space society talking about ideas of how we could someday send men and women to Mars. This shows a Mars base and a return vehicle there as well as a little greenhouse. This is what it could someday be. I encourage all my colleagues to support NASA and support our space efforts.

JUSTICE FOR FARRIEL BRITT

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I stand before my colleagues today, immensely frustrated and troubled by the judicial system in Costa Rica and the lack of enforcement authority by the United States of America. One of my constituents, a father from Southern Pines in the Second Congressional District of North Carolina, has been waiting patiently for years for justice to be done. He is awaiting the return of his 6-year-old daughter, Holly Dantzler, from the country of Costa Rica.

Many people watching today may know Mr. Farriel Britt's story. He was the subject of a ''Prime Time Live'' story that was aired in May of this year because his daughter had been kidnapped by his ex-wife, Terry Dantzler, and taken to Costa Rica. The State of North Carolina and the State of South Carolina, where Mr. Britt's ex-wife lived, both agreed that Mr. Britts should have custody of his daughter and both States have granted him custody of his daughter. But Mr. Britt's' ex-wife kidnapped her and fled to Costa Rica where she has thus far escaped American justice.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Dantzler has an international kidnapping warrant outstanding against her. An international kidnapping warrant. One would think that the State Department would be working night and day to make sure that this woman is arrested and her child returned to her father in the United States, but apparently the United States of America is powerless in the face of one Costa Rican judge.

Mr. Speaker, I am frustrated because Mr. Farriel Britt turned to me for help when he could not fight this fight alone anymore. I have to say, I thought the fact that I was a U.S. Congressman, elected by the people of the Second District of North Carolina, would be of some help to him. But I have since learned that while I may get my phone calls returned by the State Department more quickly these days, the State Department apparently is powerless because they have not responded to my needs nor Mr. Britt's.

Our State Department issued a request for extradition to the Costa Rican Government. That means that Mrs. Dantzler was supposed to be arrested by the Costa Rican Government and sent back to the United States. Mr. Britt flew to Costa Rica because Holly would need someone to care for her when her mother was arrested and taken into custody. As my colleagues may expect, Mr. Britt thought his daughter would soon be returned to him. He waited during the weekend of Father's Day on June 17. I cannot imagine the agony of waiting in a hotel room during Father's Day for the return of a daughter whom you have not seen for 3 years. But he waited to no avail.

While Mr. Britt was waiting, the judge in Costa Rica was meeting behind closed doors with Mrs. Dantzler's attorney. They met not once but twice. Some sort of deal was worked out so that Mrs. Dantzler could keep her child and only be held under House arrest. House arrest is a sham in the country of Costa Rica. There is no method of enforcing house arrest in Costa Rica. No officer is assigned to guard Mrs. Dantzler's door, no one watches her house, so she is able to come and go as she pleases.

If that is the case, I wonder what exactly prevents her from fleeing Costa Rica and going to some other destination.

Mr. Speaker, I am troubled that a judge charged with enforcing an extradition order from the United States of America is flaunting her authority in the face of this country. This is a criminal case and she would be, in this country, removed from office. The State of North Carolina already decided the custody case. As far as this judge is concerned, Mr. Britt should just wait indefinitely for his daughter to be returned to the United States, but Mr. Britt has been waiting for his child. Mr. Britt has been waiting for 3 long years. Now that he has finally located her in Costa Rica, why should he be subjected to the whims of one judge in Costa Rica?

The U.S. Department of State has asked the Government of Costa Rica to arrest this woman and send her home so that Holly Dantzler can be returned to her father. This simple justice is being subverted by one judge in Costa Rica who is flaunting the law.

Today I request that the State Department demand the Government of Costa Rica to remove this judge from Mr. Britt's' case and enforce this extradition order so that this child can be returned to the United States of America and be reunited with her father as the law demands.

I thank the Speaker for allowing me this time to speak in behalf of a father who is being unjustly denied the companionship of his daughter.

□ 1545

DON'T GIVE UP THE SHIP

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, John Paul Jones, the great American naval officer, once said, ''Don't give up the ship.'' But unfortunately, it looks like that is exactly what the United States is doing. Foreign-flag cruise lines are abusing American taxpayers by not paying taxes on billions of dollars of business from Americans and are slowly driving our domestic ships out of business.

Now, these same foreign-flag cruise lines are calling for repeal of the Passenger Services Act. This repeal would be horrible for the domestic cruise line industry. It could result in the loss of thousands of American jobs and millions, if not billions, of dollars in tax revenues.

The Passenger Services Act requires that all passenger vessels in the United States and the U.S. trade must be 100 percent American. They must be built and registered in the United States, owned by U.S. citizens and crewed by American seamen. If a vessel servicing a U.S. port fails to meet these standards, it must stop at a foreign port before it brings its passengers back home.

Mr. Speaker, almost every cruise line operating out of the United States today skirts the requirements of the Passenger Services Act by registering its ships in foreign countries like Panama and Liberia and docking in foreign ports before coming to America. As a result, these foreign cruise vessels can use poorly-trained, low-paid, Third World crews even though 90 percent of the passengers on their ships are Americans. Instead of repealing the Passenger Services Act, we should be talking about a very different question: Should foreign-flag cruise ships be allowed to unfairly compete with U.S. flag vessels?

I realize that we live in a world economy, and I certainly do not oppose free trade. Our trade with other nations has produced many jobs for Americans, and I have nothing whatsoever against people from other nations. But I also believe very strongly that our trade laws should be fair, and quite simply, Mr. Speaker, in the vacation cruise line industry the current trade rules are not fair to domestic or American cruise lines.

For example, foreign-flag operators generate billions of dollars in revenue from American travelers, but pay no U.S. corporate income tax. Let me repeat that. Foreign-flag operators generate billions of dollars in revenue from American travelers, but pay no U.S. corporate taxes.

Currently, the largest cruise line in the world reported nearly $2 billion in revenues in 1995, primarily from North American vacationers. How much U.S. corporate income tax did Carnival pay on those earnings? Zero. That is right, zero on $2 billion in revenues.

What about labor costs? Foreign-flag cruise lines employ Third World labor and pay Third World wages. In the

process they avoid immigration and labor laws that their U.S. competitors must obey.

In addition, foreign operators benefit from foreign government subsidies designed to encourage capital investment overseas and provide employment for their citizens.

The real issue at stake in the proposed repeal of the Passenger Services Act is who gets the American vacation dollars; a U.S. or a foreign business? No one would dream of letting Toyota, Sony, or some other foreign corporation set up shop within our boundaries and escape U.S. taxes, immigration and labor laws, but this is exactly what we are allowing in the vacation cruise line industry.

The U.S. passenger vessel industry deserves our support. There are some 3,600 passenger carrying vessels in the U.S. fleet, 20 or more of which are in overnight service. These U.S. passenger vessels employ thousands of Americans and make a significant economic contribution to their local communities. In addition, the owners of these vessels obey U.S. laws, pay U.S. taxes, and employ Americans. Instead of repealing the Passenger Services Act, we should be exploring ways to increase the viability and the strength of the American cruise line industry.

I would propose that we put an end to our practice of subsidizing foreign cruise lines. Mr. Speaker, Americans are sick and tired of paying over half of their income in taxes and then letting big foreign corporations get tax breaks and other preferential treatment.

The truth is that the foreign cruise lines have powerful lobbyists who have been able to get their ships favorable treatment for many years, but the American people deserve a change, they deserve better.

It is not going to be easy to fix all of our problems and close tax loopholes like this one. Opponents will throw up every roadblock they can, but the duty of the Congress is clear.

THIS HOUSE NEEDS TO GET ITS BUSINESS IN ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think today was one of those more unique days in the U.S. Congress, particularly this House, and I think it deserves an explanation to the American people, for the real issue today is that this House needs to get its business in order.

I join today on one of the very rare occasions with the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] along with many other women in this House, Congresswoman PELOSI being the ranking member on the Committee on National Security, to raise the question of fairness and the irony that we are supposed to be here to work things out. Those who might have seen the constant rising might have wondered what the business of this House was today. The business was to indicate to those who control this House, my Republican friends, that bipartisanship is something that they called for and that we called for but they are not acting upon. How disturbing to find that in foreign operations where an amendment was worked out dealing with international family planning, and some may say, ''How small an issue,'' but the issue bears on many concerns that this country has; one, its international relations with helping many, many countries formulate in a fair manner the treatment of women who are interested in family planning.

If you really want to promote families, then you will promote women having the choice to plan families and to have the knowledge and understanding which, in fact, may avoid abortions, of which many of my colleagues to the right are so vehemently opposed to, then promote family values and work with countries like China and the continents of Africa and South America in promoting family planning. But yet the bipartisan amendment that was worked out was thrown aside and discarded. Women who have worked on this issue for so long, it was substituted for by a Republican amendment that just a couple of weeks ago had failed badly.

What is the intent of that? To dash the hopes of those who would work fairly in this House to pass an amendment that would work fairly on behalf of the international community and support family planning, and, yes, to dash the hopes of anyone who would think that we would work together in a bipartisan manner. How tragic.

It is important that this House gets itself in order, and I hope that by rising today and voting time and time again to adjourn this Congress the message got out that women stand for something, Democratic women in this Congress; we stand for fairness and, yes, we stand for bipartisanship. We stand for understanding that the way to solve the world's problem is working together, training people on the way to manage their families and to be successful.

Then, as we proceeded in discussing this issue called tax reform and tax cuts, let me also acknowledge that our Republican friends need to get their House in order. I do not know. For some reason it seems that the schoolteacher and the police officer, the fire fighter, the bus driver, and the single working mother on the Republican tax plan do not deserve to get a tax cut when just 2 years ago, 3 years ago in 1994, when almost a majority of the Republicans signed the Contract on America, they agreed that those who either paid income tax received an earned income tax credit; those are the working poor, or paid payroll tax were deserving of a child tax credit. Today their memories have faded them. These people are not around to lobby, they are not out in the hallway. So they have forgotten the bus driver, they have forgotten the school-teacher, they have forgotten the single working mother, they have forgotten the police officer.

These are the families that the Republicans are saying are looking for welfare. They are preschool and kindergarten teachers, teachers aids, sales clerks, carpenters, rookie police officers, in-home caregivers. They are the millions of people across America who work hard and struggle every month to pay their bills and to provide for their children. Most of them would be pretty surprised to find out that the Gingrich Congress does not think they deserve tax breaks like everyone else, even though a big chunk of their paychecks go to paying Federal taxes.

So, I think that we need to know why we are here. First, to put forward legislation that works, the family planning amendment that women negotiated under the leadership of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] and got an agreement to be passed.

And then, if we talk about tax reform and tax breaks, go outside these halls and look at the everyday working American and tell me that they do not deserve the $500 a year tax credit because they are a rookie police officer, a teacher, a bus driver.

Let us get our House in order, and let us plan to work so that the legislation that comes out of this House speaks the right language, and that is for all of America and not special interests.

NATIONAL MONUMENT FAIRNESS ACT

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on September 18, 1996, President Clinton went out to safety on the south rim of the Grand Canyon and stood there and declared 1.7 million acres of Utah as a national monument. He had a right to do that. It is called the antiquity law that was passed in 1906, and the reason it was passed is Teddy Roosevelt and others could see that we were ruining many of the prehistoric things that were around. We were finding all these things that had been there for years and destroying them. So he had a right to do that. I do not object to the right.

What I do object to is the interpretation of the law. The law is very clear. It says that the President of the United States will do this for two purposes, and he will state these purposes. First, is to protect the archeological part of it, and another, historic site. This President did not declare either one.

And the next part of the law is the key, and it says he shall use the smallest acreage available to protect that particular thing—1.7 million acres—bigger than Delaware and Rhode Island combined; and no one told us what was there, except we know that there was

tons and tons of coal that is low-sulfur coal, high-Btu coal, and what would inure to the children who are educated in the State of Utah is 5.6 billion acres; money, billions of dollars, excuse me, that would inure to them. Also, a lot of the coal would be exported that would help people in other areas.

But the President had a right to do that. However, when they talk about protection, that is a misnomer. There is very little protection in the antiquities law.

Since that time Congress wisely has determined. The park bill has gone in since that time. The National Environment Protection Act has gone in. The Wilderness Act, the FLPMA Act. All of these acts, Wild and Scenic River Act, do this.

We go back and we check what other Presidents have done, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President Kennedy, President Carter, but from time to time some extreme environmentalist says we have got to protect this, really not realizing it does not protect anything. What it really does is it takes away the protection of the management plans of BLM and Forest Service.

So we find ourselves in a position where the President protected nothing, he abused the power of the Presidency, he hurt the people of the West, and I cannot understand why he would do it. But he has the right; I would agree with that.

Now, I have introduced a bill, which is H.R. 1127, called the National Monument Fairness Act. What does it do? A lot of people, after he introduced the 1.7 million acres, Senators, Congressmen, came to me as chairman of that committee and said, ''Well, I don't want that to happen to my State. I want a law that takes it away so it can't happen,'' and they name their State.

I think the President should have the right to do some of these things in a small amount as the law brings it about, so I have introduced this with 50,000 acres. He cannot go into these millions and millions of acres for political purposes.

□ 1600

The nice thing about our President, he was fast to say that he did it for political reasons. If we look at the idea all the way through it, I have been subpoenaing papers from the White House and the Department of the Interior, and every one of them says that ''We are doing this for political reasons. How will this play with the environmental community? How will this play with the rich movie stars? How will this play with the celebrities?

When they finally decided to do it, they did not do it in the Oval Office, they did not do it in Utah, they went to the Grand Canyon, safely in Arizona. The nice thing about it there is one of the things I subpoenaed said, we do not want mainstream Utah there, we want the environmental community there. That is a great thing to say to our people.

Anyway, carrying that on, what does my bill do? The bill allows the President to do up to 50,000 acres, much as the law originally intended. Over that he would have to confer with the Governor and the legislature of the State, and as the Constitution gives the right of the lands of America to this House and the House over there, that is what they would have to do, is go through Congress.

I would hope people would realize that this is not an environmental bill at all. This is a bill on abuse of the President's power, which I think more and more people are coming to realize, whether they are Republicans or Democrats.

THE ECONOMIC DISASTER WAITING TO HAPPEN IN BRUSSELS

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call my colleagues' attention to the economic disaster that is waiting to happen in Brussels. At this time the European Commission Merger Task Force is meeting to discuss the impact of the merger between two American companies, Boeing and McDonnell Douglas. The taskforce has as its purview the judgment of whether the merger poses any adverse impacts on competitiveness in the world aircraft market.

But what is happening, Mr. Speaker, is that the European members representing governments who have directly subsidized the European aircraft consortium Airbus are using these discussions to extort trade concessions from Boeing in order to increase the market position of Airbus. This is truly an improper and unfair manipulation of the process.

Now that our own Federal Trade Commission has determined that there are no anticompetitiveness problems with the merger, it is time for the United States to stand firm against the European Community and demand a halt to this travesty.

Until 2-days ago, Mr. Speaker, the real intention of the Europeans was thinly veiled by their expression of deep concern over competitiveness. But on July 15, the EC's Minister of Competitiveness, Karel Van Miert, betrayed what I believe is the true motivation of the EC negotiators, to extract concessions out of Boeing through these merger talks that would directly assist Airbus.

Two days ago, on the Belgian radio, Mr. Van Miert made this statement following the breakdown of the negotiations with Boeing: ''We cannot give our consent unless Boeing makes very serious commitments in order to, let's say, also further guarantee the chances of Airbus in this market in the future.''

That, Mr. Speaker, is what this charade is all about, guaranteeing market opportunities for Airbus. We cannot, as a free trading Nation, allow this to stand. Certainly in light of this outrageous statement, I believe that the President, the State Department, and our Trade Representative must clearly and unequivocally express the dissatisfaction of the United States with the progress of these negotiations, in addition to our intention of taking retaliatory action if the EC proceeds in this wrongheaded direction.

To make things worse, today Commissioner Van Miert

> noted with satisfaction the fact that the advisory committee grouping the experts of Member States unanimously shares the European Commission's analysis whereby the proposals made by Boeing are not of a kind to dispel the serious doubts expressed by the Commission regarding the risk that will weigh upon competition because of the proposed merger between Boeing and McDonnell Douglas. . .. The commission showed it remained serene, and Mr. Van Miert hopes to firmly recall that the Boeing-McDonnell issue was treated strictly within the framework of the Regulation on mergers and that the Commission analysis was based on tangible facts and figures and not just on a political motive of some kind.

I think Mr. Van Miert should go back and listen to his radio tape in Belgium.

> The spokesman then explained that the Commission will take its final decision on 23 July. . . in order to leave the relevant services time to proceed to authentication of the documents comprising this issue.

I want to point out to my colleagues that Mr. Van Miert says that the

> . . . European Commission decision in concentration matters is legally binding for the parties concerned and means, when it is a matter of veto, that the merged identity is illegal in law. The EC regulation on mergers moreover give the Commission instruments that are apt to dissuade those who do not respect such a decision. In particular, it has the power to impose fines up to 10 percent of the cumulated turnover of the parties, or daily penalties, as long as the infringement lasts.

So I want to point out to my colleagues, this is a very serious matter, one that could result in fines of up to $4.5 billion against the Boeing Co. and the seizure of Boeing aircraft overseas. I say to the President and Vice President, members of this administration, we in the Congress want to support you in whatever actions are necessary in order to explain to the Europeans that if they do this, the United States will retaliate, must retaliate, in order to make certain that this merger goes forward and that we not be blackmailed by the European Commission and Mr. Van Miert.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article on the current status of EC negotiations.

The article referred to is as follows:

CURRENT STATUS OF EC NEGOTIATIONS

> Discussions between Boeing and the European Commission Merger Task Force have reached an impasse. Boeing has offered significant remedies (see Attachment A) to allay the Commission's concerns regarding the merger, but the Commission continues to demand more. A team of Boeing executives and lawyers met around the clock with the

Merger Task Force from July 11th through July 15th. On July 15th, Boeing appeared to have a potential agreement with the Merger Task Force, only to have the Merger Task Force retreat later that day on the issue of Boeing's contracts with American, Delta, and Continental. Following the Advisory Committee's meeting on July 16th, Boeing was advised that the Commission was reopening the divestiture issue.

Boeing is concerned that it will be unable to reach a successful conclusion to the merger review. Every time it appears that Boeing is near an agreement with the Commission, the Commission escalates its demands. At the present, the two open issues appear to be divestiture of Douglas Aircraft Company and modification of Boeing's existing contracts with American Airlines, Delta Air Lines and Continental Airlines.

Boeing has repeatedly stated to the Commission that it will not consider divesting Douglas Aircraft Company. Divestiture of Douglas Aircraft Company will mean its certain death and the loss of over 14,000 jobs.

The Commission's true objective on Boeing's airline contracts was revealed when, on July 15th, following the breakdown of negotiations, Karel Van Miert stated on Belgian radio: ''. . . we cannot give our consent unless Boeing makes very serious commitments in order to, let's say, also further guarantee the chances of Airbus in this market in the future.''

As reported in the Financial Times, the Wall Street Journal and the International Herald Tribune of July 17th, 1997, Mr. Chirac said on July 16th: ''We strongly support the Commission on its position on Boeing-McDonnell. It could be extremely dangerous for Europeans.''

Similarly, Mr. Rexrodt, Germany's economics minister is reported to have said that concessions offered by Boeing were ''clearly not enough''.

Boeing is now faced with the proverbial Hobson's choice of agreeing to divestiture and, effectively, kill Douglas Aircraft, capitulating to the Commission's demands that Boeing abandon its airline contracts or simply walking away from a merger which has received the unqualified endorsement of the Federal Trade Commission.

BOEING'S REMEDIES PROPOSALS

Douglas Aircraft Company

The Commission has repeatedly asserted that Boeing's share of the commercial aircraft market would jump from 60% to 84% upon the acquisition of Douglas Aircraft Company and that Boeing's position as a ''dominant'' player in the commercial aircraft market would be enhanced. Once again the Commission is manipulating facts to fit a predetermined result. To achieve the 84% market share figure, the Commission included all of Douglas Aircraft Company's installed base. This includes aircraft delivered up to 30–50 years ago! Douglas Aircraft Company's share of the commercial aircraft market in 1996 was 3.8%. Since the merger announcement in December, 1996, Douglas Aircraft Company has booked orders for a total of 7 aircraft, all of which were announced before the merger announcement and 5 of which are leased freighters.

The Commission has argued that Boeing may be able to leverage the Douglas Aircraft installed base into additional sales of Boeing aircraft. The Commission has not put forward any evidence to suggest that this would be the case and in fact, evidence suggests the contrary. If the Douglas installed base were so valuable, why is Douglas failing? If the Fokker installed base were valuable, why did one of the Airbus partners (Daimler Benz) sell Fokker's spares business and why didn't another airframe manufacturer surface as a potential buyer?

The Federal Trade Commission has thoroughly investigated the viability of McDonnell Douglas's commercial aircraft business and has concluded that it is not viable and that any attempt to divest the commercial aircraft business would further damage the business and not promote competition. Nevertheless, the Merger Task Force proposed that Boeing attempt to divest Douglas Aircraft Company. The Merger Task Force further proposed that if no buyer could be found for Douglas Aircraft Company Boeing would be required to shut down the commercial aircraft production lines of Douglas Aircraft and sell the spares business.

So great is the Commission's zeal to deny Boeing any access to Douglas Aircraft Company, it is overlooking potential enormous harm to the owners and operators of Douglas aircraft worldwide. Expert analysis submitted to the Merger Task Force shows that even an attempt at divestiture of Douglas Aircraft Company or its spares business could result in the loss of value of Douglas aircraft in service worldwide of 7–14 billion dollars. Evidence has also shown that the cost of customer support increases when such support is provided by someone other than an airframe manufacturer, and the quality of such support decreases.

Not only is the Commission ignoring the potential adverse impact of a divestiture on airlines, but it is ignoring EU precedent and jurisdiction and comity considerations as well. An order by the Merger Task Force requiring divestiture of United States assets in the context of a merger between two U.S. companies would be unprecedented in the history of EC antitrust review and would violate principles of jurisdiction and comity.

Boeing has repeatedly stated to the Merger Task Force that it would not attempt to divest any portion of the McDonnell Douglas commercial aircraft business because of the potential harm to world's airlines and the adverse impact such an attempt would have on the over 14,000 employees of Douglas Aircraft Company. Boeing has instead offered significant structural and procedural remedies (see Attachment A) that address the Commission's particular concerns regarding ''leveraging'' without having a devastating impact on Douglas Aircraft Company's customers, suppliers and employees.

Exclusive Agreements

From almost the very beginning of the Commission's merger review, the Airbus Member States and Karel Van Miert have asserted that the merger could not be approved unless Boeing terminated its ''exclusive'' agreements with American, Delta and Continental.

The agreements are between a United States airplane manufacturer and United States airlines and are unrelated to the merger. The three ''exclusive'' agreements essentially provide the customers significant price protection and order flexibility over a 20 year period in exchange for a sole supplier relationship with Boeing. Were the exclusivity clauses not present, Boeing would have required much larger firm orders from the airlines to compensate Boeing for its risk. The airlines are therefore receiving the benefits of very large orders without the financial risk.

The Federal Trade Commission has thoroughly reviewed the existing ''exclusive'' agreements and has found no basis to challenge them under U.S. law. While the Federal Trade Commission's July 1, 1997 decision evidences concerns regarding such agreements, the concerns relate only to the degree of foreclosure of the market that may result from future additional ''exclusive'' agreements.

The Commission does not have jurisdiction over the ''exclusive'' agreements in a merger review. It can acquire jurisdiction only if it attacks the agreements under the competition rules of Articles 85 and 86 of the EC Treaty. However, because of its desire to obtain concessions from Boeing regarding these agreements, the Commission has manufactured jurisdiction based upon unsubstantiated allegations by Jean Pierson of Airbus that the agreements were the result of a conspiracy between Boeing and McDonnell Douglas to use the merger and Boeing's resulting ''dominant'' position and access to McDonnell Douglas customers to force airlines to enter into such agreements. Thus, the Commission is seeking ''voluntary'' concessions as the price of merger approval instead of running the risk of losing a competition case under traditional antitrust rules.

Although Boeing's agreements with its three U.S. customers are not properly included in the Commission's merger review and are legal under U.S. law, Boeing is willing to make significant concessions to the European Commission regarding, such agreements in order to resolve the issue and obtain merger clearance.

As seen in Attachment A hereto, Boeing has offered a 10-year moratorium on such ''exclusive'' agreements except for those campaigns in which another aircraft manufacturer offers one first. Boeing has never gone one step further and offered to modify its existing agreements to shorten the duration of the ''exclusivity'' period to 13 years (the term of Air Bus' ''exclusive'' deal with US Airways) and to allow American, Delta and Continental to become launch customers for the A3XX. What the Commission asks Boeing to do instead is give up all of its contract rights and allow the airlines to keep all of theirs.

Spillover

Notwithstanding the existence of the 1992 Bilateral Agreement between the DU and U.S. relating to commercial aircraft subsidies, the Commission has repeatedly tried to extract concessions from Boeing in the area of government-funded research and development contracts. It has also insisted on extracting concessions from Boeing that would impair its ability to deal with its suppliers.

The Commission's articulated concern is as follows: by acquiring McDonnell Douglas, Boeing will become bigger and therefore more ''dominant''. In addition, the acquisition of McDonnell Douglas would increase Boeing's resources in the area of Dodd and NASA research and development contracts.

The Commission has demanded that Boeing hold its commercial and defense businesses separate. This would, of course, deprive the U.S. Government of the benefits of the application of commercial technology to defense programs. The Commission has also demanded that Boeing license its patents to Air Bus.

Boeing has attempted to address the Commission's concerns by offering certain remedies in the area of suppliers, reporting of government research and development contracts and patents, as set forth in Attachment A. To offer any further remedies would interfere with the 1992 Bilateral and would seriously impair Boeing's ability to conduct its business.

BOEING RESPONDS TO EUROPEAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

SEATTLE, July 16—The Boeing Company today was informed that the Advisory Committee of the European Commission's Merger Task Force has recommended that the proposed merger between Boeing and McDonnell Douglas Corp. not proceed because remedies offered by Boeing were not sufficient.

In particular, Boeing and the Commission have not been able to resolve the issue of

combining McDonnell Douglas's commercial airplane business with that of The Boeing Company, and the issue of so-called ''sole-source supplier'' agreements that Boeing entered into at the request of its U.S. airlines customers.

''We are extremely disappointed because Boeing submitted to the Commission a series of significant remedies designed to address all of the Commission's concerns and to protect the interest of our airline customers, suppliers, and the more than 200,000 employees of Boeing and McDonnell Douglas,'' said Boeing Chairman and Chief Executive Officer Phil Condit.

In addition, Condit noted, ''The issues that the Commission has raised already were analyzed in an extensive review by the U.S. Federal Trade Commission, which approved the merger, without conditions, on July 1.''

''It is our hope,'' Condit added, ''that once our remedies are reviewed by the full Commission, prior to July 23, that the Commission will find in favor of the merger and in favor of free and fair competition.''

THE GUAM WAR RESTITUTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this is the last opportunity that I will have to speak on the issue of Guam's liberation before its 53d celebration on Monday, July 21, 1997, which will be the 53d anniversary of the liberation of Guam from the hands of the Japanese occupiers when the marines landed on the beaches with the help of the 77th Army.

What I would like to do is to tell a little bit about the story about Guam, and some legislation that I have introduced today to help rectify an egregious error, an egregious error that may be made about the experience of the people of Guam.

The people of Guam experienced something that is very unique in the American framework. It was the only American territory with civilians who lived on it that has been occupied by a foreign power since the War of 1812. During World War II the Aleutian Islands of Attu and Kiska were occupied by the Japanese, but prior to that the civilians on those islands were evacuated by the military.

In the case of Guam, what we had was approximately 20,000 native Guamanians, better known as Chamorus, who were at that time considered U.S. nationals. They were not aliens. They were non-U.S. citizens, but they were considered U.S. nationals. Of course, Guam was an American territory. They endured some 32 months of Japanese occupation.

The reason I tell this story is to celebrate not only the heroism of the American marines and soldiers and sailors who did so much to liberate the island from the hands of the Japanese, but also to draw attention to the experience of the people that I represent, the people of Guam, the experience of the elderly generation of Guam.

I myself, I am the youngest in my family, and every one of my siblings was born either during the Japanese occupation or during the 1930's. I think almost everybody from Guam, certainly of course who was born on Guam, has a very clear and direct connection and strong family history with respect to this dramatic experience of the Japanese occupation.

My purpose here is not to reopen wounds, but rather to heal the wounds of the people. The people of Guam will have a compelling case to make before their Federal Government, and of a Federal Government that seems unwilling to hear this story and unwilling to correct the injustices committed against the people of Guam in World War II.

I want to make it clear that from my chronicling of this, it is not meant to cast any doubts about the nature of the liberation, or to even cast aspersions about the nature of the Japanese people. We all know that World War II was a terrific world conflagration. But I do want to take the opportunity to explain the experience of this unique island and this unique group of people.

The central point, as I have indicated, is that Guam, only Guam, was the only American territory occupied in World War II; not the Philippines, which although it was an American territory at the time, was promised its independence long before the outbreak of World War II, and in fact became independent in 1946; and not the Aleutian Islands, as I have indicated, which was also occupied by Japanese soldiers, but whose inhabitants were evacuated by the military prior to the onset of hostilities.

From the invasion day of December 10, 1941, when the Japanese landed on Guam to what we celebrate on Guam as Liberation Day, July 21, 1944, Guam was the only American soil with American nationals occupied for 32 months.

It has now been 53 years since the liberation of Guam, and if anything, time has not meant that all is forgotten or forgiven, not until there is some measure of national recognition of what happened to our fellow Americans on Guam, and how the Federal Government failed to make them whole and right the wrongs of the occupation.

The occupation of Guam was especially brutal, for two reasons. First of all, the Japanese were occupying American territory with American nationals whose loyalty to the United States would not bend; and second, the Chamorus, the indigenous people of Guam, dared to defy the occupiers by assisting American sailors who hid and who evaded initial capture by the enemy by providing food and shelter to the escapees.

In the final months of the occupation, just before the marines landed in July 1944, the brutalities increased. Thousands of Chamorus were made to perform forced labor by building defenses and runways for the enemy. Others were put to labor in rice paddies. The war in the Pacific turned for the worse for the Japanese occupiers, and in the final weeks as the pre-invasion bombardment by American planes and ships signaled the beginning of the end for them, the atrocities likewise escalated.

Forty-six Chamorus in the southern village of Malesso were herded into caves and were summarily executed by the enemy throwing hand grenades into the caves and spraying the caves with rifle fire and machine gunfire. Miraculously, some of them survived by pulling the bodies of their fallen fellow villagers over themselves to protect themselves against the rain of shrapnel and bullets, and also to hide the fact that they were still alive.

Louisa Santos called on me in 1992. She was a survivor of this. She asked me never to let this country forget what happened on Guam, and to promise that I would do everything I could to tell her story, and to tell the story of the people of Guam. She survived the massacre in Malesso, bore the scars of that massacre and the shrapnel in her back and on her feet, and every time she walked, with every step, she was reminded of that nightmarish experience on Guam. I am sad to report that she died 3 years ago.

In the capital city of Agana another group of Chamorus were rounded up and one by one executed by beheading and mutilation by swords. Miraculously the story of one very brave woman, Beatrice Flores Emsley, who was 13 years old at the time, stood to bear witness as she survived an attempted beheading.

Mrs. Emsley, before she died 2 years ago, bore the long scar down the side of her neck where a sword struck her. She fainted after being struck and awoke 2 days later with maggots all over her neck, but thankful to be alive. Mrs. Emsley, of course, stood as the best spokesperson for the experience of the Chamoru people during World War II.

Thousands of Chamorus, every single one of them, not hundreds but thousands, were forced to march from their villages in northern and central Guam to internment camps in southern Guam before the weeks before liberation. Everyone marched, old people, old men and women, newborn babies, children and the sick, they were marched to internment camps in Manengon, the largest one of all, where they awaited their fate for the next few weeks, and many did not live to see the liberation.

Many did not live, but their brothers and sisters, and most importantly, their children and grandchildren, survived, and their fellow Chamorus survived, again to bear witness to these atrocities. In their final acts of retribution against the people of Guam the Japanese occupiers inflicted a violence against our people that cannot easily be forgotten.

The Catholic high school for young men in Guam, Father Duenas Memorial School in Tai, bears witness to the courage of one young priest who in the

last days before liberation was also beheaded as revenge for the occupiers' frustration in not capturing the lone American sailor who had evaded their grasp with the aid of the Chamoru people.

□ 1615

The memory of this young noble priest lives on as the high school named in his honor stands witness to his courage. Against this backdrop of terror the liberation of Guam began on July 21, 1944.

On that fateful day, if we can think back historically, two groups of people came together. One was in uniform and the other was in rags; one used weapons of war and the other used tools for survival. One came in from the sea and the other came down from the hills; and one left their families behind while the other tried to keep their families together. One liberated the island from without, while the other liberated the island from within.

In their meeting the great historical drama that Guam alone could play in World War II came to pass, as American soil was liberated from enemy hands and as American marines and American soldiers were united with American civilians held captive in internment camps on American soil.

The battle-hardened American servicemen, many of whom I have met over the years, came to Guam concerned about meeting a determined enemy; but these men soon came to understand the special nature of this battle amongst all those battles in the Pacific war, indeed amongst all the battles of World War II. This was a reoccupation. This was retaking what once was lost and what was once American.

As the young marines and the soldiers saw our people coming down from the hills, they broke down and openly wept as they saw Guam's children emerge from the hills carrying handmade American flags, and as they saw Guam's old men and women emerge from the internment camps clutching rosaries and thanking young liberators for their deliverance from certain death.

The story of these people cries out for attention and certainly understanding. The story has a dimension of unfinished business to it, of an injustice that must be corrected and of a legacy of loyalty that has been tarnished by the neglect of some Federal officials; in the aftermath of liberation, a grave injustice that to this day, 53 years later, has yet to be undone.

The Treaty of Paris, the treaty of peace with Japan signed on September 8, 1951, by the United States and 47 Allied powers, effectively precluded the just settlement of war reparations for the people of Guam against their former occupiers, against the Japanese. In the treaty the United States waived all claims of reparations against Japan by United States citizens.

Consider how ironic this situation is, in that the people of Guam became citizens just 1 year earlier, on August 1, 1950, by virtue of the Organic Act, a citizenship that was granted to the people of Guam largely because of their demonstrated loyalty to America during the occupation, was given in 1950. And the peace treaty in 1951 waived all their rights for filing war claims against the Japanese a year later for an experience that occurred in the previous decade.

The historical events surrounding the signing of this treaty of peace creates a compelling argument that the Federal Government, including the U.S. naval government of Guam at the time and the U.S. Congress, failed to address the circumstances of the Americans on Guam and allowed a situation to develop over the years where justice was delayed and ultimately denied. The bitter irony is that the loyalty of the people of Guam to the United States has resulted in Guam being forsaken in the determination of war reparations.

Did the Federal Government simply forget what happened on Guam? Unfortunately, the answer is not that Guam was forgotten at all, but that at critical moments when Congress dealt with the issue of war reparations for all Americans during World War II, like the case of civilian nurses who were captured in the Philippines or civilian Americans who were interned in Japan, those situations were attended to. Whenever Congress attended to those issues, Guam's unique situation escaped the attention of lawmakers in this body.

In fact, the record does show a deliberate attempt by Congress and the Navy to address the reparations issue and to do right by the people of Guam for their wartime loyalty. That they fell short in their attempts is the cause for our efforts to seek redress 50 years later. This is not a case of a people belatedly asking for something that they are not entitled to by justice or design. It is a case of the law falling short in the goal of making Guam whole after the war, and of Congress neglecting to address the issues that were raised by its own War Claims Commission.

What Congress did was, they recognized right after the war, 1945, they recognized the devastation and the dramatic and urgent need for rehabilitation. And on November 15, 1941, Congress passed Public Law 79–224, which is known as the Guam Meritorious Claims Act. This was supposed to grant immediate relief to the residents of Guam by the prompt settlement of meritorious claims. The following year, 1946, Congress also passed the Guam Land Transfer Act, Public Law 79–225, and the Guam Rehab Act, 79–583.

While the Guam Meritorious Claims Act became the primary means of settling war claims for the people of Guam, the Guam Land Transfer Act provided a means for exchanging land for resettlement purposes. Unfortunately, conditions on Guam in 1945, which was thoroughly devastated, in 1946 did not lend themselves to the best of congressional intentions. During the battle to liberate Guam, over 80 percent of the buildings were destroyed. The city of Agana and the second largest city, Sumay, were completely annihilated.

Once the island was secured, Guam became the forward operating base for the subsequent invasions of the Philippines, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa. Over 45 percent of the land mass was acquired for this wartime effort, and over 200,000 military personnel came to Guam to prosecute the war against Japan. The Chamorus, numbering only about 20,000, were temporarily housed in refugee camps. To their credit, the Chamoru people did not complain. In fact, they helped the military in every way they could to help defeat their former oppressors.

In the report of the War Claims Commission with respect to the war claims arising out of World War II, it stated that no organized program for reconstruction of damaged or destroyed civilian facilities had been undertaken.

In asking Congress to revisit this issue at this particular time, I want to point out a couple of items. When Congress passed the Guam Meritorious Claims Act in 1945, it established a mechanism where if you made a claim for more than $5,000, you had to go to Washington to personally adjudicate the claim. You had 1 year in which to file and complete a claim. When and if you had a claim for personal injury or death, and I just mention that many people were killed and/or beheaded, you could not adjudicate that as other than a property claim.

Despite those three defects, the people of Guam were allowed only 1 year's opportunity to address these claims.

When that was completed in 1948, the Congress passed a broader war claims act which included all Americans and American nationals who were interned by the Japanese and other enemies during the war. In 1962, due to defects in that law, this law was again changed. Neither the 1948 law nor the 1962 law included the people of Guam.

Here is the anomaly. My grandfather, James Holland Underwood, who was originally from North Carolina, was taken and was interned as an American civilian in Japan. As a result of the 1948 War Claims Act, he received a war claim for his internment by the enemy. His wife, my grandmother, and all their children who were also interned by the Japanese could not receive any claim under the 1948 or the 1962 law.

So you have the anomaly here where you have one group of Americans who were attended to by two separate actions of Congress, while you had one war restitution law that was dealt with by the people of Guam in the Guam Meritorious Claims Act for 1 year.

It has been a great tragedy, and in the course of dealing with that the Department of the Interior created what was known as the Hopkins Commission in 1947; came out, studied the situation, made a series of recommendations and clearly indicated that in the

case of Guam, the Guam Meritorious Claims Act was clearly inadequate.

So here we are, some 53 years later, addressing the same issue. This issue could have been resolved had Guam been included in the 1948 law or had Guam been included in the 1962 revision of that law. But in both instances, Guam was not included. Guam had no representative in this body until 1972, so there was not adequate opportunity for any elected representative of the island to present their case in front of this body when the issue came to surface during 1948 and 1962.

All of this is not meant to cast any doubt or to lessen the intensity of the feelings of the people of Guam on Liberation Day. Liberation Day on Guam is still by far the largest single holiday, widely celebrated. Schools are out. The government is closed. Businesses are closed. The greatest parade of the year occurs on that day. And when the Marines go marching by, you will hear the greatest cheer for the Marines that you will ever hear in any community throughout the world.

So there is a great deal of affinity and a great deal of love and recognition for the military and their efforts during World War II. And the people of Guam in their experience and in their devotion to the flag that stands behind me are, I think, unmatched in the experience certainly during World War II as the only community that was held and occupied by a foreign enemy.

But we still have this issue. And so today I have dropped in the bill, the Guam War Restitution Act, and I am happy to report that I have several, very many cosponsors on this. Basically, what it does is it allows for the payment of war claims of $20,000 for a death, $7,000 for an injury, and $5,000 for forced march or forced labor or internment.

Most of the people who were injured or experienced forced labor, forced march, or internment have regrettably already passed on, so they will not get any awards. And their descendants will not get any awards, either, because in the context of providing legislation like this, the only money that could actually ever go to an heir of someone who experienced this was in the case of a death.

So in the case of Guam, these issues still remain unresolved, and they still tug at the heart strings of those of us who have heard all of the stories and for many of the people of Guam who personally experienced the hardships. It is really important to understand the context in which the people of Guam feel this. Every family has a relationship to the war experience which is at once powerful and inspiring at the same time that it is disheartening and sometimes a little debilitating.

But, nevertheless, the war experience stands as powerful testimony to the capacity of the Chamoru people to survive and their ability to survive under some very difficult circumstances, as well as powerful testimony to the liberators who came. And the liberators who came numbered many who have served in this body and in the other body, most notably Senator Howell Heflin of Alabama, who was wounded on Guam, and Gen. Louis Wilson, who received the Congressional Medal of Honor and who later on became Commandant of the Marine Corps.

□ 1630

In fact, last week I laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier with the current Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Krulak, in recognition of the work and the relationship that I think the people of Guam have with the United States Marine Corps as a result of this war experience.

But the war experience is still unresolved, and so I call upon Members of this body to cosponsor the legislation. Let us do something that should have been done before.

We have an enormously ironic situation, where we have a people who could have submitted claims against the Japanese Government but they were declared citizens 1 year before the peace treaty between Japan and the United States, although that peace treaty occurred 6 years after the war.

So we have in the instance, for example the Philippines, which was American territory, we had the Congress giving the Philippines $390 million for the war experience, and then the Philippines, as an independent country, also claiming war restitution from Japan and receiving it. And in both instances the Philippines deserved it.

But in the case of Guam, we have the instance where they are denied the opportunity to make claims against Japan and, by any Federal official who has studied the situation, clearly inadequate opportunity to make claims against the U.S. Government.

I want to point out that in the negotiation of the Japan-U.S. peace treaty and in the reporting of this peace treaty to the Senate, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles clearly indicated, in response to a question, that if any American citizen has a legitimate war reparations claim that, as a result of this treaty, that war reparations claim should not be directed to the Japanese Government, it should be directed to the U.S. Government.

So in light of all of that history, I call upon the people of this House to cosponsor this important legislation and to honor this very unique and powerful story about how a small group of people endured much in the name of the flag that stands behind me, and whose faith that America would return never wavered and who indeed suffered much.

Now, I want to bring this story up to the present day, and I want to bring it up to the present day because it is bothersome. Guam, today, is a vital part of the projection of American power in the Asia and Pacific part of the world. As the dynamics of the world has shifted, Guam remains the only U.S. territory that is on the other side of the international dateline in which military facilities exist.

As the dynamics of power has shifted in Asia, the United States no longer has military facilities in the Philippines and, increasingly, the U.S. forces in Japan, particularly in Okinawa, are always under a great deal of criticism by some of the local people and even in Korea.

So we have a situation where the United States military and the United States' interests, which are projected into the Asia-Pacific theater, Guam's role in that is enhanced by the whole changing dynamics of the area, yet the Department of Defense has taken a couple of steps which really the people of Guam have interpreted as hostile steps.

To discuss one, just to briefly touch on it, last week, July 10, the Department of Defense announced that they were pulling out of the Guam school system and establishing their own Department of Defense school. They are in the process of establishing this school system, which is destined for opening in October of this year, despite the fact that I and other Guam officials had been reassured that if they took this step, it would not happen until 1998 so that we could, hopefully, work out some problems and disagreements. But here the Department of Defense has decided to unilaterally pull out their students from the Government of Guam schools.

This is really the first time in my experience, and we have discussed this with a number of people, where a Department of Defense school has been established in opposition to the wishes of the local community. It may surprise some people to know that there are Department of Defense schools in the 50 States, but usually it is done within the context of collaboration and cooperation with the local community.

Now, the net effect of pulling these military dependents out of the Guam schools is to change the racial composition. It will have an effect on the ethnic composition of the kids who attend schools on Guam.

This action was taken at the same time or nearly the same time, 4 days ahead, of the first meeting of the President's One America Commission; to have one America. The President has created a commission to improve the racial climate of the United States and to bring the people of the United States together and to make sure that we openly acknowledge our racial and ethnic differences and that we can do so in a climate of trust and mutual support.

At the same time that the President announces this initiative and the first meeting of this commission is held here in Washington, D.C. on July 14, just a week earlier the Department of Defense is creating a separate school system on Guam.

This always begs the question whether people in the Department of Defense

see Guam as part of America rather than as ''us and them'' or as some, perhaps, overseas foreign area. Of course, it is not, but if they continue to behave this way, they are really threatening civilian-military relationships on the island.

To add insult to injury on this, the Department of Defense has announced that no local teachers can be hired for their DOD schools, but they would be happy to hire local custodians or other people to work in the schools in a less than professional capacity; and that while no locally hired civil service employees can attend these DOD schools, State-side hires, State-side hired civil service employees will be able to attend these DOD schools.

So the bottom line on these actions is not to build connections and bridges between communities, but certainly has the net effect of not only building more gaps between the communities but certainly is not keeping faith with the experience that I described on July 21, 1944.

In addition to this, BRAC, in 1995, decided to close down some facilities on Guam, and many military planners have now acknowledged that that was probably not a very wise decision, but, inevitably, in any event, it has occurred and the people of Guam are trying to recover from this.

In addition to this, the Navy announced earlier this year that they are conducting two A–76 studies on their military facilities to determine which civilian jobs can be privatized or let out on a contractual basis. And the two bases that they picked were in Pensacola and on Guam.

It is hard for me to understand why they would identify, in addition to the BRAC decision, in addition to all that has gone on, they identified in January of this year some 1,100 jobs as being analyzed for privatization. They said they did this after exhaustive study and careful analysis and understanding that this would not affect the readiness, but, of course, not considering how it would affect those 1,100 loyal civil service workers.

Just yesterday they wrote a letter, as required by law, to officials of this body and to officials of the administration announcing that they are adding another 534 jobs for this careful analysis, which leads me to believe that the first analysis was probably not all that careful.

But here is the kicker. The kicker is that this is only applied to Guam. It is not being applied to other locations. And when the people from Guam are only represented in this fine institution by a nonvoting delegate, and they have no representatives in the other body, and they represent a fairly small population, they always ask themselves the question: Would the Navy do this in Virginia? Would the Navy do this in Florida? Would the Navy do this in California? And, most importantly, would they do it in this way?

I think, clearly, the answer is, probably not. They probably would not do it, and for sure they would not do it in this way.

This is not the way to treat a community that has been tested by war, that has not only evidenced its loyalty in the context of World War II, but most people who have a great deal to do with the military know the fine record of many young people from Guam in the military. Guam had the highest per capita casualty rate of any jurisdiction during the Vietnam conflict. So everybody knows the record of the people of Guam in the context of service to this country and in the context of the hardships that sometimes war imposes on people. And the people of Guam have responded well.

But now, when there are times of peace and there are times of contentment, their peaceful existence is again disturbed not by foreign enemies but by a series of misguided planners in the Department of Defense.

I ask officials at the Department of Defense, and I call upon them, especially those who are responsible for projecting American power in Asia and the Pacific, to seriously consider the ramifications of their actions on what was formerly a very good and solid relationship between the civilian and military communities on Guam.

On Guam this relationship is a three-legged stool. This relationship is founded upon the economic value of the military presence to Guam, on the fact that our kids go to the same schools, and the fact that we have a peaceful land resolution process. The one on land is a little wobbly, the one on schools has been fractured, and now DOD is carefully sawing off that other one as we speak. I ask them to take these words very seriously.

And I call upon the Members of this institution to take a serious look at the people of Guam's experience during World War II. I know there are many people who are watching, particularly those who were veterans of the conflict, of any conflict in the Pacific during World War II, who know about the viciousness and the brutality of war, and who know about the viciousness and the brutality of the battle on Guam and who remember those events fondly.

I think the people of Guam deserve the recognition on July 21 and that, indeed, all of the liberators, all of the men who participated in the liberation of what once was an American territory prior to the invasion of the Japanese deserve all of our honor and our attention and we should make good on that experience.

FEDERAL RESERVE EXERTS POWERFUL INFLUENCE

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

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, when the Federal Reserve speaks, people listen. When the Fed is about to make some sort of monetary decision, the world stops and watches. That is because the Federal Reserve System is comprised of powerful experts whose influence affects anyone who makes and spends money.

Some people think the Federal Reserve's primary purpose is to conduct monetary policy. Little do they know that only 1,600 of the Fed's 25,000 employees are working in monetary policy. The rest are employed in unrelated services, such as the transportation of paper checks.

The Fed pays $36 million for this service, of which $17 million is a Government subsidy. This money, taxpayer money, could be used to reduce the debt.

□ 1645

The Federal Trade Commission staff said in a 1990 report that these subsidies drive out private competition and innovation.

My bill would end this subsidy. It is time to ask why a giant Government bureaucracy is subsidized to run something that the private sector can run far more efficiently.

I come before my colleagues tonight to point out another area of this powerful Government bureaucracy that has not received enough scrutiny, the Fed's fleet of 47 airplanes that ferries canceled checks back and forth across the country Monday through Thursday.

Since 1980, the Monetary Control Act has required the Fed to extend these check-clearing services beyond its member banks to all depository institutions at prices without a subsidy. The purpose of the Monetary Control Act of 1980 was to make sure that private companies could compete with the Federal Reserve on a level playing field in providing services to the banking industry. But the Fed, to this day, insists on subsidizing its paycheck transportation as long as it makes up the cost somewhere else in its operation.

The Democratic staff of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services conducted a 2-year investigation of the Fed's check-clearing practices and determined that, as of 1997, $17 million of the $36 million used to run the program is subsidized by you and me, the American taxpayer.

In effect, we are subsidizing an inefficient, overgrown operation that the private sector could provide at a lower cost and with better results. If this operation cannot be run more efficiently, the Government should check out of the check transportation business and concentrate on helping Americans make money, not waste it.

I recently introduced a bipartisan bill with my colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF]. This bill would end this subsidy and require the Federal Government and the Fed to operate on a level playing field with the private sector.

As we enter the 21st century, with all the revolutionary changes, it is bad

public policy and downright foolish to subsidize the Fed's transportation of paper checks. Competition and free enterprise will provide lower prices and wider consumer choices in the provision of banking service.

Support our bipartisan bill, the Efficient Check Clearing Act of 1997, H.R. 2119, and help bring our Nation's central bank into the 21st century.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislataive days to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

THE INVASION OF THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, once again, it is my sad privilege to address the House to remind all of America of the invasion of the Republic of Cyprus.

As we know, 1997 is the 23d year of divided rule on the island; 1997 has also been hailed as the year of Cyprus. Although I am greatly saddened that the northern portion of the island remains occupied by Turkish troops, on this map here, actually, this is called the green line, and in actuality, in order to see it better, we have it colored in blue here and you can see that the northern part of the island is separated from the southern portion.

I do remain hopeful and optimistic that we are 1 year closer to a just solution. It is imperative, Mr. Speaker, that we continue to build upon the progress that was made during 1996, referred to in some quarters as the year of the big push.

The divided island of Cyprus is certainly ready for peace. There are families who are certainly ready for answers as well. They want answers to what happened to their loved ones who disappeared 23 years ago during the Turkish invasion.

To this day, there are still five American citizens among the 1,619 people still missing from the invasion. These families want to end sleepless nights of wondering whether or not their loved ones are still alive. Hopefully, these questions will be answered and these families will finally be given peace of mind.

Our ultimate goal should be peace for all citizens of Cyprus. However, peace will not come without the strong and active leadership of the United States. The United Nations has unsuccessfully attempted to resolve the differences between the two Cypriot communities.

Since 1974, the United Nations has stationed over 1,000 troops on the island to prevent violence from spreading throughout Cyprus. Yet the violence has not abated. I strongly support U.N. Resolution 939, which calls for a bizonal, bicommunal single state of Cyprus. However, I submit we will not achieve this goal by maintaining the status quo.

I yield at this time to my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, once again, as I have every year that I have been a Member of Congress, it is my honor and sad privilege to stand with the gentleman from Florida and remember and commemorate the 23d anniversary of the 1974 illegal Turkish invasion of Cyprus. The continued presence of Turkish troops represents a growing violation of human rights and international law.

On the positive side, I am pleased with the success that the gentleman in Florida and I have had in the formation of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues last year. We now have 62 Members from both parties and from all regions of the country. Democrats, Republicans, liberals, and conservatives have all joined together to pursue our common objectives of justice, human rights, and stronger ties between the United States and its strong democratic allies, Cyprus and Greece.

Earlier this year, many of the members of the Hellenic Caucus joined us in signing a letter to the President to stop the sale of Seahawk helicopters. We were successful. No helicopters were sold to Turkey. Over the last week, U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright mitigated a nonaggression pact with the Foreign Minister of Greece and the Foreign Minister of Turkey.

Now that Greece and Turkey have come to a peaceful agreement, it will allow the focus to be concentrated on a more peaceful solution, hopefully, in Cyprus. Last weekend, the President of Cyprus, Glafkos Clirides, and the Turkish Cypriot leader, Rauf Denktash, met in a first round of U.N. talks, and they have agreed to a second round of talks in August.

The appointment of Richard Holbrooke as United States special envoy to Cyprus shows the United States' commitment to a settlement in the region. In fact, he met with both sides this past Monday. I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 81, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], that calls for a United States initiative seeking a just and peaceful resolution in Cyprus.

I am hopeful that we will reach a peaceful solution soon, but it must be a fair solution. Turkey must withdraw its troops. Imported settlers must be returned to their countries of origin. The island must be unified without a green line. The almost 200,000 Greek Cypriots who were expelled from their homes must have the opportunity to return home. We must know what happened to the 1,614 Greek Cypriots and 5 Americans which were seized by Turkish troops and remain unaccounted for to this day.

The pain of some of my constituents in Astoria, Queens, whose beloved family members are still missing, must be put to rest. On this issue, there can be no compromise. We will never give up the demand to know the fate of people like Chrisaci Loizoi, Andrew Kassapis, and George Anastasiou. We must have them accounted for.

I have many constituents who do not know what happened to their brothers, their fathers, their sisters, their mothers. For all they know, they are still suffering in some brutish Turkish prison. Human decency demands an accounting.

Over the past few years, we have witnessed tremendous changes around the world: The fall of the Berlin Wall, the beginning of steps in the Middle East toward peace, and the end of apartheid. It is my sincere hope that soon we will be able to add Cyprus to that list of places where peace and freedom have triumphed.

I would like to bring to the attention of my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], and to other Members of Congress that there will be a meeting and concert in Bryant Park, located in Manhattan, NY, this coming Friday to further observe the invasion of Cyprus.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I really have to commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], my friend and colleague from the other side of the aisle, who has worked extremely hard on this issue. Both of us have visited Cyprus and we have seen firsthand the green line that separates this country; and we both hope that in the coming talks, this line will be erased and that finally there will be peace and justice in Cyprus.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY]. I dare say that there are not many people, within or without Congress, who have put more time into this issue on behalf of those great people, and I thank her so very much. It is such a pleasure and honor to work with her on this issue and so many others.

Continuing with my remarks, Mr. Speaker, last year some of the worst human rights abuses occurred on the island since the Turkish invasion. Four unarmed Greek Cypriots and one unarmed Turkish Cypriot were shot and killed while protesting the division of the island. Nearly 100 protesters and 14 U.N. peacekeepers were injured throughout the year, as well.

We ask ourselves sometimes, why is an end to the division of Cyprus in America's best interest? International stability is a key factor to our increasingly global economy. A divided Cyprus

only continues to serve as a fuse between, lit fuse I might say, between two of our NATO allies, Greece and Turkey.

Twice since the 1974 invasion Greece and Turkey have almost gone to war. The most recent incident was in 1996 concerning the Imia Islet crisis. The Aegean Sea is home to the world's busiest shipping lanes. Indeed, Cyprus is in a key strategic position relative to the Mediterranean region and the Suez Canal, which is instrumental in supplying oil and other materials vital to the stability of the entire region.

In this map here to my left, we see actually the country of Greece here and Turkey here, and then the Republic Island of Cyprus in this particular area. And I think it is just very easy to be able to determine the tremendously strategic position of that island.

So it is just imperative that the problems be solved. As such, any conflict between Greece and Turkey could disrupt trade in the region and have extremely serious consequences for many nations, including the United States.

□ 1700

If the situation in Cyprus continues to deteriorate, there could be serious repercussions among other NATO nations and these nations could be forced to choose between two allies, Greece or Turkey. In order for a lasting peace to be forged, the Turkish militarization of the island and of the region must end. Currently there are over 35,000 Turkish troops stationed on Cyprus, and in addition Turkey has a large amphibious assault force located within 100 miles of the island. The proximity of such a significant Turkish presence has led NATO to estimate that the island of Cyprus could fall to Turkish troops within 24 hours should Turkey ever decide to attack.

U.N. reports cited Turkey's lack of motivation as the reason for the stalled peace process. The Turkish Government has stated that it will take all necessary steps including military actions to defend Turkey's interest on the island. Without U.S. leadership, it is unlikely that a lasting peace settlement can be negotiated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS].

Mr. PAPPAS. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding and once again I commend him for his continued leadership on issues affecting Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey and, most important, the people that live in those three nations. I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman on these issues and other issues.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to add my voice to the chorus calling for justice in Cyprus. Twenty-three years ago, 6,000 Turkish troops and 40 tanks landed on the north coast of Cyprus and captured nearly 40 percent of the island.

Today 35,000 troops occupy the northern portion of Cyprus; 1,619 people remain missing, including 5 Americans. A barbed wire fence known as the Green Line cuts across the island, separating towns and people that had lived together for many generations. Mistrust and animosity have spread beyond this island to our NATO partners Turkey and Greece. This is not good.

Efforts are undertaken but they are not enough. The United States, the European Union, NATO, and the United Nations must do more now before this sore develops into a permanent cancer between our NATO partners and the peace and security of southeast Europe. We must remember that this problem started by the violent invasion of Cyprus by Turkey, and lasting peace can only be restored by the removal of the Turkish armed aggressors.

Why has the sad story of the invasion of Cyprus not received more attention in the press here in the United States? Maybe it is because the press is intimidated to report on this. Turkey, which occupies by military force the northern part of Cyprus, has the distinction of leading the world in jailing of journalists. More than North Korea, more than Communist China, more than Iraq and more than Iran. That is why we are here today on the floor and what we are doing is so important, because we in a sense are acting as the journalists for the world, for the people of Cyprus, bringing to the scrutiny of the public what has been censored in Turkey.

As evidence of this, I cite an editorial that appeared in last week's Philadelphia Inquirer, July 9. The article notes, ''It is impossible to have other freedoms in a country where there is no freedom of the press.''

This past Sunday, the New York Times wrote in an editorial, ''Under Turkey's broad antiterrorism law, journalism itself is criminalized and reporters face prison time for doing their job.'' It goes on to say, ''Press freedom is among the casualties of a failed strategy, imposed by the military, which Mr. Yilmaz cannot change overnight.''

And then just yesterday the Washington Post weighed in on the subject in an editorial that said, ''Journalists who write about Kurdish nationalism from an independent perspective have been at risk of being locked up and censored, harassed and beaten. Article 312 of the Turkish penal code permits reporting and community on other than the government line to be punished as incitement to racial hatred.''

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues to join the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], and many others in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 81, which would show the world that this Congress and this country are committed to seeking a just and peaceful resolution of the situation in Cyprus. Let us not let this problem caused by the Turkish invasion of Cyprus fester in the underbelly of southeastern Europe any longer.

I urge everyone to pray for a peaceful and just end to the Turkish invasion while there is still time to make peace. Again I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the articles referred to in my remarks for the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, July 9, 1997]

FREE SPEECH UNDER FIRE—TURKEY LEADS THE WORLD IN JAILING JOURNALISTS.

His name is unfamiliar to most Americans; his newspaper, unknown here. But his case should be a cause for anyone who cherishes the right too often taken for granted in this nation; to publish criticism of the government.

Ocak Isik Yurteu was imprisoned on Dec. 28, 1994, for editing a daily newspaper critical of the Turkish government, and is now serving a 15-year, 10-month sentence under the country's abusive antiterror law. ''Nobody in the world has been sentenced to so many years in prison for articles others have written,'' he said from Sakarya Prison last year.

But then, no country in the world imprisons journalists and smothers press freedoms more egregiously than Turkey. According to the Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ), for three years running Turkey has held more journalists in prison than any nation on earth. The count is now 78.

Most are charged under an antiterror law that effectively classifies all reports on the Kurdish rebellion other than the government's as either ''separatist propaganda'' or ''incitement to racial hatred.'' Imagine if the United States had had such a law during the civil-rights movement.

Mr. Yurteu's newspaper published what is considered balanced reporting on the Kurdish conflict, but truth is not what the Turkish government wanted its people to read.

A delegation from CPJ will be arriving in Turkey on Saturday, to champion the cause of Mr. Yurteu and his many jailed colleagues before the nation's top leaders. They will be pushing for the abolition of the repressive laws and the release of the 78 imprisoned journalists.

They will be demanding that a nation that wants desperately to join the European Union and to take part in the Western world's economic and technological advances, adhere to a fundamental precept of democracy: a free press.

The imprisoned journalists deserve the support of anyone here who has published an angry letter about the President—or written such a letter. Or has called a radio talk show and complained about Congress. Or has passed out leaflets knocking the major or town council.

It's worth remembering, as Mr. Yurteu wrote, ''It is impossible to have other freedoms in a country where there is no freedom of the press.''

[From the New York Times, July 13, 1997]

TURKEY, JAILER OF JOURNALISTS

Turkey has the shameful distinction of imprisoning more journalists than any country in the world. The New York-based Committee to Protect Journalists has compiled a list of 78 reporters, writers and editors now in jail, and the Turkish Press Council reckons the total may be twice as high. Now that a new Government has assumed power, it has a timely opportunity to open those prison doors. Doing so would lessen a stain on Turkey's reputation and enhance the democratic credentials of Prime Minister Mesut Yilmaz's secularist center-right coalition.

Most of the journalists in prison are charged with disseminating ''separatist propaganda'' or with being members of proscribed

pro-Kurdish political groups. In fact, under Turkey's broad anti-terrorism law, journalism itself is criminalized and reporters face prison for doing their job. An emblematic case is that of Ocak Isik Yurtcu, a prominent writer and former newspaper editor who has served 3 years of a 15-year sentence. Mr. Yurtcu's offense was to publish articles about the Turkish Army's scorched-earth campaign against Kurdish insurgents in southeastern Turkey.

Mr. Yurtcu's plight, along with scores of other cases, will be taken up this summer by a visiting delegation of journalists, among them Terry Anderson and Peter Arnett, at the request of Turkish press organizations. By responding favorably, Prime Minister Yilmaz would signal a halt to Turkey's descent into repression. He would begin to answer critics, especially in the European Union, of Turkey's dismal human rights record, and would set a different example from his immediate secular and Islamic predecessors.

This is more than a press issue. For nearly a decade Turkey has relied primarily on force to counter Kurdish terrorists, without opening a parallel political attack for a huge, aggrieved ethnic minority. Press freedom is among the casualties of a failed strategy, imposed by the military, which Mr. Yilmaz cannot change overnight. Yet it is within his power to release jailed journalists and decriminalize free speech, an essential precondition for an end to Turkey's domestic turmoil. Turkey's friends hoped he will not let this moment pass.

[From the Washington Post, July 16, 1997]

TURKEY'S PRESS: TURKEY'S KURDS

It is an irony and an embarrassment that even as NATO imposes high democratic standards on new members, it has given an errant old member, Turkey, a bye. On the litmus issue of imprisoning journalists for what they write, for instance, Turkey is the recognized world champion. The Committee to Protect Journalists, an American defense group, counted 78 jailed Turkish journalists at the beginning of the year. All the more satisfying, then, that the group has not elicited from the new Turkish government of Mesut Yibnaz a commitment to do something about a record that, if a current NATO applicant had it, would exclude it from the West's premier democratic club.

The trouble lies, of course, in Turkey's continuing conflict with a Kurdish minority that has its pacific assimilationist element but its armed separatist element as well. An official policy giving a long leash to an assertive Turkish military has not only failed to curb Kurdish terrorism but has also cost past governments political support. Journalists who write about Kurdish nationalism from an independent perspective have been at risk of being locked up and censored, harassed and beaten. Article 312 of the Turkish penal code permits reporting and commentary on other than the government line to be punished as ''incitement to racial hatred.''

The Kurdish problem is as tough as any ethnic conflict anywhere. No one has a good solution in the inflamed circumstances in which it is unfolding now. What is certain, however, is that the problem must be addressed in a context in which the Turkish people are fully and fairly informed about the options before them. This is the prospect now opened up by the Yilmaz government. It speaks for a minority coalition and faces parliamentary resistance to its new free-press commitments. But it also has the opportunity to bring Turkey the appreciation rather than the opprobrium of the democratic West. Up to this point, the army has plainly been calling most of the shots on policy toward the Kurds. The army is manifestly unfit for this role and plays it poorly. Opening up the press is no glib civics textbook prescription. It is a practical way for Turkey to build support for a consensus approach.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I thank the gentleman. He is a rookie, I guess we would call him, a freshman here, but he has already made his presence known in many ways and particularly on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Cyprus needs active United States support to attain its goal of membership in the European community. This membership would promote stability by permanently linking Cyprus to Europe both economically and strategically. Indeed the European Parliament has indicated its desire for peace on the island. Cyprus has earned its place in the European Union. Now the international community must take steps to move the peace process forward.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, Cyprus is ready to become an important trading partner with the United States. The Greek Cypriot community is a democratic society known for its open and efficient economic system. Despite the violent blow dealt by the invasion, the Cypriot economy has strongly rebounded to become one of the strongest economies in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for calling this special order. I will not take too much time, since I see a number of my colleagues, showing the importance of this very vital issue to many of us in the Congress on both sides of the aisle from throughout the United States of America, because we talk about justice and fairness, we talk about the new era that we live in where we say that we will not allow the big and the strong to take advantage of the smaller.

That was the whole question in the Persian Gulf situation when 28 nations came together to say that the invasion of Kuwait that was imminent was wrong and we came together as a united country of the world, countries of the world, from the Arab community, from Africa, from the West to say that we will protect this little country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Human Rights Subcommittee to join in commemorating this sad day in history of the Republic of Cyprus. On July 20, 1974, 6,000 Turkish troops and 40 tanks landed on the north coast of Cyprus and captured almost 40 percent of the island. More than 35,000 Turkish troops continue to occupy the northern portion of Cyprus.

The Green Line, a barbed wire fence, separating the northern part of the island from the free portion, is the only wall remaining in the world. We brought down the Berlin Wall. We have gone through and have sort of new independent countries in Europe. But this wall still remains.

Thousands of Greek Cypriots from the towns and communities in which they and their families have previously lived for generations are separated from one another. Today there are 1,619 people whose whereabouts are still unknown, and we have heard already 5 of these are U.S. citizens that we still have not heard about.

The illegal invasion and occupation by Turkey represents over two decades of unanswered questions, human rights violations and cultural destruction. As I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I had the opportunity 2 years ago to visit Cyprus. I had the opportunity to go with a constituent of mine, Andy Comodomos, where we drove up to the Green Line. We were allowed to go up into the Turkish-occupied portion of the island where we went to the street that Mr. Comodomos lived on and went to the house that he was raised in and then went up the to the home of his cousin who lived there.

We rang the bell and we were allowed to come in by this Turkish family who came up from the south to occupy the house. It was heartbreaking for him to see his home, his backyard, the basement of the home that his family grew up in being occupied illegally by people who had illegally taken possession of the home. I speak out with my other colleagues here and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Turkish Cypriot leader Denktash and Greek Cypriot President Glafcos Clerides in their talks and that our new head of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, is calling for continued talks. We hope that there will finally be a breakthrough.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I thank the gentleman. I daresay that probably this constituent who was able to get to go to his former home probably had not seen it for something like 20, 21 years and would not have been able to do that were it not for the fact that he was accompanying the gentleman. I appreciate the gentleman's support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], who has been an outstanding spokesman and advocate for peace in Cyprus for organizing this special order this evening. Today's special order on Cyprus comes on the eve of the 23d anniversary of the brutal invasion of Cyprus by Turkish troops. As we observe this sad anniversary, the international community is still confronted with the fact that in excess of 30,000 Turkish military personnel still remain on the island to enforce an illegal partition and to protect a self-proclaimed government that has been recognized by only one other country, Turkey itself.

Those of us in the Congress who supported the negotiated settlement to the dispute which has led to the division of Cyprus are painfully aware of the complexities of the issue, of the injustices committed, and particularly

the suffering over these many long years of the Cypriot people on both sides of the Green Line.

Indeed Cyprus has become a code word for stalemate and intractability in international diplomacy.

Just last week there occurred a new and positive development in Madrid, on the fringes of the NATO summit. The foreign ministers of both Greece and Turkey met together, under the auspices of our own government, and agreed on a set of principles to guide the resolution of disputes between our two NATO allies. The essential element of the statement issued by the foreign ministers in Madrid is that disputes between Greece and Turkey are to be settled through peaceful means and will be based on the mutual recognition of their legitimate interests. While this communique was related specifically to disputes in the Aegean, I am hopeful that it is going to inaugurate an era of better understanding on the issues that concern both Greece and Turkey, including Cyprus itself.

Although a resolution of the Cyprus problem depends first and foremost upon the will of the Cypriot people themselves, regardless of their ethnic background, certainly a better relationship between Greece and Turkey can play a critical role in helping resolve this vexing international dispute.

It is gratifying that the Clinton administration seems more interested than in the past in finding a solution for Cyprus. The announcement last month that President Clinton appointed Ambassador Richard Holbrooke as a special envoy for Cyprus is also promising. If Ambassador Holbrooke brings the same energy and determination to Cyprus as he brought to ending the conflict in Bosnia, it is hopeful that he will be able to convince the Cypriot people to put behind them their differences and work out a just and peaceful settlement.

The shape of a possible settlement is out there. I believe that both President Clerides and Mr. Denktash are men who can rise above the recent enmity that has developed between the two communities and find a way to reunite the island based on mutual good will and confidence.

We should all encourage these two leaders to make the most of direct talks which began in New York just last week and which will soon be continuing in Geneva. Old history and grievances must be placed behind us as we seek to resolve the division of Cyprus. Let us hope that both sides will reach within themselves to find the resolve to settle this persistent problem.

The Greek Cypriots have demonstrated flexibility and the spirit of compromise in recent rounds of U.N.-sponsored talks. We now call upon Mr. Denktash to demonstrate this same kind of flexibility. Twenty-three years is too long a time. There are now young people coming of age in Cyprus who know nothing other than the experience of living on a divided island and a divided society.

□ 1715

For this next generation what can be done to guide them in learning to accept life with a neighboring but different culture? Time is running out for the possibility of achieving a peaceful settlement, and the people of Cyprus now have to ask themselves if the enmity between the two communities is truly worth the price of a divided nation.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman who for years and years has done the best he possibly could to try to resolve this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] at this point.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to begin as I do every year by thanking the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] for organizing this special order. It has now been 23 years since Turkey invaded Cyprus, and I deeply appreciate the opportunity to join the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] and the other cochair of our Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] in keeping this issue in the spotlight.

For almost a quarter of a century now the people of Cyprus have lived on a divided, militarized, and occupied island, and the facts of the situation are well known. I do not want to spend time tonight revisiting them, but I do believe there are important developments on the Cyprus issue that I want to spend the bulk of my time addressing, and I do want to say to those who were murdered during the Turkish invasion and to the 1,619 people who have never been accounted for, 5 of whom are American, that you are not forgotten. Those who have lived through the nightmare of the last 23 years and those who have never known freedom in their lifetime, I want you to know that you have many allies in the U.S. Congress who are determined to see you govern every inch of your own country.

On July 9, this year, as was mentioned by some of my colleagues, these high-level negotiations between some of the key principals involved, once again got underway at the invitation of the Secretary General, the President of Cyprus, and the Turkish-Cypriot leader. They met face to face for the first time in 3 years, and I just want to say this is certainly a very positive development, as my colleagues have said, as was the joint statement which was released by Greece and Turkey the day before the talks in New York in which the two countries vowed to settle disputes by peaceful means, based on mutual consent, and without use of force or threat of force.

But before I discuss the current peace process in further detail, I wanted to draw attention to an unfortunate display of provocation by the Turkish government. Two days ago Turkey's Vice Prime Minister, who was the Prime Minister when Turkey invaded Cyprus in 1974, announced that he is going to visit the Turkish occupied area of Northern Cyprus on July 19, and the stated purpose of his visit is to congratulate the Turkish military for its invasion in 1974 and celebrate the subsequent occupation which is today enforced by some 35,000 Turkish troops.

So while we are here today honoring the memory of those who were murdered and never accounted for as a result of this Turkish aggression and even as the Greeks and Cypriots around the world prepare to do the same, the Turks are planning celebrations and slapping themselves on the back to commemorate these 23 years of brutality.

Mr. Speaker, I am outraged by this behavior, and I know the Cypriot people are as well. Yesterday I had the honor of personally meeting with the Cypriot Ambassador who conveyed to me his disappointment in this uncalled for provocation.

And I think the Vice Prime Minister's visit is deserving for another reason that we mentioned, that Ankara and Athens are releasing a joint statement vowing to settle their disputes peacefully. I mean the purpose of this statement one would presume was to set a good tone for settlement negotiations. But the Vice Prime Minister's visit to Northern Cyprus really belies Ankara's intent to negotiate in good faith, and I think it is really a deliberate provocation and needs to be brought to my colleagues' attention.

It also serves to reinforce the Congress' belief, this Congress' belief, that there are several aspects regarding the U.S. position that I think need to be addressed and reaffirmed as these negotiations get underway. I would just like to state those briefly.

As everyone is aware by now, President Clinton recently signaled his commitment to resolving the Cyprus problem by appointing Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, who was the architect of the Dayton Accords, and he is now the special emissary to Cyprus and his record of service has been mentioned by my colleagues, and, I think, the President should be congratulated for signaling his interest in the Cyprus issue through this appointment. But there was some concern following Ambassador Holbrooke's appointment that he might use the Dayton Accords as a model for the situation in Cyprus. To his credit, Ambassador Holbrooke has stated he does not intend to do such a thing and I want to commend him for that statement.

And I just wanted to say and reiterate that the Dayton Accords are not applicable to Cyprus. The roots and causes of the Cyprus problem are without question very different from those of the conflict that began in Bosnia in 1992. The Cyprus situation is a matter of illegal invasion and occupation of a foreign power. By contrast, the conflict in Bosnia was primarily ethnic in nature.

Accordingly, any solution to the situation in Cyprus must reflect the circumstances that are unique to the Cyprus problem's origin, and this problem is clearly one of illegal invasion and occupation.

There are a number of conditions. I think the United States must pressure the Turkish Government to accept conditions that the Cypriot and Greek Governments and certainly all of us here tonight consider nonnegotiable, and these are first, with regard to the issue of sovereignty: Any solution reached must be consistent with U.N. Resolution 750 of 1992, which states a Cyprus settlement must be based on the State of Cyprus with a single a sovereignty and international personality and a single citizenship with its independence and territorial integrity safeguarded. Relatedly, any overall settlement must be consistent with all U.N. resolutions on the Cyprus issue.

To facilitate the goal of the State of Cyprus with a single sovereignty, the United States should push for the establishment of a federation with two federated States, one Greek Cypriot and one Turkish Cypriot administered by a federal government. In other words, the United States should support the establishment of a constitutional democracy much like our own where the States receive their powers from the Federal Government. A rotating presidency under separate sovereignties for the Greek and Turkish communities should be viewed as completely unacceptable.

Second, any solution to the Cyprus problem must be based on internationally accepted standards of human rights. Simply stated, all Cypriots must be guaranteed the three basic freedoms: freedom of movement, property, and settlement.

And third, all foreign troops should be withdrawn from the island. In 1994, President Clerides proposed the demilitarization of the island as a precursor to meaningful negotiations, an offer which has to date been met with nothing but derision from Turkey. In 1995, the House went on record in support of this peaceful gesture when it passed the Cyprus Demilitarization Act, and I believe, and most informed observers of the Cyprus situation agree, that no progress can be made until Ankara withdraws its illegal occupying force.

I just want to stress again, Mr. Speaker, as I did earlier, that the Cyprus situation is one of illegal occupation of a sovereign country by a foreign power. The United States therefore must use its influence to facilitate the removal of the Turkish occupying force in the introduction of NATO or U.N. peacekeeping forces, if necessary, so negotiations can begin in earnest.

And just in conclusion, while these issues do not represent a comprehensive list of concerns, they are, in my opinion, most important. Other matters the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] mentioned, such as the Cypriot accession to the European Union, have to be pursued. Integrating Cyprus into the framework of the European Union would demonstrate unequivocally to Turkey that its only real option is to accept a sovereign, independent Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say that obviously the United States should embrace the opportunity to make progress, but we must not reach an agreement just for the sake of reaching an agreement. It is tragic that Cyprus has been divided for 23 years, but we would have to wait as long as we must to bring true and lasting freedom to the Cypriot people.

Again I want to thank my colleague from Florida. I know he believes very sincerely in this. He has been doing this for many years, and when this finally is resolved a lot of the reason for it, a lot of the reason why the U.S. Government is now more concerned and the President is more concerned, is because of the efforts of Mr. BILIRAKIS and the Hellenic Caucus.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those kind remarks and thank him for consistently year in and year out joining me in this special order, and if I were not leading this, I dare say he probably would be or certainly would still be just as much involved.

Mr. Speaker, in the past, our Nation has pledged its support to developing free, market democracies. The United States should consider offering trade incentives to Cyprus to allow the manufacturing sector to increase, the labor market to improve, and the infrastructure to modernize.

I also welcome efforts in Congress to maintain the traditional $15 million earmarked for Cyprus. This money funds projects aimed at reunification and reducing tensions between the two communities on Cyprus. I pledge my total support to building a strong trade relationship between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus. The continued growth of their economy will provide for a more stable country, which is a key ingredient in the peace process.

Mr. Speaker, the island has seen a tremendous amount of growth over the years mostly from tourism. However, the heart of Cyprus' potential growth has yet to be tapped. Hundreds of international firms recognize that the island's $15,000 per capita gross domestic product and the high education level of its people make Cyprus an ideal location for their regional headquarters.

In stark contrast, and I really, I just hesitate to mention it because I do not mean to be throwing stones, but the per capita gross domestic product in the Turkish-occupied region is a mere $3,500. There is also a significantly higher crime rate in the Turkish portion of the island.

I yield at this time to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in marking the tragic events that occurred 23 years ago on the island of Cyprus. On July 20, 1974, the Government of Turkey sent troops to Cyprus and forcibly assumed control of more than one-third of that island. The action dislocated much of the Greek Cypriot population creating a refugee problem that exists to this day.

Just think about it, children who are born 23 years ago, are old enough to have families of their own today. Additionally, over 1,600 Greek Cypriots are missing. They are still unaccounted for as a result of this invasion. The children who were born may not have known their own families.

While in the past the Turkish Cypriot community was unwilling to work toward an agreement, I am pleased that both sides have come together in my congressional district to hold their first round of talks in Amenia, NY. It is clear to me that the clean air and beautiful countryside of Amenia has assisted immeasurably in laying a strong foundation for these negotiations since both sides have agreed to continue these talks in Geneva on August 11.

The talks are the first step in a long process that will hopefully lead to a consensus agreement for lasting peace. It is my hope that an agreement will include the removal of the roughly 35,000 Turkish troops from the island of Cyprus and the return of 180,000 Greek Cypriots to the homes that they fled in 1973. We have heard about the anguish that those Cypriots feel when they know that there are other people occupying those homes.

I want to applaud the willingness of the Greek Cypriots in demonstrating their continued commitment to compromise in order to bring an end to this longstanding dispute and also to Rauf Denktash, the President of Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, a State recognized only by Turkey for making the right move toward the peace table.

While the past efforts have failed to produce any movement toward an agreement, we continue to pray that these talks will bear fruit so that all the people of Cyprus will know the sweet taste of freedom and a lasting peace. While the talks continue, the U.S. Government has to let our position be heard loud and clear by all interested parties to show we are serious about achieving a lasting peace in Cyprus. In this regard, I am pleased to be a cosponsor to the House Concurrent Resolution 81, the concurrent resolution calling for the United States initiative seeking a just and peaceful resolution of the situation in Cyprus.

Additionally, I am going to continue to support legislation in Congress to cut economic support funds and military assistance to Turkey until it withdraws its troops from Cyprus, lifts its blockade of Armenia and makes progress on extending political and economic rights to its Kurdish minorities.

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, it is with decisive steps such as these that we can begin to hope

for a brighter future for Cyprus. I wish to commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] for his steadfast work in this area. I look forward to working with him and all of my colleagues who share our concerns to achieve a unified and peaceful Cyprus for the future. The talks are a long step toward the peace process that we hope will lead to a consensus agreement for lasting peace. I think it is very important that we get that.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for taking the time to come over to join us on this special order, and for hosting those two gentlemen during those important talks.

I yield to the other gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ], who also has visited the island.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. First of all I want to recognize and commend the gentleman for keeping this issue before the Congress of the United States, and for that matter, before the American people, and for organizing this special order.

We do hope there will be a point in time in which this special order will truly be just a commemoration and not a further quest and search for peace and justice in Cyprus. The gentleman has been an outstanding advocate in this respect, and we commend him.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of the Committee on International Relations and as a member of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus to join in the commemoration of that unhappy anniversary and tragic circumstances of 23 years, over two decades, of the division of the island of Cyprus. It seems incredible, but for 23 years now the Republic of Cyprus has been artificially divided following an illegal invasion by Turkish troops on July 20, 1974.

On that date over 200,000 Greek Cypriots became refugees in their own country and to this day are denied the right to return to their homes. Today a full 37 percent of the island remains under occupation by Turkish troops, which in defiance of U.N. resolutions, now number over 35,000. This makes Cyprus one of the most militarized places in the world.

I saw that fact firsthand as I traveled with my constituents from New Jersey, the Zambas family, to Cyprus, crossed the green line, which is the division between northern Cyprus and the rest of the country, to the occupied territory to an area called Brastio-Morphu. Clearly to me the militarization was so, so obvious in the process of that visit.

But also what was obvious is that when Turkish Cypriots, those who lived on the island, not those who have been imported from Anatolia but those who live on the island, are given an opportunity to intermingle with Greek Cypriots, that there is the opportunity for coexistence and coalescence. That became clear to me in the conversation between my constituents and the Turkish Cypriots who had lived there before the invasion. They were willing to talk to each other. Only the people who were escorting us, the security forces, refused to let them speak to each other. As an example of that, it is those who occupy the north that create this division.

We remember the over 1,619 Greek Cypriots and 5 American citizens who are still missing as a result of the military operations in 1974. Sadly, we also commemorate this year the deaths of three civilians last summer, two who died from the bullets of Turkish soldiers, they were unarmed, they were simply along the green line, and the other at the hands of a mob of Turkish thugs.

These actions are nothing but barbaric and should be addressed in that way, which is why I was happy to join many of my colleagues at the United Nations in condemning those barbaric actions. Those are not the actions that a civilized country takes. It is not the actions that a country for which we give aid takes against other individuals.

Mr. Speaker, the comments of the former Prime Minister, Prime Minister Tansu Ciller, that we will break the hands of those raised against us, signify, contrary to Turkey's stated position, that in fact they consider northern Cyprus Turkey's domain. So after 23 years, the people of Cyprus in both communities deserve a solution which will reunite the island, its communities, and its people.

For too long the Cyprus problem has been a source of tension and instability in an important area of the world. My colleague, the gentleman from Florida, has a map that very well describes that part of the world and the importance of what is happening in the Aegean. Even our Secretary of State Madeleine Albright recently pointed out ''U.S. Cyprus relations extend far beyond, far beyond the so-called Cyprus problem. Cyprus is a valued partner against new global threats.''

I think that is why we in the Congress are engaged in this issue. A resolution would strengthen peace and stability in the volatile eastern Mediterranean and significantly advance the United States national security interests in the region and beyond. It is in the United States national interest to see such a solution. Cyprus is a bridge between East and West. It is a bulkhead in the sea of Islamic fundamentalism. Its solution would ease the tensions between two very important NATO allies.

President Clinton's appointment of Richard Holbrooke as his Special Emissary on Cyprus has us all refocused again on the attention to a resolution to the Cyprus problem at a crucial time. Last week I was proud to circulate and send a letter, and I know that my colleague, the gentleman from Florida and others, joined with me in a letter signed by 67 of our colleagues in the House to President Clinton outlining what we believe should be the parameters of any Cyprus solution.

Those parameters are basically those that have been recognized I think by the international community through U.N. resolutions, but specifically they are that Cyprus should be reunited with a strong federal government in which the federated states derive their powers from a federal constitution, a democratic constitution which would ensure the rights of all citizens and all communities, and which would guarantee the right to private property and free travel to all parts of the country.

We have heard much about the Greek Cypriots' willingness to compromise, and they have, time and time again. But there are limitations. Turkey must not be allowed to derail once again the tremendous opportunity for peace that exists on the island. While Turkey has verbally committed itself at appropriate moments during these years to pursue better relations with its neighbors, its actions, however, not what it says but what it does, its actions demonstrate a consistent pattern of hostility and unwillingness.

Even the former U.N. Secretary General, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, said so in a report on Cyprus. So if Turkey is serious about its commitment to a permanent solution, then it must bring its views into conformity with the U.N. framework on issues of sovereignty and political equality.

In conclusion, I want to say that Cyprus will not be a prisoner to Turkey's objections or threats. It will not postpone and it should not postpone its well-deserved entry into the European Union over Turkish objections. If European integration is good for Turkey, then it must be good for all of the Cypriot people.

The world must know that in this small Mediterranean island of Cyprus, there are people filled with hope and expectation that this is the moment in which their divided homeland can once and for all be reunited in accordance with international expectations. We cannot rest until the last boot of the last Turkish soldier leaves Cyprus, until a divided country is reunited, until the last divided city of the world, Nicosia, is rejoined, until peace and justice become a reality for all of its citizens, Greeks and Turks alike.

I again commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] for keeping this before the American people, before Congress, and forging ahead.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I thank the gentleman so much for helping in that regard, and for his energy and support for this cause over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN], who is also one of our freshmen, but very much interested in this subject.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I rise to join my distinguished colleague from Florida and all those who acknowledge today this sad date in the

history of Cyprus. I rise to add my name to the long list of Members of Congress who throughout the past 23 years have decried Turkey's brutal invasion of this Mediterranean island.

After 23 years some might be tempted to throw in the towel, to believe that these 23 years of Turkish occupation of northern Cyprus prove the helplessness of the international community in the face of ethnic strife and injustice. Some might even say that our yearly acknowledgment of this tragic event are wasted words.

I say that now more than ever we need to voice our resolve, our ongoing commitment to build a lasting peace for all the people of Cyprus. As we have witnessed in so many parts of the world, peace-building does not happen overnight. It requires hard work, vigilance, and the very resolve that we have maintained over the years and that will help us undo Turkish wrongdoing in Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot let our determination falter. To do so would be to allow the persistence of injustice, and equally as important, harm our own interests. Ethnic conflicts, as those in central Africa have so dramatically shown us, tend to spill over and threaten the stability of entire regions, and threatening markets for American business overseas.

The Republic of Cyprus has worked to develop a stable economy and an important economic role for itself in the Mediterranean and Europe. It attracts millions of tourists to its shores annually, and also serves as an economic focal point for the entire eastern Mediterranean region. Furthermore, the Republic of Cyprus is one of the few countries that has met the tough economic criteria of the Maastricht agreement, indicating its promise as a future actor in European economies.

Yet, can there be real economic stability when 160,000 Greek Cypriots remain displaced and away from their rightful homes? Can there be real economic stability when 35,000 Turkish troops threaten security in the Republic of Cyprus? Can there be real economic stability when the northern half of Cyprus languishes in economic and political isolation under a neo-totalitarian regime?

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that much work remains to be done to guarantee the health of the Cypriot economy and our own interests in the region. This work begins right here in Congress. We Members must follow the lead of our Representatives, like the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL], and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] in their efforts on behalf of Cyprus.

I pledge my support for the resolution they have introduced, House Concurrent Resolution 81. Further, I urge my colleagues to ensure that the foreign aid appropriations bill that we submit to the President will include the $15 million earmark to help Cyprus in these critical times.

Congressional actions, however, are not the only means to complete the work of building a lasting peace in Cyprus. This month's U.N.-sponsored peace talks in New York between Greek and Turkish Cypriots have shown that the international community shares our determination for peace. The European Union, in selecting Cyprus as one of its next members, has especially proven their commitment to progress. Furthermore, the Clinton administration has taken an energetic and more direct approach to the Cyprus issue, and their efforts clearly contributed to the spirit of optimism emerging from this month's U.N. talks.

I further commend the administration's appointment of Ambassador Richard Holbrooke as Special Emissary for Cyprus. The Ambassador will be an important instrument for us to bring about change, most notably, in the following areas.

First of all, human rights. Ambassador Holbrooke should be aware of our objections to Turkey's deprivation of Greek Cypriot possessions, its discrimination against the Greek Cypriot community in Northern Cyprus, its restrictions of liberties in the form of curfews for Greek Cypriots, its confinement of 2,000 Greek Cypriots in detention centers, its imprisonment of Greek Cypriots in Turkey, and finally, its repression of legal recourse for Greek Cypriots living in the occupied areas.

Second, Cypriot unity. We must urge the Ambassador to work for a unified Cyprus, supported by a constitution that provides for proportionate and equitable participation of both Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

Finally, missing persons. We will not abandon the American citizens who count among the 1,619 people who disappeared following the Turkish invasion of 1974. With the continued resolve of Congress, the help of the administration, the cooperation of our European U.N. partners, we will succeed in ending a status quo that fractures Cypriot society and stifles democracy and justice for the people of Northern Cyprus. In doing so, our strategic, economic, and humanitarian interests will be well served.

I want to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] for his leadership on this issue, which has been steadfast over the years. When I was a congressional aide here working for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], I was well aware of all of his efforts, and I appreciate his letting me be part of this special order.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments and support.

The division of Cyprus, Mr. Speaker, is perhaps most obvious in the divided capital city of Nicosia, located here on a map about in the international center of the island, a city which after the collapse of the Berlin Wall is the last truly divided city in the world. At checkpoints across the city, armed guards stare at each other across an uneasy no man's land. In the center of the city, bullet holes scar buildings and serve as a powerful reminder of the events of 1974.

□ 1745

It is no wonder that the people of Cyprus, both Greek and Turkish, are ready for peace. Nese Yahsin, a Turkish Cypriot poet, was recently featured in the Christian Science Monitor. Her poem ''Which Half?'' captures the spirit of the two people. ''Which Half?'' is the name of her poem.

She writes:

''They say a person should love their homeland,
that's also what my father often says.
My homeland has been divided in two,
which of the two pieces should I love?''

I find it symbolic that a popular Greek Cypriot composer, Marios Tokas, put this simple four-line verse to music which is often sung by Turkish and Greek Cypriots.

Even with the animosity and intercommunity conflict, the divided people of Cyprus have made progress toward bicommunal living. Recently several thousand young Cypriots from both communities were able to come together for the first time in over 23 years for a U.N.-sponsored pop concert. Despite much protest, the concert was successful and Cypriots from both sides of the island took one step closer to bicommunal harmony.

A couple of years ago I led a delegation over the green line to Famagusta, located here, Kyrenia, located up here, and to the tip of Karpassas, the area of the enclaved Cypriots. Sadly, this line not only divides a nation but people as well. In order for Cypriots living in the occupied zone to visit the southern side of the island, they must first fly to Ankara, Turkey, then to Athens, Greece, and then to the unoccupied portion of the island. In contrast, a trip between the occupied ghost town of Famagusta, where I have had relatives who are displaced, and the thriving holiday resort of Protoras, which is just below the line, would only take a matter of minutes by car.

However, I believe that the tide may be changing and unity in the island of Cyprus is a real possibility. Just last week, Greek and Turkish leaders pledged to overcome decades of tension and threats of war by agreeing to respect each other and settle disputes by peaceful means. I am hopeful that the United States appointment of Richard Holbrooke, as others have said, as special envoy to Cyprus will accelerate the peace process.

Mr. Holbrooke's appointment was well received in Cyprus, Greece, and especially in Turkey. Perhaps, because of his experience and respect in the international community, he will be in a better position than his predecessors to negotiate with the Turkish Government. It seems rather odd, though, doesn't it,

to be negotiating for land wrongfully taken in an illegal invasion and recognized by only one country on Earth?

The United States must re-examine its goals and interests in the region. We must send a strong message to all parties involved—that a divided Cyprus is unacceptable. Furthermore, Congress must send a message to Turkey stressing our commitment to finding a lasting peace on the island of Cyprus. In fact, I am an original cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 81, which reaffirms that the status quo on Cyprus is unacceptable and detrimental to the interests of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude on a note of urgency. Now is the time to take the next step in the Cyprus peace process. Cyprus, Greece, Turkey, and the United States are finally coming together this month in New York to discuss their respective issues. Moreover, Greece and Turkey, with strong pressure from the United States, recently announced their intentions to settle all disputes in a peaceful manner.

However, once the peace process begins, we should only move forward. We must insist that the United States serve as a constructive participant in the peace settlement in order to ensure a just and lasting solution.

As Members of Congress, we must do everything possible to encourage this peace process. It is only through this process that we will achieve our ultimate goal—to reunite the people and the island of Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHERMAN].

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I appreciate the efforts of the distinguished gentleman from Florida on this issue. I want to associate myself with the comments that have come earlier.

Those who are watching us have heard the sad story of how this island was divided by force from an invasion of a foreign army 23 years ago today. They have heard how there are nearly 200,000 refugees, over 1,600 missing persons, 5 of them U.S. citizens. Nicosia is today, as the gentleman from Florida pointed out, the only truly divided city and only divided capital in the world.

A few years ago the most famous divided city was Berlin. President Ronald Reagan said, ''Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall.'' It is time for Americans to turn to Mr. Yilmaz and say, ''Mr. Yilmaz, tear down this wall. Unite this island. Unite the city of Nicosia.''

I do want to bring to the attention of my colleagues renewed interest in the State Department and the Defense Department to transferring several frigates to the Turkish Navy. This is something that should not be done without a lot of pause and a lot of consideration. There are those that say that we should help the Turkish military because it confronts Iran and Iraq, but I would ask, in an effort to contain Iran and Iraq, where will the Turkish Navy deploy the frigates? The last ocean-going vessel seen in eastern Anatolia was Noah's ark.

These frigates ought to be viewed as an expansion of the Turkish Navy. The people of Cyprus are familiar with that organization's work, and these frigates should not be transferred without an awful lot of careful consideration, both in the administration and here on Capitol Hill.

We are all happy to see Mr. Holbrooke given the responsibility and the mission of trying to bring peace and unity to Cyprus. Now, on the 23d anniversary of a terrible division and illegal invasion, we call for the demilitarization of Cyprus and peace and unity on that island.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in commemorating the somber anniversary of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus on July 20, 1974. I would like to thank Congressman BILIRAKIS for holding this special order.

In the 23 years since the invasion of the Sovereign State of Cyprus, Turkey has illegally occupied 40 percent of the island, maintaining 35,000 troops and installing 80,000 colonists in properties seized from Greek Cypriot refugees who have lived there for many generations. As a result of this human tragedy, 200,000 displaced persons have lost their homes and livelihood, another 1,619, including 5 American citizens remain unaccounted for and several thousand have lost their lives. The enclaved people who remained in northern Cyprus are denied basic human rights such as freedom of movement, access to education, religious freedom or political rights. Today the ''Green Line'' separating the Greek and Turkish portions of the island stands as a testament to this ethnic cleansing.

My colleagues and I have called and will continue to call for a just and lasting settlement of the Cyprus problem that will reunify the land and its people. In House Resolution 81, recently reported from the House International Relations Committee, we called for the withdrawal of Turkish troops and an early substantive initiative toward a resolution. We welcome the recent diplomatic efforts with the appointment of Richard Holbrooke as a Special Emissary for Cyprus and the heightened attention given to this issue by the President. The proximity talks concluded in Troutbeck under the auspices of the U.N. Secretary General and upcoming rounds of negotiations represent a critical window of opportunity for a peaceful resolution of this conflict. As we have stressed to the President and the parties to the conflict, such a resolution must be based on international law, democratic principles and respect for human rights, property rights and freedom of movement.

The resolution of this conflict and the prompt accession of Cyprus to the European Union will guarantee the extension of democratic principles and the rule of law in Cyprus and contribute to the stability of this region, which is critical to our national security interests.

Let the 23d anniversary of the invasion be the last time we commemorate this tragic event. I hope that next year we gather to mark the first anniversary of the reunification of Cyprus and the conclusion of this tragic chapter in the long and rich history of the Cypriot people.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida for organizing this special order on Cyprus. MIKE BILIRAKIS has truly been a tireless champion for the peaceful resolution of the Cypriot problem.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues this afternoon in observing the 23d anniversary of Turkey's illegal invasion and continued occupation of the island of Cyprus. On July 20, 1974, Turkey unleashed its army on the Cypriot people. Turkey's violent and bloody invasion of this Mediterranean Island State has been rightfully condemned by the United Nations and all peace loving nations of the world.

I would like to applaud Secretary of State Madeleine Albright's recent statement to Cyprus' Foreign Minister Loanis Kasoulides when she said, ''What we seek is the reunification of Cyprus. We believe that the division of the island is unacceptable.'' It is clearly in American national security interests to seek a peaceful settlement to this problem. I would also like to commend President Clinton's decision to appoint ambassador Richard Holbrooke as the U.S. Special Emissary to promote a Cyprus settlement. Ambassador Holbrooke is eminently qualified to meet this new diplomatic challenge.

Mr. Speaker, the 23d anniversary of this brutal invasion should weigh heavily on the conscience of all civilized people of the world who share in the belief that states must eschew the destructive path of naked aggression and abide by the rules of international law. It is time for the world to tell Turkey that the status quo in Cyprus is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, the status quo must be broken. The paralysis in U.N. sponsored negotiations must be broken. And the intercommunal strife that has torn Cypriots apart must be settled peacefully. But none of these worthy objectives can occur as long as Turkey continues to violate international law and flout U.N. resolutions condemning its oppressive occupation of one-third of Cypriot territory.

It is indeed a sad testament to the intransigence of Turkey's position that 23 years after its invasion of northern Cyprus, it still maintains 35,000 troops on the island. The Ankara government must come to the realization that its troops in northern Cyprus stand as an obstacle to a just and permanent resolution of the Cypriot problem.

President Glafcos Clerides deserves to be commended for his honesty, flexibility and good faith efforts to broach the divide that needlessly separates Greek Cypriots from Turkish Cypriots. President Clerides statesmanlike position is a far cry from the inflexibility reflected by Turkish Cypriot Leader Mr. Denktash.

Mr. Speaker, any permanent resolution to this issue must take into consideration the anxieties and legitimate concerns of both Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. However, the first step toward reconciliation and reunification must be the end of Turkey's illegal occupation of northern Cyprus.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, we come to the floor today, as we have many times before, to commemorate the sad anniversary of the division of Cyprus. I want to commend my friend and colleague from Florida for initiating this annual special order, and express my deep regret that it is again necessary for us to come together to mark this occasion.

The history of this conflict, marked by strong feelings and a lingering threat of violence, speaks to the difficulty of finding a permanent solution. Over 1,600 Greek Cypriots and 5 Americans are among those who remain missing 23 years after the invasion. A generation of Cypriots on both sides of the green line has

grown up knowing only division, hate and mistrust. Over 35,000 heavily armed Turkish troops continue to occupy the upper one-third of this beautiful country, despite the fact that this military occupation is recognized to be illegal and in violation of numerous U.N. resolutions. Turkish Cypriots are being displaced in their own homeland by settlers from Turkey who do not share their Cypriot culture. While the military division of the island has been a tragedy the world has long recognized, the economic divergence between the two communities which is currently taking place not threatens the future of the island in a different way.

Since I stood here on this date a year ago, the Clinton administration and the international community have made strong statements about their resolve to find a solution to the Cyprus problem. Earlier this year, we heard from the Clinton administration that there would be a big push on Cyprus this year. But we are over half-way through 1997 and a Cyprus solution still seems a distant reality. We appoint envoys and we talk about what needs to be done to bring peace and unity to this tiny Mediterranean country, but when it comes time to deal with hard issues, we have no will to take a tough stand against aggression and in favor of international law. The Cyprus problem has been reviewed at least 150 times during the past 23 years to no avail. We cannot let the 151st effort meet the same fate.

I must say, however, that this year I have some hope that this will be the last time that we have to raise this issue in the context a continuing occupation of over one-third of Cyprus' territory by Turkish troops. The recent appointment of Richard Holbrooke to mediate a permanent solution to this long-running problem indicates a higher level of attention to this issue than we have seen in recent years, and I am hopeful that this interest on the part of the U.S. Government will translate to a greater commitment among the parties to resolve the issues which keep them divided. I know Mr. Holbrooke's abilities are formidable, and it will take all of his diplomatic skills to reach a just solution. I wish him well and urge him to seek a lasting resolution, and not just a quick fix that cannot be sustained. I am also cautiously optimistic about the U.N. initiative that is currently underway, and the encouraging signals that have come out of last weekend's session in New York.

For Cypriots to have a prosperous and secure future, the Turkish troops must leave, enabling Cyprus to once again be whole. Talks are scheduled to begin in 1998 regarding Cyprus' entry into the European Union, and this impending event will be a catalyst for Greek and Turkish Cypriots of goodwill to find a lasting peace and reunite a divided country. I would urge the administration to raise this issue at the highest levels. I also urge our military officials to talk directly with their counterparts in the Turkish military and encourage them to begin withdrawing the troops as a first step toward unification.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, our country cannot and, in fact, should not involve itself in the negotiations themselves—the parties must resolve this problem themselves. But we can and should do everything possible to establish an environment in which agreement can take place.

Twenty-two years is too long to see a divided island and divided people. It is my deepest hope, that the next special order on Cyprus will be to commemorate and celebrate a new found lasting peace and unity in Cyprus.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 23d anniversary of the 1974 illegal Turkish invasion of Cyprus. The continued presence of Turkish troops in Cyprus is a gross violation of human rights and international law.

Fortunately, since the last anniversary of this tragic event, significant and commendable progress has been made toward a peaceful resolution. Foreign Minister of Greece, Theodoros Pangalos, and Foreign Minister of Turkey, Ismail Cem, have made a nonaggression pact. Furthermore, the President of Cyprus, Glafkos Clirides, and the Turkish Cypriot leader, Rauf Denktash, met in a first round of United Nations talks. A second round is scheduled for next month.

The United States has also contributed to the region's efforts to reach a settlement. Richard Holbrooke has been appointed U.S. Special Envoy to Cyprus and U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright was involved in mediating the nonaggression pact between Greece and Turkey. Furthermore, I am pleased with the success that my colleague, Representative BILIRAKIS, and I had in the formation of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues. Only 1 year old, the 62 member caucus has played a leading role in ending the U.S. sale of Seahawk helicopters to Turkey.

The invasion of Cyprus by Turkey was an outrageous show of inhumanity. We must remember that 200,000 Greek Cypriots were expelled from their homes and that 1,614 Greek Cypriots and 5 Americans were seized by Turkish troops and remain unaccounted for to this day. And, consistent with the dictates of human decency, we must strive to reach a peaceful, fair solution without delay.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues rise with me in commemoration of the 23d anniversary of the invasion of Cyprus. Many of my own constituents in Astoria, Queens, continue to suffer as they wait for more information on the fate of their relatives. I am hopeful that a resolution will soon be reached and the pain caused by this inhumane invasion will be alleviated. Thank you.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my distinguished colleague from Florida, Mr. MIKE BILIRAKIS and all those who acknowledge today this sad date in the history of Cyprus. I rise to add my name to the long list of Members of Congress who throughout the past 23 years have decried Turkey's brutal invasion of this Mediterranean island.

After 23 years, some might be tempted to throw in the towel, to believe that these 23 years of Turkish occupation of Northern Cyprus prove the helplessness of the international community in the face of ethnic strife and injustice. Some might even say that our yearly acknowledgement of this tragic event are wasted words. I say that now more than ever, we need to voice our resolve, our ongoing commitment to building a lasting peace for all the people of Cyprus. As we've witnessed in so many parts of the world, peace building does not happen overnight—it requires hard work, vigilance, and the very resolve that we've maintained over the years and that will help us undo Turkey's wrongdoing in Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot let our determination falter. To do so would allow the persistence of injustice, and, equally as important, harm our own interests. Ethnic conflicts, as Central Africa has so dramatically shown us, tend to spill over borders, compromising the stability of entire regions, and threatening markets for American business overseas. The Republic of Cyprus has worked to develop a stable economy and an important economic role for itself in the Mediterranean and Europe. It attracts millions of tourists to its shores annually, and also serves as an economic focal point for the entire Eastern Mediterranean region. Furthermore, the Republic of Cyprus is one of the few countries that has met the tough economic criteria of the Maastricht agreement, indicating its promise as a future actor in European economics.

Yet, can there be real economic stability when 160,000 Greek Cypriots remain displaced and away from their rightful homes? Can there be real economic stability when 35,000 Turkish troops threaten the security of the Republic of Cyprus? Can there be real economic stability when the northern half of Cyprus languishes in economic and political isolation under a near totalitarian regime? It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that much work remains to be done to guarantee the health of the Cypriot economy and our own interests in the region.

This work begins right here in Congress. We Members must follow the lead of Representatives GILMAN, HAMILTON, PORTER, BILIRAKIS, ENGEL, and MALONEY in their efforts on behalf of Cyprus, and I pledge my support for the resolution that they have introduced, House Congressional Resolution 81. Further, I urge my colleagues to ensure that the Foreign Aid Appropriations bill that we submit to the President will include the $15 million earmark to help Cyprus in these critical times.

Congressional actions, however, are not the only means to complete the work of building a lasting peace in Cyprus. This month's U.N.-sponsored peace talks in New York between Greek and Turkish Cypriots have shown that the international community shares our determination for peace. The European Union, in selecting Cyprus as one of its next members, has especially proven their commitment to progress.

Furthermore, The Clinton administration has taken an energetic and more direct approach to the Cyprus issue, and their efforts clearly contributed to the spirit of optimism emerging from this month's U.N. talks. I further commend the administration's appointment of Ambassador Richard Holbrooke as Special Emissary for Cyprus. The Ambassador will be an important instrument for us to bring about change, most notably in the following areas:

First of all, human rights. Ambassador Holbrooke should be aware of our objections to Turkey's deprivation of Greek Cypriot possessions, its discrimination against the Greek Cypriot community in Northern Cyprus, its restriction of liberties in the form of curfews for Greek Cypriots, its confinement of 2,000 Greek Cypriots in detention centers, its imprisonment of Greek Cypriots in Turkey, and finally its suppression of legal recourse for Greek Cypriots living in the occupied areas.

Second, Cypriot unity. We must urge the Ambassador to work for a unified Cyprus, supported by a constitution that provides for proportionate and equitable participation of both Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

And finally, missing persons. We will not abandon the American citizens who count among the 1,619 people who disappeared following the Turkish invasion of 1974.

With the continued resolve of Congress, the help of the administration, and the cooperation of our European and United Nations partners, we will succeed in ending a status quo that fractures Cypriot society and stifles democracy and justice for the people of Northern Cyprus. In doing so, our strategic, economic, and humanitarian interests will be served.

I thank the gentleman from Florida for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. FRELINGHYSEN. Mr. Speaker, for 23 years now, the citizens of Cyprus have had to endure a national divided by a 112-mile barbed-wire fence guarded by thousands of soldiers on either side.

Since the Turkish invasion of the island on July 20, 1974, the Turkish Government has fortified the northern section of Cyprus with hundreds of tanks with more than half a billion dollars per year in military spending for only 175,000 inhabitants. In fact, defense spending accounts for approximately three-quarters of the gross domestic product for the Turkish-occupied section of Cyprus. It is time to send the Turkish tanks homes and let the citizens of Cyprus decide the future of their island.

While appeals for self-determination and peace continue to fall on deaf ears in Ankara, there is renewed hope for peace and freedom in Cyprus. United States Ambassador Richard C. Holbrooke, who brokered the Dayton Peace Accord for Bosnia, was recently assigned to be United States Special Emissary for Cyprus. This is a clear sign that the Clinton administration is finally giving Cyprus the diplomatic attention that it so desperately needs. I have long held the belief that the United States, along with the United Nations, the European Union, and interested countries can play a critical and constructive role in facilitating efforts toward a peaceful, just, and lasting resolution for the Cypriot people.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I, gathered here today, stand ready to do what we can to assist Ambassador Holbrooke in his efforts during the peace process. In fact I recently signed the following letter, along with many of my colleagues, to President Clinton which expresses our hope and support for a just and speedy resolution for the people of Cyprus. I would like to include the text of that letter for the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, July 10, 1997.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to welcome your appointment of Ambassador Richard C. Holbrooke as your Special Emissary for Cyprus. The decision is certainly a positive development and reflects the high priority the Administration is attaching to the just and speedy resolution of the Cyprus issue.

The remainder of the current year, as well as next year, offers a window of opportunity and new hope for progress on the issue. The meetings this week in New York between President Clerides and Mr. Denktash can be a positive development. We also believe that the prospect of Cyprus' accession to the European Union, with negotiations scheduled to start early next year, can act as a catalyst and reinvigorate efforts to achieve a comprehensive and lasting settlement. We hope that all sides will recognize the benefits of such a prospect and grasp this significant opportunity.

We, in Congress, have long considered the forcible division and foreign occupation of Cyprus as unacceptable and a continuing source of tension and instability in an area, which undermines our national interests. We have therefore consistently supported a peaceful, just and lasting resolution of the Cyprus problem that will reunify the island and its people. Such a solution will also strengthen peace and stability in the volatile Eastern Mediterranean and significantly advance our national security interests in the region and beyond.

We firmly believe that the United States, in coordination with the United Nations, the European Union and interested governments can play a critical and constructive role in facilitating efforts towards this end.

We wish to express our views on what the basis of such a solution should be. We believe that the principles of this resolution should include a reunited country, with a strong federal government in which the federated states derive their powers from the federal constitution. A democratic constitution would create such a federal government and would insure the rights of all citizens, including the rights of all communities. The Constitution would also guarantee private property rights and free travel to all parts of the country.

We believe that these principles are based on international law, the provisions of relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions, our democratic principles, a respect for human rights, and would be in accordance with the norms and requirements for accession to the European Union. A solution that does not encompass those principles would not lead to a lasting peace.

Your appointment of Ambassador Holbrooke, the prospect of the European Union accession negotiations and recent positive developments in the Eastern Mediterranean give all of us hope that we will, at long last, witness real progress towards a final resolution of this tragic problem. We are ready to assist your efforts, and the efforts of your emissary, in the best possible way and look forward to cooperating with you closely during the process. We wish to be kept closely advised of the progress that takes place.

Sincerely,

Robert Menendez, Luis V. Gutierrez, Thomas J. Manton, Peter Deutsch, Donald M. Payne, George W. Gekas, Ed Pastor, Robert E. Andrews, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Alcee L. Hastings, Brad Sherman, Bob Clement, Albert R. Wynn, Rubén Hinojosa, Bob Filner, John Lewis, Frank Pallone, Jr., John Edward Porter, Sander Levin, Carrie P. Meek, Patrick J. Kennedy, Gary Ackerman, Maurice D. Hinchey, Bill Pascrell, Jr., William O. Lipinski, Marty Meehan, Tom Lantos, David E. Bonior, Michael R. McNulty, Carolyn B. Maloney, Michael Pappas, Stephen Horn, Michael Bilirakis, Mike Forbes, Curt Weldon, Robert T. Matsui, Eliot L. Engel, Earl Blumenauer, Steven R. Rothman, Sherrod Brown, Tim Holden, Esteban E. Torres, John F. Tierney, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Nancy Pelosi, Joseph P. Kennedy II, Darlene Hooley, Charles E. Schumer, Rod R. Blagojevich, Gene Green, Ed Bryant, Nita Lowey, Ron Klink, Walter Capps, Sue W. Kelly, Jim McDermott, Glenn Poshard, Sam Gejdenson, Owen B. Pickett, Herbert H. Bateman, Jane Harman, Howard L. Berman, Rod Frelinghuysen, Elizabeth Furse, Marcy Kaptur, Dennis J. Kucinich, Mike Doyle.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness and frustration that I rise this evening to commemorate the 23d anniversary of an international crisis. On July 20, 1974, Turkish forces invaded the Island Nation of Cyprus, capturing nearly 40 percent of the country and 70 percent of its economic wealth. The invasion was a craven act of aggression resulting in thousands of deaths, the expulsion of 200,000 Greek-Cypriots from the northern territory of Cyprus and today 1,619 people, including some Americans, are still unaccounted for. The Turkish Government's unjust actions are atrocious violations of human rights.

A permanent reminder of this tragic event is the Green Line, a barbed wire fence that severs the nation, cutting across family and community ties that had been intact for generations. This oppressive occupation is illegal and the Turkish Government's self proclaimed Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is not recognized in the international community. Despite the government of Cyprus making every attempt possible to bring peace to the region, Turkish troops, that number well over 35,000, are still intact. Turkish warplanes continue to fly over Cypriot airspace undeterred by the ban on military planes overflying the island. Turkey simply refuses to cooperate in seeking a compromise and has even threatened war if Greece asserts its legitimate rights.

The United States Government has always supported a solution to the Cyprus crisis and it's important to continue, in fact, it is time for Congress to get even more vocal on the issue. Fortunately, there are signs indicating this is becoming a top foreign policy priority as Richard Holbrooke will be a special envoy to frame a settlement. This is encouraging news as Holbrooke was the key negotiator of the 1995 accord that ended the ethnic war in Bosnia. By pressing Turkey to remove its illegal occupation and to constructively work for a resolution we look forward to celebrating the end of this conflict. Until that happens, the Turkish Government must know the United States will continue to mark this anniversary and speak out for the suffering in Cyprus.

As founders of democracy, Greece and the United States share a special and unique kinship. The Republic of Cyprus is an example of a country that has maintained its democratic institutions under extremely difficult circumstances. It is for these reasons that I vehemently oppose the continued Turkish occupation of Cyprus. I am a proud sponsor of H.R. 81 the demilitarization of Cyprus proclaiming the status quo unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida, Congressman BILIRAKIS, for once again taking a leading role in organizing these annual special orders. Rest assured I will continue to be a supporter of Cyprus' security interests and urge all Members to support peace and reconciliation in the region.

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member, it is an honor to participate in this important special order. As a Member of the International Relations Committee who is privileged to represent many Cypriot-Americans, I believe it is imperative to call attention this evening to the 24th anniversary of the tragic invasion of Cyprus.

First, I want to commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], not just for organizing tonight's event, but for their leadership as co-chairs of the Congressional

caucus on Hellenic Issues. I am proud to have joined more than 60 of my colleagues on the Caucus, whose goal is to advance our national interests by educating Members on the military, diplomatic and human rights issues that are paramount in this region.

Tonight, as we discuss the beautiful island of Cyprus, we reflect on the past and look with hope toward the future. Sadly, the event we commemorate this evening is one of the most horrifying and tragic in recent history. Twenty-four years ago, Turkish forces invaded Cyprus. As a result, 200,000 Greek Cypriots were evicted from their homes and watched as their property was confiscated. Most tragically, more than 1,600 Cypriots and 5 Americans were captured by Turkish troops and remain unaccounted for to this day.

For almost a quarter of a century, the situation has not demonstrably improved. The Turks still occupy over a third of the island with 35,000 heavily armed troops. Human rights abuses are still common, violent clashes between the two sides flare up with regularity, and the families of the missing still await any news about their loved ones.

Unfortunately, this pattern of behavior on Turkey's part is not restricted to Cyprus. Earlier this year, the International Relations Committee noted in the State Department funding bill that the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul has been the subject to terrorist threats without the protection of the Turkish government. And just yesterday, the Washington Post editorialized about Turkish mistreatment of its Kurdish minority and of journalists who write about this conflict.

But as we lament two dozen years of despair, recent events give us some cause for hope. Mr. Speaker, I believe President Clinton demonstrated his commitment to finding a just and lasting solution to the Cyprus conflict by naming Ambassador Richard Holbrooke as special U.S. Envoy. Mr. Holbrooke's diplomatic skills are legendary, and I know that he will work very hard to bring peace and human rights to this troubled land.

In another development, President Clirides and Turkish-Cypriot leader Denktash met recently for the first time in almost 3 years, and plan to meet again next month. I join my colleagues in urging both leaders to negotiate in good faith so that Cyprus will once again become a united country, free from foreign troops, and a bastion of human rights, peace and serenity. I thank my colleagues for inviting me to participate in this important special order.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Greek-Cypriot people and express my support for the unified Cyprus. For too long, Greek-Cypriots have been living in a divided nation. It is my firm belief that the time has come for a reversal of the unlawful territorial gains made by Turkish forces in 1974, and for a unified Cyprus to once again assume its rightful place among nations.

I am optimistic that a unified Cyprus will begin to emerge in the coming months, especially given the Clinton administration's new commitment to this troubled part of the world. I believe the appointment of Mr. Richard Holbrooke as our Nation's special envoy for Cyprus marks the beginning of this long-awaited transformation.

Greek-Cypriots have always been the majority in Cyprus. Unfortunately, the tragic events of July 20, 1974 created a divided Cyprus. When Cyprus gained independence from Britain in 1960, Turkish-Cypriots aggressively sought to dominate the newly independent state of Cyprus. While Cyprus' 1960 constitution provided for power-sharing between the Greek and Turkish-Cypriot communities, the Turkish-Cypriot community, which constituted 18% of the island's population, gained veto powers over legislation and became entitled to a disproportionate share of governmental posts.

Mr. Speaker, on July 20, 1974, Turkey invaded Cyprus and declared victory by securing 37% of the island's territory. This unilateral military action led to the flight of thousands of refugees from their ancestral homeland. To this day, over 35,000 Turkish troops remain on Cyprus. That is 35,000 too many troops. That is 35,000 too many war-makers. What we need on the island of Cyprus is not more troops, not more armed forces from the Republic of Turkey, but peace-makers, people who are willing to secure a genuine peace, restoring unity to the proud people of Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, my final remarks concern the solemn memory of the 1,619 Greek-Cypriots, who to this day, remain unaccounted for after Turkey's 1974 invasion. Among these individuals were five Americans, who like the others, share a fate unknown and whose loss pains their respective families to this day. So as the reconciliation process moves forward, I for one, strongly believe that officials from the Republic of Turkey must account for the missing. They must work hard to bring to a close the tragedy born out of their decision to invade Cyprus in 1974.

On behalf of my Greek and Cypriot-American constituents, it is a solemn honor to join with them on this day and stand in solidarity with their cause.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, July 20th will mark the 23d anniversary of Turkey's illegal invasion of Cyprus and their continued occupation of the country of Cyprus. I rise today to join my colleagues to commemorate this event. I particularly want to thank Congressman BILIRAKIS for arranging this special order.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important event in the history of Cyprus because it marks the end of the Greek Cypriots freedom to practice their religion, educate their children as they see fit and express themselves in an open and free manner.

Since Turkey first invaded Cyprus in 1974, 1,619 people, including five Americans, were last seen alive in the occupied areas of Cyprus and have never been accounted for. We must not let the passage of years weaken our determination to pressure the Turkish Government to provide answers for the families of the missing. We cannot forget that their suffering continues.

Last summer, Cyprus was witness to some of the worst outbreaks of violence in their region since 1974. The two separate hostile incidents left two young men dead and many injured. This illustrates the need to bring to an end the illegal occupation of the island of Cyprus. Although there has been little reescalation of violence since then, an uneasy calm continues to hand over the divided island.

During my time in Congress, I have taken an active interest in Greek issues. As a member of the Congressional Hellenic Caucus, I have continuously strived to find a solution to the problem that plagues Cyprus and her people. I have appreciated the opportunity to work with my colleagues in Congress on a number of other issues which directly impact the Greek and Greek-American communities.

A number of pieces of legislation addressing the Cyprus issue and those related to it have been introduced during the 105th Congress and I am proud to be a cosponsor of these important bills. In particular, House Concurrent Resolution 81 calls for a United States initiative seeking a just and peaceful resolution of the situation in Cyprus. In addition, H.R. 1361 would prohibit economic support fund assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the Government of Turkey for Fiscal Year 1998 unless they make certain improvements relating to human rights.

This week in the Catskill Mountains a glimmer of hope has emerged through the tension which has hunted the island of Cyprus for over 20 years. The two leaders of Cyprus, Rauf Dentkash and Glafcos Clerides, have been enemies in the past, however, their discussions seem to be leading in the direction of finding a solution to the problems they, and their people, have been facing for so many years. I was pleased to learn of the positive feedback given by the leaders and by the United Nations about what has been accomplished during these talks so far and the hope for a positive outcome.

I would also like to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to Ambassador Richard Holbrooke for becoming the new special emissary for Cyprus. His past success and leadership on the peace process in Bosnia was an asset to Bosnia, the United States and the entire international community. I am confident his expertise and rigorous diplomacy will produce a positive outcome to the situation in Cyprus.

Earlier this year, I was pleased to meet with Rev. Christophorou Christophorou, the president of the Cyprus National Committee of Struggle for the Missing Persons, during the annual conference of PSEKA. We discussed the issue of those missing from Cyprus as a result of the Turkish invasion of the 1974 and other issues important to the people of Cyprus.

Turkey holds the key to ending the Cyprus situation. It is my hope that next year we will be celebrating the end of the strangling occupation of Turkish troops on the island of Cyprus and the people of Cyprus may once again enjoy the freedoms so many of us enjoy and take for granted.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I would like first to thank my colleague from Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, for organizing this special order acknowledging the 23d anniversary of the Turkish occupation of the island of Cyprus. It is imperative that we correct Cyprus' situation as a divided state. The people of Cyprus are divided into two states ruled by two governments. The Greek Cypriots in the south are ruled by the Republic of Cyprus, erected in 1960 when independence was granted. The north has been occupied by the Turkish since 1975, when they illegally invaded the island.

The divided Cyprus is a story of two nations; one a well balanced democracy with three thriving parties, the other a militarily occupied area. The economic disparity in the divided Cyprus is even more pronounced. The south's economy is booming as the result of their low trade barriers and free market economies. Their GNP has risen at a record-breaking rate as unemployment falls. Meanwhile,

the economy of the north has stagnated and inflation run rampant at 70 percent as the Turkish close it off from the rest of the world. For there ever to be peace and prosperity on the island of Cyprus, a unified independent government protecting all of Cyprus must be created. A critical part of such an event will be the withdrawal of Turkish troops from northern Cyprus. Only then will Cyprus become the thriving member of the European trade community it has the potential to become.

In my State of Rhode Island we have a strong Greek and Cypriot community, which has brought the plight of Cyprus to my attention. Only when we, in Congress, show our strong support for a unified Cyprus will the necessary changes occur.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in marking a sad day, the 23d anniversary of the Turkish invasion and partition of the Republic of Cyprus. I would like to thank and comment Mr. BILIRAKIS of Florida for his vigilance and commitment to a peaceful resolution of this illegal act which cast a pall on the world stage on July 20, 1974.

This is, perhaps, the first time in 23 years that we can reasonably talk about an end to the standoff on Cyprus. Many of us in the House have long fought for peace, some from the very moment the Turkish army landed on the island nation's northern shores, depositing thousands of troops and armor in a bald-faced land grab. Tragically, it was with U.S. arms in hand that Turkish soldiers committed their brutal acts of atrocity. Today, only Turkey recognizes the Turkish Cypriot state which declared independence in 1983. No other nation has taken that step.

Recently, President Clinton showed us reason for hope. With the appointment of Richard Holbrooke as his special envoy for Cyprus, the President gave every indication that the clock is ticking, and he intends there be peace on Cyrpus. Greek and Turkish Cypriot leaders sat down in upstate New York only last week to lay the groundwork for future talks. All of this is encouraging, and significant for a region which could explode at any moment. At present Cyprus is a tinderbox: 35-thousand Turkish troops are on the island and stand ready to rip it apart. Despite the tension on the island, and the longstanding animosity between Greece and Turkey, it has been Greece which has shown a desire to move the peace process forward, sounding a conciliatory tone toward Turkey, a move which I commend and support.

While we work for an end to the Turkish occupation of Cyprus, we must do so within the context of a just peace. Peace should come with a full accounting of the atrocities committed against the Greek Cypriot community. Nearly 2,000 people, including 5 Americans, are still missing, unaccounted for, 23 years after the invasion; thousands of Greek Cypriots have been uprooted from their homes. We cannot allow more than two decades of human rights abuses to go uninvestigated.

A just peace, Mr. Speaker, is a lasting peace. The people of Cyprus deserve no less.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today's special order on Cyprus comes on the eve of the 23d anniversary of the brutal invasion by Turkish troops. I congratulate my friend, the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. BILIRAKIS] for organizing this special order. As we observe this sad anniversary, the international community is still faced with the fact that in excess of 30,000 Turkish military personnel remain on the island to enforce an illegal partition and protect a self-proclaimed government that has been recognized by only one other country—Turkey itself.

Those of us in Congress who have supported a negotiated settlement to the dispute which has led to the division of Cyprus are painfully aware of the complexities of the issue, the injustices committed, and particularly the suffering over these many long years of the Cypriot people on both sides of the green line.

Indeed, Cyprus has become a code word for stalemate and intractability in international diplomacy.

Last week there occurred a new, positive development in Madrid on the fringes of the NATO summit. The Foreign Ministers of both Greece and Turkey met together under the auspices of our own Government and agreed on a set of principles to guide the resolution of disputes between our two NATO allies. The essential element of the statement issued by the Foreign Ministers is that disputes between Greece and Turkey are to be settled through peaceful means and will be based on the mutual recognition of their legitimate interests. While this communique was related specifically to disputes in the Aegean, I am hopeful that it will inaugurate an era of better understanding on all the issues that concern Greece and Turkey, including Cyprus itself. Although a resolution of the Cyprus problem depends first and foremost upon the will of the Cypriot people themselves, regardless of their ethnic background, certainly a better relationship between Greece and Turkey can play a critical role in helping resolve this vexing international dispute.

It is gratifying that the Clinton administration seems more interested than in the past in finding a solution for Cyprus. The announcement last month that President Clinton has appointed Ambassador Richard Holbrooke as Special Envoy for Cyprus is also promising. If Ambassador Holbrooke brings the same energy and determination to Cyprus as he brought to ending the conflict in Bosnia, it is hopeful that he will be able to convince the Cypriot people to put behind them their differences and work out a just and peaceful settlement.

The shape of a possible settlement is out there. I believe that both President Clerides and Mr. Denktash are men who can rise above the recent enmity that has developed between the two communities, and find a way to reunite the island based on mutual goodwill and confidence. We should all encourage the two leaders to make the most of the direct talks which began in New York last week.

Old history and grievances must be placed behind us as we seek to resolve the division of Cyprus. It is hoped that both sides will reach within themselves to find the resolve to settle this persistent problem. The Greek Cypriots have demonstrated flexibility and the spirit of compromise in recent rounds of U.N. sponsored talks. We call upon Mr. Denktash to demonstrate the same flexibility.

Twenty-three years is too long a time. There are now young people coming of age in Cyprus who know nothing other than the experience of living in a divided society. For this next generation what can guide them in learning to accept life with a neighboring but different culture? Time is running out for the possibility of achieving a peaceful settlement, and the people of Cyprus now have to ask themselves if the enmity between the two communities is truly worth the price of a divided nation.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 23d anniversary of the invasion of Cyprus by Turkish military forces, and to express my support for U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan as he strives to bring a long awaited peace to this troubled island.

After 23 years, the people of northern Cyprus continue to be ruled by Rauf Denktash, who assumed control on July 20, 1974, with the assistance of 6,000 Turkish troops. There are still 1,619 people whose whereabouts remain unknown in the wake of the Turkish assault that captured 40 percent of the island. Of the 1,619 missing, 5 are United States citizens.

The United Nations has always recognized the Greek Cypriot Government as the legitimate government of the island, while Turkey remains the only country that recognizes Denktash's government and supports it with 30,000 troops scattered at military posts throughout the north of Cyprus. The Turkish Cypriot Government has continually refused to make progress toward a solution to the conflict.

In the past years, the international community has attempted to pressure Turkey to pull its hand away from the Cyprus conflict. Last year, the Clinton administration made an attempt to ease tensions by sending Special Presidential Emissary Richard Beattie to the region. Beattie's efforts were unsuccessful because neither Turkey or the Turkish Cypriot Government seemed willing to work toward facilitating change.

Last week, the United Nations brought the Greek and Turkish Cypriot leaders together in upstate New York for several days of talks. President Glafco Clerides of Cyprus and Rauf Denktash are meeting face to face for the first time in 3 years. The aims of the talks are to achieve a bizonal, bicommunal federation between the two sides. It is my belief that the United Nations, the European Union, and the United States should continue to keep pressure on the Turkish Cypriot leaders and the Turkish Government in order to facilitate a peaceful resolution to this conflict.

Mr. Speaker, the Cypriot people deserve peace and prosperity. Let us send a clear message that the United States Congress supports the United Nations efforts to bring pace to the people of Cyprus.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, July 20, 1997, marks the 23d anniversary of the illegal invasion and occupation of the Republic of Cyprus by Turkey. The legacy of this invasion and subsequent division of Cyprus continues to this day, making Cyprus the only country in the world divided by a wall. Constructed by the invading Turks in an effort to divide the island, the Green Line, as it has become known, is a symbol of the ugly face of naked aggression.

This aggression came on July 20, 1974, in the form of 6,000 Turkish troops and 40 tanks. Turkish forces successfully seized 40 percent of the island which represented 70 percent of the Nation's economic health; 200,000 Greek Cypriots were forced from their homes by the invading forces, and to this day, 1,619 people remain unaccounted for—5 of them American citizens.

Turkey has since fortified its illegally obtained gains by placing 30,000 troops and 65,000 settlers in the land that rightfully belongs to the forcibly ousted Greek Cypriots. We simply cannot validate an unwarranted, unprovoked invasion of a peaceful, self-governing republic by allowing Turkish occupation to continue. The presence of the Turkish troops represents the continuing shackles of occupation and oppression and also demonstrates a gross violation of human rights and international law.

I am encouraged by the undaunted spirit and courage of the Greek Cypriots in the face of this occupation. That is why I hope that the 23d anniversary that July 20 signifies will rekindle American and international intolerance of aggression and inspire us to nullify the rewards Turkey has reaped as a result of this illegal action. The Greek Cypriots deserve this justice and I remain committed to efforts to deliver this to them.

Ms. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to pay tribute to a dubious anniversary. As we sit here, after 23 years of Turkish occupation of Cyprus, it is especially appropriate to recognize the struggle for the freedom of all Cypriots that has been waged for more than two decades.

It was over two decades ago that 6,000 Turkish troops and 40 tanks landed on the north coast of Cyprus, and more than 200,000 Cypriots were driven from their homes and forced to live under foreign occupation. Over two decades ago, and still Turkey has thousands of troops on the island. Over two decades ago, and we still don't know what became of the 1,614 Greek Cypriots and 5 American citizens missing since the Turkish invasion.

That is why I'm pleased that we have this opportunity today. Today, we remember what happened in Cyprus 23 years ago and we pledge to fight to end the occupation. Today, we also look toward the promise of the future. President Clinton recently demonstrated his commitment to solving this difficult issue by appointing Richard Holbrooke as the special envoy to Cyprus. I applaud the President for this decision and I hope that it will lead to a real solution for Cyprus. I hope that this time next year we will be standing here on the House floor celebrating the end of the Turkish occupation.

We must continue to fight against injustice in Cyprus. We must continue to provide aid to Cyprus to help that country deal with the terrible problems caused by more than two decades of Turkish occupation. And, above all, we must continue to keep the plight of the Cypriots on the minds of everyone around the world.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, July 20, we will be commemorating the 23d anniversary of a tragic day for the democratic people of Cyprus. That was the day in 1974 that a foreign army invaded and occupied the northern one-third of the island.

Since that time the Cypriot people have been struggling to regain their freedom and the House of Representatives and the American people need to be aware of the plight and the suffering of the people of Cyprus. Therefore, I am very pleased that Congressman BILIRAKIS has called this special order so that I may join with him and my other colleagues to bring the suffering of Cyprus to the attention of the general public.

We should note that there are encouraging signs of a growing commitment to find a peaceful resolution to this problem. The President has appointed Ambassador Richard Holbrooke as Special Envoy on Cyprus. Ambassador Holbrooke played a key role in bringing the warring factions in Bosnia to the peace table and to agreement on the Dayton peace agreement. Ambassador Holbrooke, along with the ongoing effort by the United Nations and the European Union member countries, will try to finally bring the 23-year-old dispute to a peaceful resolution.

A peaceful resolution to the Cyprus problem is not just in the interest of the Cypriot people. As a country at the cross roads of the great civilizations of Europe and the Middle East, Cyprus has long been an island where people from all these civilizations and cultures mingled freely and in harmony. Cyprus can and needs to play a stabilizing role in this volatile region of the world, as it once did before. That would be in the United States interest, as well as in the interest of the Cypriot people.

But no peaceful resolution will ever succeed while a foreign military force occupies the northern one-third of the island.

The people of Cyprus understood their cultural diversity and were able to live peacefully together for hundreds of years. Outside forces intervened and then invaded Cyprus, caused the division of the island by barbed wire.

Many thousands of Cypriots were forced to leave their homes and have since been prevented from returning. Hundreds, called the enclaved, remain in the military occupied northern part of the island and are suffering many human rights violations under police-state conditions. They are prevented from freely communicating with or meeting with each other or the outside world. These Greek Cypriots, many of whom are elderly, are forced to send their children away to school and suffer many deprivations and hardships and human rights violations.

I filed legislation in the last Congress and am prepared to refile it if a peaceful resolution is not found to relieve the suffering of the enclaved. This legislation would this redirect United States foreign assistance away from the country who maintains a military force in northern Cyprus and redirect that assistance to the suffering people of the enclaved.

Within the last 12 months, the situation had temporarily become very tense and threatened to escalate which could have set off an international chain reaction, causing many deaths. Thanks to the efforts of cool heads, tensions were reduced. But the world can ill afford to allow the forcibly divided Cyprus situation to continue much longer. We must find a way to find a peaceful, lasting, and real resolution to this problem.

I thank the Greek-American community for bringing the plight of people of Cyprus to our attention and for their ongoing efforts to reunite the island of Cyprus. Recent signs are encouraging but a resolution to the CYPRUS problem remains elusive. We must all keep up the pressure on the Clinton administration and the United Nations and the European Union.

I wish to commend Ambassador Holbrooke and the administration for their efforts thus far and urge them to continue their good work on the crucial problem of Cyprus.

I congratulate my fellow Floridian Congressman BILIRAKIS, for being the guiding force in Congress to bring this issue of peace and true freedom for all of Cyprus to the attention of the House and the general public.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 23d anniversary of Turkey's invasion, and subsequent occupation, of Cyprus.

In 1960, Cyprus gained its political independence from the British Empire. Fourteen short years later, however, this independence was shattered when 6,000 Turkish troops and 40 tanks invaded the north coast of Cyprus and proceeded to occupy nearly 40 percent of the island. The ensuing fighting killed thousands of Cypriots and forced hundreds of thousands from their homes. Today, there are 1,619 people still missing, 5 of whom are U.S. citizens.

Twenty-three years after the invasion, we gather to remember those who died and to ensure that the world never forgets that Cyprus is a land divided. More than 35,000 Turkish troops continue to occupy Cyprus in violation of international law. A barbed wire fence cuts across the island, separating families from their property and splitting this once beautiful country in half.

I am pleased that President Clinton has taken positive steps to resolve the situation in Cyprus, including his recent appointment of Ambassador Richard Holbrooke as a special envoy to Cyprus. I strongly encourage Ambassador Holbrooke to hold Turkey accountable for its brutal occupation of Cyprus and to ensure that the island is returned to its rightful owners.

The occupation of Cyprus is one of the reasons that I offered an amendment to the Fiscal Year 1997 Foreign Operations appropriations bill that would have effectively cut $25 million in United States economic aid to Turkey. This amendment, which the House overwhelmingly approved by a vote of 301 to 118, sends a clear message to Turkey that its illegal and immoral occupation of Cyprus will not be tolerated by this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in standing up against Turkish oppression in Cyprus. I would especially like to extend my thanks to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] for his tireless work to ensure that the people of Cyprus are not forgotten. Twenty-three years is a long time to wait, but it is my sincerest hope that our actions will help persuade Turkey to end its unlawful occupation of Cyprus.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 23d anniversary of Turkey's invasion of the peaceful, self-governing island of Cyprus. For 23 years, Turkey has tried to make the island its own. It has attempted to do this by installing 80,000 illegal colonists, by maintaining over 30,000 heavily armed troops on the island, and by moving 200,000 Greek Cypriots from their homes. Through 23 years of hardship, the people of Cyprus have held on to a hope for peace and for the return of their island. Their purpose has not been revenge, but negotiation and reconciliation. Here in the House of Representatives, we have the opportunity to help the cause of justice. Several colleagues and I sent a letter recently to the President outlining our concern for the delicate peace process in Cyprus. We wrote welcoming the appointment of Ambassador Holbrooke as Special Emissary for Cyprus, and what we believe a lasting and peaceful solution should look like: a reunited country, with a strong federal system; a democratic constitution which would insure the rights of

the minority; and guaranteed property right and free travel. I then went one step further and wrote directly to Ambassador Holbrooke and asked him the following two questions: First, if the Turkish Government fails to negotiate in good faith, what actions, sanctions or otherwise is the United States prepared to take? Second, if the Turkish Government fails to negotiate in good faith, what incentives will the United States provide Turkey, in recognition of this major step forward? While I have not yet received a response to my questions, there is no doubt in my mind that this Congress can have a positive effect on the outcome of peace for the island nation.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 388, legislation I have introduced that would cut off all economic and military assistance to Turkey until that country complies with several conditions, including progress toward withdrawal from Cyprus. As saddened as I am by their plight, as dismal as their treatment by a foreign force has been, we should all be inspired by the patience, courage and faith shown by the people of Cyprus. Let us make this the year when the people of Cyprus once again can govern themselves with peace and dignity.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my esteemed colleague from Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS for organizing this special order on the 23d anniversary of the Turkish invasion and occupation of Cyprus.

In 1974, Turkey launched an invasion of the island of Cyprus that resulted in thousands of deaths, the displacement of over 200,000 people from their homes, and the occupation of 38 percent of the island of Cyprus by Turkish armed forces.

Today, over 35,000 Turkish soldiers and 80,000 Turkish ''colonists'' occupy the northern portions of the island. They are divided from the Greek-Cypriots by a barbed-wire fence referred to as the ''Green Line.'' This buffer zone is patrolled and maintained by a 1,160-strong U.N. peace keeping force. Periodic outbreaks of violence have broken out along this dividing line. Just last year, an unarmed Greek teenager bled to death after being shot by Turkish troops within sight of peacekeepers. The peacekeepers attempted to rescue the youth, but were fired upon from the Turkish side.

The United States must work to put a stop to this cycle of violence and separation.

I am encouraged by President Clinton's appointment of Ambassador Richard Holbrooke as our Nation's Special Emissary to Cyprus. It is my hope that this, along with renewed efforts by the United Nations and the European Union, will help bring an end to the long entrenched disputes that separate the two sides.

I am also encouraged by the renewal of talks in New York between Greek Cypriot President Glafcos and Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Dentkash. While the two remain far from an agreement, the leaders have at least resumed a dialogue and agreed to additional talks in Nicosia, the capital of Cyprus, and in Geneva later this year.

According to U.N. Special Envoy Diego Cordovez, the two agree that a settlement is necessary for Cyprus to survive, but still disagree over the particulars of what should be included any final agreement. My hope is that the talks will result in a settlement that includes the complete removal of all foreign forces from the island and the establishment of a free and fair democratic government that represents the interests of all the island's citizens.

In the absence of such an agreement, I would urge the two parties to again consider the option of demilitarization of the island. This could be used as a first step to build confidence between the two sides and remove negative foreign influences from the equation.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the twenty-third anniversary of an extremely troubling event; the invasion and occupation of the northern part of Cyprus. This takeover was an escalation of unrest and violence that Cyprus had been experiencing since it gained independence from Great Britain in 1960.

As a result of this tragic event, 1,614 Greek Cypriots and five Americans have been missing since the 1974 invasion. In 1996 the Turkish Cypriot President Rauf Denktash, reported that the missing Greek Cypriots had been handed over to Turkish Cypriot fighters who carried out revenge massacres, killing all of those who were missing.

Turkish troops now occupy thirty-eight percent of Cyprus, a segment that is recognized only by the State of Turkey. This occupation has led to the dislocation of thousands of Creek Cypriots from their hometowns, friends, and families. This is an unacceptable situation, and our Nation should act decisively to right this wrong.

The situation in Cyprus continues to get worse. In 1996, the violence in Cyprus reached it's worst level since the 1974 invasion. Violence in the buffer zone increased in 1996 as many supporters from both side were killed throughout the year. In addition to the increase in violence, the Greek Cypriots have begun purchasing SA–10 missiles from Russia, which they will begin receiving in February 1998. This has increased tensions, as the Turkish Cypriots insist they will maintain their troops in Cyprus as the level and the rate of increase of arms in Cyprus continues to increase.

Tolerance and reconciliation needs to be stressed to find a solution to this crisis. Again, I urge that we take the necessary steps to obtain a favorable constitutional and territorial settlement.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate an unhappy anniversary—the Turkish military invasion of the Republic of Cyprus in July 1974. Mr. Speaker, it has been twenty three years—the occupation remains in place and the suffering of the people of Cyprus continues.

When the Turkish armed forces invaded Cyprus twenty three years ago, the people of Cyprus were driven from their homes and villages, brutalized, and over 1,600 people—including 5 American citizens—were never heard from again. Since that time, the Turkish military has maintained a barbed wire border, with an occupying force of 35,000 troops, called the green line that cuts through miles of countryside.

Mr. Speaker, Greek-Americans in my home town of San Diego and across the United States also share in the agony created by the occupation of Cyprus. They agonize about missing friends and family, the destruction of the Greek-Cypriot culture and the denial of access to ancestral homelands now occupied by the Turkish army.

These people have suffered too long. It is time for the Turkish occupying force to leave and it is time to allow the people of Cyprus to establish a true and united democracy.

The momentum for a real solution to this tragic situation is developing. Negotiations between the parties are proceeding and President Clinton recently appointed Ambassador Richard C. Holbrooke as his Special Emissary for Cyprus. I agree with him that the time for a peaceful solution to this problem is long overdue. We must work to put an end to this occupation and I urge the parties to continue their talks until a peaceful settlement is agreed to. The time for the withdrawal of Turkish troops from Cyprus is now and the need is urgent. The green line that separates the people of Cyprus must be erased forever.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 23d year since the brutal partition of Cyprus, yet the focus of the international community and the Congress on a resolution to this tragic separation has not lessened. If anything, attention on the plight of Cyprus has heightened recently. In 1996 we unfortunately witnessed the worst outbreak of violence since the invasion in 1974. In January of this year the Clerides government signed a contract to purchase Russian S–300 air defense missiles. These factors combined threaten to introduce a new and destabilizing element in the mediation process, and has generated a sense of urgency in the efforts towards achieving a viable settlement. Indeed, the role of the United States in pressing for peace on the island has become even more vital to ensuring the creation of a stable, secure and free Europe.

On June 4, President Clinton named former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs, Richard Holbrooke, as Special Presidential Envoy for Cyprus. I wholeheartedly welcome that appointment. As one of our most capable negotiators, Mr. Holbrooke's appointment demonstrates the United States' commitment to help support a final political settlement on Cyprus. I also want to commend the Clinton Administration's announced determination to support the peace brokering efforts of the United Nations, as well as ensuring that 1997 is the year of the ''Big Push on Cyprus.'' I am also delighted to note that the Greek and Turkish-Cypriot leaders, Mr. Clerides and Mr. Denktash, convened recently for U.N.-sponsored direct peace talks. This step can only serve to bear further positive fruit.

There is no doubt about the necessary role that the U.S. Congress must play in assisting the parties in reaching a just and peaceful resolution. That is why I cosponsored House Concurrent Resolution 81, introduced by International Relations Committee Chairman BEN GILMAN. This bill reaffirms that the status quo on Cyprus is unacceptable and detrimental to U.S. interests. The resolution also calls for the complete demilitarization leading to the withdrawal of foreign occupation forces, as well as the cessation of foreign arms transfers to Cyprus—all necessary and vital actions that must be undertaken before any settlement is reached.

The time is ripe for one of the world's most intractable conflicts to disappear into the dustbin of history. In fact, NATO's efforts to expand and redefine its role in the post-cold-war era require that the Cyprus conflict be resolved. As a worrisome source of friction between Greece and Turkey, NATO's anchors in the eastern Mediterranean, it serves as a thorn in the side of the greatest alliance ever forged.

I conclude by reiterating Secretary Albright's remarks that Cyprus is a valued partner in the fight against the new global threats of proliferation, terrorism, illegal narcotics, and international crime. Cyprus and the United States share common values and are committed to building a world based on open markets, democratic principles and the rule of law. These ties demand that the United States continue to work towards assisting the two Cypriot communities in reaching a just and secure peace.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1031

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1031.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2169, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mrs. MYRICK (during the special order of Mr. BILIRAKIS), from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–189) on the bill resolution (H. Res. 189) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2169) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

A MESSY DAY IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, it has been a messy day here in the House of Representatives. Today is July 17. We are certainly midway through the work of this first year of the 105th Congress, and it was most unfortunate that we started the day by pulling a bill which would have reauthorized vocational education assistance, and stopped the forward movement of that bill because there was an amendment on the bill which called for a retention of provisions in the bill which would have encouraged local governments and local education agencies to continue to emphasize vocational-technical education for women.

It was most unfortunate that with the overwhelming support that that amendment seemed to have, which merely wanted to continue what was going on already, that it led to the majority suddenly pulling the bill from the floor and refusing to let the House work its will on a bill which would have provided fair treatment for women in vocational education and technical education programs. In an era when technical education is very much in order, and women certainly can do as well as men in some of the high tech areas that offer the most opportunities for the future, the highest pay, we are not willing to have our own Vocational Education Assistance Act reflect the fact that we want maximum opportunities for women.

So that was an unfortunate start of the day. It has been an unfortunate week in that same manner.

Two days ago we refused to allow the House to work its will on a vote, up or down, on the National Endowment for the Arts. The National Endowment for the Arts seems to upset a small band of Members in the House of Representatives. They insist on harassing and pursuing the National Endowment for the Arts, despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of the American people support the National Endowment for the Arts and support the National Endowment for the Humanities, overwhelmingly.

And the Members of Congress, if given a chance to vote yes or no on the funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, would certainly keep its funding at the present level. We were not allowed to do that. This is a week that the majority chose to use its overwhelming powers, because it is the majority, to manipulate the process, and by one vote we lost on a procedural vote that would have given us the opportunity to vote up or down on that important matter.

Later on today we also experienced the intense annoyance and anger of the minority, the Democrats in the minority of the House, because in the agricultural appropriations bill that was about to come up, the same kind of treatment we had received in some other bills this year and in the NEA vote was being manifested. The ranking member of the agriculture subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, the ranking Democrat was not allowed by the Committee on Rules to present an amendment that she had requested.

The power of the majority is certainly great enough to stop on this floor most of what they want to stop and to promote and push what they want to push, past it, but we ought to at least have the opportunity to go on record on certain votes, and we are being denied that. So we had a very messy end to the day, at a point where really we do not have much time left before we adjourn on August 1st.

We are moving to pass appropriations bills. Appropriations bills are the most important bills, probably, that we pass, in that they are the ones that provide the funding to keep our government activities going, and we are going to be rushing through those things in the next 10 working days of Congress.

We also have in the background negotiations going on which are very important, vitally important negotiations on the expenditure plan that was passed by both Houses, negotiations on the tax package. That is ongoing.

We know that those important processes are in the works, and worry about the fact that we are going to be pushed against the wall and stampeded at the last minute on those packages if we do not change the way this House operates. The majority does not, again, respect the will of the minority.

There is another problem also beyond the procedural questions, and that is, I lament the fact and a number of my colleagues lament the fact that the tax and expenditure package, the appropriations bills, as they come up are zeroing out or refusing to even discuss and consider certain important matters that ought to be on the agenda. In this 105th Congress, when we enter a situation where we started out with a lot of talk about bipartisan cooperation, especially in the area of education, I suppose one of the most disappointing absences is the fact that the education initiatives that have been proposed have been watered down so and some are not even on the agenda.

The most important, disappointing absence, in my opinion, is the one related to the school construction initiative. That is not even in the tax package or the expenditure plan which the President and the two Houses are negotiating now. We are grateful for the fact that the President at least has kept the school construction initiative alive by listing it among his priorities. The trouble is that the President has a long, long list of priorities, and we wonder how high on the list the school construction initiative will be.

We also wonder about the fact that the empowerment zones which mean so much to our urban areas, since nothing else has been offered in the last 10 years to deal with very pressing problems in our urban areas, the empowerment zones were considered to be a reasonable answer because both parties would support it since it was a combination of the private sector, the government sector and there was a lot of talk about this is the way of the future, but empowerment zones are not in the package either at this point, except for the President's priority list.

So I guess we will have to be grateful for the President at least keeping these things in the discussion. They are not in the House bill or the Senate bill. Therefore, they would not be on the conference table. So the fact that the President has tax incentives for school construction on the list of items for his tax cut proposals, and he has deductions for K through 12 computer donations on his list, and he has brownfields empowerment zones and enterprise zones, expansion of these in his package, we are grateful for that. We are holding on by a thread.

These are very important matters and I think to shift to the most important area, that is the area of education, not only the most important but the

most universally approved area, the area that everybody agrees we need some forward movement on by the Federal Government, that area also has been pushed into the background. It is almost a certainty that very little is going to happen except in the area of higher education, because the President has made that his highest priority and certainly something very new, however inadequate it might be, is going to happen with respect to higher education.

Our concern for K through 12, however, grows greater because we see less and less discussion or talk about how to move to provide more Federal Government encouragement of the improvement of schools, even in the area that the President, this administration has staked out great interest, and that is telecommunications, education technology and computers.

Even in this area the present movement is kind of feeble. They are going to allow deductions for K through 12 computers. The President has in his list an allowance for deductions by corporations and businesses for K through 12 computer donations. About $300 million is proposed to be allowed over a 5-year period. That is a far cry from what is needed in this area.

□ 1800

In other words, education, I had great hopes for because there was great agreement between the two parties that education should be a priority. So I thought the fact that education is considered a priority by both parties would mean that it would be reflected in the tax package and also in the expenditure package, and it really is discouraging to find that that is not the case.

Maybe we should not give up hope. In fact, I will not say maybe. I want to urge all of those who care about education, which is the overwhelming majority of the American people, not to give up hope, because we were in worse shape, probably in July 1995 when proposals were being made that the Department of Education be totally abolished.

At that time proposals were being made to cut certain federally funded education programs by as much as almost $4 billion. So we held on, we persevered, we insisted that the will of the people, that the polls showing the will of the people be honored. And finally, in the election year 1996, there was a turnaround and education did get a great deal of attention. Instead of the $4 billion cut that had been proposed in 1995, there was a $4 billion increase in 1996.

Some people might say, if they are listening, that they have heard me say this many times before. I cannot say it too often. It was an amazing feat that the party in power decided in an election year, but before the election of 1996, to increase funding for education by $4 billion. It was an amazing feat because it represented the triumph of common sense.

We had been talking all along about the fact that we needed to give more attention and more funding and more support for education. The polls had shown it all along, but the leadership, those who were in charge, refused to recognize it until they were faced with the possibility of losing an election. And, of course, it is to their credit that they understood that at the last minute they had to turn around.

So we had an increase of $4 billion for education programs in the fall of 1996, which leads me to encourage my colleagues to hold on. Because in the fall of 1998 we may witness the same kind of resurrection of an understanding of what the priorities are. We may witness the Republican majority being born again in 1998. In order to do that, we have to be diligent. We have to persevere.

We never let up in 1995 and 1996 on the issue of education. We followed the issue right through the proposals to cut the school lunch programs, all the way down to the various proposals to cut Head Start, to cut title I. We brought the issue to the public again and again in order to let the public know what was happening, and they responded with common sense that got through to the majority and they turned around.

Let us stay on the message of the need for a school construction initiative. Let us stay on the message that it is a small amount compared to the total need. Five billion dollars is what the President proposed. Five billion dollars was under discussion for school construction, mainly in loans, low-interest loans that go to localities and States. It was not adequate, but it was at least a beginning.

To have that beginning snuffed out is not acceptable. So keep it in mind. It is a matter of common sense that the deteriorating schools represent one of our greatest problems. The physical deterioration of schools is not just a New York problem.

I have talked before about the fact that in New York it is astonishing that we still have almost 300 schools that burn coal. They have coal furnaces, and the coal is spewing smoke and substances into the air, which are toxics, of course, and New York has a high rate of asthma among young children.

We have a clear correlation between something that is being done by government-owned buildings, and in this case government-owned buildings that are a part of a program to help children, which are very detrimental to the health of children. We have at least 300, almost 300 of 1,000 schools in New York that still have coal-burning burners.

There is an initiative, which I have just read about in the New York State Legislature, which I want to applaud, to float a bond issue for school construction. I hope that that moves beyond talk in the legislature. It is not as much as is needed, but it may be that the States can prime the Federal Government.

We cannot go it alone. Most States and localities cannot go it alone. But if there are some initiatives at the State level, it might embarrass the Federal Government, it might embarrass the majority here in the House and Senate in order to make them begin to reconsider and move forward.

But the public, the voters, the people with common sense must continue to hold on and understand the seriousness of the situation. There are schools, of course, that have lead poisoning problems, there are many schools which have asbestos contamination, and there is a great space problem, which I have enumerated many times here in connection with New York City. And what happens in New York City is not so different from other big cities.

The fact that these things are pushed aside is very disturbing, because it is not a matter of it costs too much money. The $5 billion over a 5-year period, when compared to other programs, does not amount to much money. They are almost not even arguing the issue of it is too much money anymore.

There are philosophical arguments offered, like the fact that if the Government gives help to States and localities for school construction, it is an unprecedented intervention and an intolerable intervention into the local and State government matters. I think that is ridiculous. Education is not merely a local and State government matter. Education impacts on everything, including our national security.

We have gone through those arguments, and we have had a great deal of involvement of the Federal Government in the jawboning about school improvement. It is time we continue to increase the resources that are provided by the Federal Government.

There is no need to worry about the Federal Government taking over education. At this point the Federal Government only spends between 7 and 8 percent of the total expenditure for education overall. That includes higher education. So the percentage of the Federal Government's involvement in local education is less than 5 percent. And if it was increased greatly, even to 15 percent, it certainly would not mean that the Federal Government could control what happens in terms of decisions, or even up to 25 percent.

I advocate strongly that we move in the next 5 years toward a 25-percent involvement of the Federal Government in education funding. That would be a radical increase, but it is necessary. Even if we had 25 percent of the expenditures, and 25 percent of the funds were provided by the Federal Government, it still leaves 75 percent to be provided by the States and the local governments.

If we want to divide power along the lines of money, that means that the State and local governments would still have 75 percent of the power to make decisions. If they have 75 percent of the power to make decisions, they

would not have to worry about anybody else. So I do not think the argument that the Federal Government's involvement in providing resources means that they would take over or be a detriment to decision-making at the local level holds any water at all.

What it is, unfortunately, at the other end, is kind of an abandonment of the issue of the problem of education, abandonment of schoolchildren, while, at the same time, we are spending enormous amounts of money for other kinds of things that are far less necessary.

For example, the B–2 bomber. One of the votes that took place last week, which would be upsetting to most of us, common sense would dictate that we did the wrong thing, was a vote on the B–2 bomber. The B–2 bomber is not needed, according to the President. The B–2 bomber is not needed, according to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The B–2 bomber is not needed, according to the head of the Air Force. The person in charge of the Air Force says we do not need it, the President says we do not need it, the Joint Chiefs of Staff say we do not need it. Still, we come to the floor and disregard all of that and vote to keep funding a B–2 bomber, the cost of which will escalate as they move into production, and it increases.

My colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], stood on the floor and outlined how we are talking about $28 billion that will be needed more in the budget in future years at a time when the budget will be set. And if we are to balance the budget, that means that $28 billion worth of other programs would have to come out of the budget in order for the B–2 bomber to be accommodated. Despite the fact that we clearly understood the mathematics and the arithmetic, the B–2 bomber was voted for continued funding.

So it is not a matter of money, it is a matter of attitudes. And those attitudes are what we have to confront. The attitudes have nothing to do with common sense. The attitudes have nothing to do with scientific reasoning, certainly. They have nothing to do with logic. Logic would dictate we do not continue to build bombers that military authorities do not want.

But of course there are some Neanderthal considerations, like the fact that contracts are given out to factories and manufacturing firms and so forth who produce the B–2 bombers and they have spread around the production of the parts in various States and localities. Everybody sees themselves as having a piece of the pie. Whether the pie is good for America or not, they have their piece so they vote to continue the funding of the B–2 bomber, while we do not fund or refuse to provide even a measly $5 billion over a 5-year period for school construction.

Two weeks ago, I think it was June 28, there was a documentary on television. It was not national, unfortunately. I think it was a local television station in New York, Channel 7. I wanted to congratulate Channel 7 on that excellent documentary. It was just a 30-minute documentary about Class 104. Class 104 is in some school in New York, an actual school.

I want to congratulate the board of education for letting Channel 7 come in and film what was going on in the school. It is a first grade class that is overcrowded, 42 children in a first grade class, and they were documenting the dilemma or the problems faced by a teacher of 42 children in a first grade class.

Just to move around the room was a problem. And then, of course, they very sensitively zeroed in on three children, to talk to their parents, and to get an example of what does it mean to be in this class with 42 children competing for the attention of one teacher.

And it was an excellent production and I urge that my colleagues contact Channel 7, which is an ABC affiliate in New York, and maybe they will send a copy of the documentary on Class 104 and what it means to have children in an overcrowded situation who are that young.

There was one very sensitive young man who was totally lost and beginning to hate school despite the fact that he had a high IQ, very intelligent. He was off to the wrong start and beginning to hate school.

There was another young lady who was very aggressive, and she was only becoming more aggressive because of the fact that in order to get the teacher's attention she had to be aggressive and do things that forced the teacher to pay attention to her. She was doing much better than the sensitive young man who was not aggressive.

Children should not be put into a position where they have to fight for the attention of a teacher. That kind of abandonment represents a kind of institutionalized brutality, a child abuse that is institutionalized. We know if we put 42 children in a first grade class it means that children will be kind of brutalized and yet we do it.

I want to make a connection here at this point with another issue, and that is the issue of the apology that I talked about some time ago that received a lot of very intense response. The apology that was proposed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] in a resolution that the Congress apologize for slavery. It caused a lot of furor.

These issues that are taking place right now in terms of appropriations and budgeting, of tax expenditures, the abandonment of certain areas, certain populations, the abandonment of certain programs, the willingness to run and vote for a B–2 bomber while we cannot find it possible to vote for school construction, while we cannot find it possible to vote for empowerment zones. It all relates to the fact that we have sort of stumbled and lost our way at this point in America.

There is a connection between the furor, and there was a lot of upset people about the proposal by the gentleman from Ohio that we apologize for slavery, that Congress apologize for slavery. I have connected the two.

And I was shocked to find that a poll cited on ''Nightline'' stated that more than 60 percent of whites were angry about the idea and said there should not be an apology for slavery. At the same time more than 60 percent of the blacks said, yes; it was a good idea. Even though it was not originated by blacks and the Black Caucus is not the sponsor, it is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] and a group of well-meaning individuals, who deserve to be applauded for what they have done.

It is not a power play, but a very sensible kind of approach to providing healing and reconciliation in a situation that needs more healing and reconciliation. But it set off a furor. And the fact that 60 percent of whites in America, their first reaction, and I hope that that reaction will change, I hope that was the first reaction and that they will stop and consider and that that will not be the reaction a few weeks from now, or certainly a few months from now, after more thought is given to the power of the apology exercise. But the fact the initial reaction was that way is part of the problem in terms of decision-making here in the Congress.

□ 1815

This is a reaction which tells me that people are ready to move to forget anything related to a special sector of the population. Anything that you attach to the descendants of slaves, the African-Americans, anything you attach to them gets hostility. And that is an even greater argument for having the apology exercised, for having a discussion of it, because we still are getting this automatic, almost instinctive hostility:

Why should we do it for the blacks, for the African-Americans? Why should we have a school construction initiative which is primarily going to benefit the inner-city communities where African-Americans go to school? It may not be the indication, but that is the reasoning. Why should we have a welfare program which really provides jobs and training and moves people along the road to establishing some dignified connection with the mainstream economic system? Why should we have that if it is going to blacks?

That is the underlying current there that needs to be dealt with, that we still think that there are deserving Americans and undeserving Americans. And anything that relates to African-Americans, the first reaction is that they are undeserving Americans; they do not deserve empowerment zones, they do not deserve school construction initiatives that might benefit them in education, they certainly do not deserve an apology. Apology means we have got to recognize the problem.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] did not talk about reparations or anything complicated, just a apology. But

the instinctive reaction means that they understand the apology needs recognition, they recognize that there was a problem, and if they have a problem, they might have the obligation to seek a solution.

Well, so be it. Apology does mean that we recognize that there was something that happened in the past that ought to be recognized as a problem. The impact of that on people in the present is something we can debate. As we debate it, we may come up with an obligation to seek a solution to the fact there was a great impact.

Two hundred thirty-two years of slavery had an impact on the descendants of slaves. I mentioned before that the first impact is that none of them could inherit anything. Two hundred thirty-two years, from one year to another, one generation to another, nothing was handed down.

We know from studies that have been documented that most wealth is accumulated from inheritance. Big millionaires and lucky guys who find gold mines and oil fields, that is something else. Most wealth in the world is generated by one generation passing on to another, handing them down, sometimes in small amounts. Small amounts accumulate. People have capital and then invest it.

But if we go back in the genealogy, trace economic genealogy of people, we will find that those who have the benefit of this, which is just about all Americans except two categories, they have been the beneficiaries of inheriting property, inheriting pots and pans, of accumulating enough to use that as a jump-off point for something else; and that is the way wealth in America has moved, and most nations have, moved in the same way. It is passed down from one generation to another.

The native Americans, of course, who owned the land when the Europeans arrived here, that is not the case. It was kind of a reversal. The land was taken away from them in many cases and they could not pass it down. Certainly the African-Americans whose ancestors were born in chains against their will, and then they were forced into labor and the accumulation of wealth, none of that wealth was shared with them. They were not paid for their labor.

So nothing was passed down for 232 years by African-Americans, the descendants of a people who, in the long chain of the Nation, could not pass down that kind of wealth. So it means that we arrive at this point in history with a deficit that has to be recognized.

All these kinds of complicated issues would not be put on the table if we recognized that there was a great criminal enterprise called slavery and it generated these kinds of problems. We can have a search for a solution now, however, in an atmosphere which is not so tense and stressful.

We could not propose such an apology after the end of the Civil War. We could not propose it even 100 years later as we moved into the fight to end legalized segregation and Jim Crow. But why can we not propose it now? Why can we not entertain a discussion of apology for slavery and the implications of it at this point of history?

We are sort of at a pinnacle right now. Consider what is happening right now in 1997 in America. The stock market, Dow Jones Industrial index at 8,000, unprecedented activity on the market. The dollar is stronger than ever before against the yen and mark. We are rated against our competitors economically, doing much better. Our economy is outperforming. We have licked inflation. Employment is moving forward despite the low inflation.

We are on a mountaintop. America is on a mountaintop. We do not have an evil empire to fight anymore. Peace might exist for many decades to come or maybe even for hundreds of years. This is a point in our history where we should not be squabbling about the NEA's funding or about vocational education not having a provision which takes care of women and peculiar problems that they have had in the vocational education area. We should not be squabbling about those things.

We should not be passing legislation which obligates us for billions of dollars for B–2 bombers, while we at the same time cannot conceive of the fact that we should have more money available for education in the form of school construction.

We ought to be able to relax, to use our reason to its maximum. We ought to be able to relax and have the leaders in Congress listen to the people. The polls out there show that the people, with their common sense, still think education is the high priority. I do not think that they have defense as high as education at this point on the polls.

Nobody is more familiar with the polls than the people who are in the political leadership here, or we politicians in general. We know what polls are all about. We listen to polls. And yet the polls that clearly show the popularity of education and the Federal Government's involvement in education are being ignored systematically all the time. Only at election time in 1996 did they bother to listen in order to save their skins at the polls.

Now that we are a year and a half away from an election, nobody wants to deal with the problems of education that the rest of the American people overwhelmingly want to deal with. So we are at a pinnacle, we are at a very advantageous spot.

Why can we not listen to the polls, listen to the mind of the American people? Why can we not entertain and even invite a discussion of very controversial issues that might open the door for reconciliation and healing?

The whole matter of the apology for slavery is one of those things that might open the door that takes us forward into the 21st century with a new kind of mind-set. The present mind-set, as I said before, is unfortunate when we have 60 percent of whites who automatically think it is a bad idea.

It is all right for the Germans to apologize to the rest of Europe for what was done in World War II. It is all right for the Swiss to apologize to the Jews for their conspiracy with the Nazi government to take their gold and their deposits away from them. It is all right for the Japanese to apologize for what they did in Asia. But suddenly the idea of apologies upsets us a great deal.

I want to just drive this home by reading a very disturbing article that I read, by a top-flight columnist for the New York Times. I have read other columnists who also thought the idea of the apology was ridiculous and attacked it with great passion and vehemence.

Mr. Russell Baker's column of July 1, 1997, in the New York Times follows in the same vein. Mr. Baker is a brilliant writer, and although I often do not agree with him, his writing is always entertaining. Mr. Baker is extremely competent, intelligent, knowledgeable; and that is why his article is even more disturbing.

I am just going to read a few quotes from Mr. Baker's article about apologizing, because I find it very, very interesting about these people who get upset and outraged by the notion that they are being asked to apologize. I do not know what kind of family values they have or what kind of upbringing they have.

But I remember very well my mother once told me, after I had stepped on a little girl's foot as I was rushing to get, I think it was a church picnic and they had ice cream. I was rushing and stepped on a little girl's foot and she started crying. I hurt her foot, and my mother said, ''Go apologize.'' Well, my first thought was, apologizing is something that is not going to help her. I stepped on her foot. It is hurting. My apology will not help her at all. I said to my mother, ''I'm sure she's all right. Why should I apologize?'' She said, ''Go apologize.''

If I had not gone and apologized, I probably would have been sort of slapped across the mouth or roughed up a little bit, because my mother would want her child to acculturated in that way to understand apologizing is part of the process of being a civilized human being. It is not a time to get into the logic of apologizing will not help her foot, apologizing will not ease her pain.

But here arguments are saying apologizing will not ease pain, so it is ridiculous. Do we raise our children that way? But the argument comes across from a number of columnists that it is ridiculous because it cannot go back and undo the hurt.

Anyway, let me just do Mr. Baker the honor of quoting from his article, straight from the New York Times, July 1, 1997. It is entitled ''Sorry About That,'' which is already a little sarcasm introduced. It is arguing that

apologizing for slavery would show great sensitivity. ''Why anyone would propose such an aimless exercise, except to demonstrate great sensitivity, is hard to say.''

Now, if I had said to my mother, ''Why should I go back and apologize? All I am doing is demonstrating great sensitivity,'' she would have thought that she made a great error in the way she raised me, or she would have thought it was time to get to work disciplining me to show great sensitivity, part of being a human being. Why do we want to say it is an aimless exercise? But that is what Mr. Baker says here. ''Why anyone would propose such an aimless exercise, except to demonstrate great sensitivity, is hard to say.''

To continue quoting Mr. Baker: ''Both parties to the slave and owner relationship being long dead, there could be nothing more grotesque than the generation of white yuppies apologizing for the sins of long-buried ancestors.''

I do not know where he got the ''generation of white yuppies.'' The U.S. Congress is not a generation of white yuppies. We are the government. We are representatives of the government. Everybody is the government, but we are the spokespersons for the government; the government that was there in 1776, however different it might have been; the government that was there in 1865, when the Emancipation Proclamation was signed. I mean not the Emancipation Proclamation, when the Civil War ended. This government was there when the 13th Amendment that freed the slaves was passed. We are still part of the same government, so I do not know why we suddenly have become white yuppies.

But to continue quoting from Mr. Baker: ''Surely, no sensible descendant of slave forbearers look on such a spectacle without disgust for the hypocrisy of it.'' Again, ''Surely, no sensible descendant of slave forbearers look on such a spectacle without disgust for the hypocrisy of it.''

Well, Mr. Baker is clearly wrong. Sixty percent of the descendants of slaves said they thought apologizing was a good idea. According to the polls that had been reported, 60 percent of the slave descendants, I being one, see nothing wrong with apologizing.

□ 1830

We do not look upon it with great disgust. We do not consider it hypocritical.

But continued Mr. Baker, ''No sensible white American could countenance it without feeling embarrassed by its shabby theatricality.''

He may be right, because after all I just told you 60 percent of white Americans said we should not apologize. I do not know whether they were worried about shabby theatricality or something else, but he says it is shabby theatricality that they are worried about.

To continue quoting Mr. Baker, ''Apologizing for the country's past can only gratify the apologizer's desire to feel good about himself. It invites the audience to compare his moral tone to that of his ancestors, so derelict in their respect for humanity, and come out a winner.''

I do not know what is wrong with having anybody feel good about themselves if that is the only benefit. I think there are many other benefits but feeling good about yourself is a first step toward feeling good about others and reacting to others in a positive way. I have no quarrel with people feeling good about themselves.

Continuing with Mr. Baker's article, ''It not only enhances the apologizer's self-esteem, it doesn't cost him anything. This is an important consideration nowadays when government's chief goal is to avoid spending money on life's losers so the rest of us will have more to spend on ourselves.''

I agree with Mr. Baker wholeheartedly. Apologizing does not cost anything. All the more reason of why we should not hesitate to do it in my opinion. But he is saying that because it does not cost anything, we should not do it. There is a lot of contradiction and conflicts here. We should do things that do cost money. The whole Congress is running away from doing things that do cost money. I suspect that a lot of people are afraid to apologize because they think the next step is that somebody will want some compensatory programs or reparations or those kinds of things, but not Mr. Baker. If all we did was apologize, of course, it would be kind of hypocritical, but why not take the first step and we will take our chances. Let the Congress go forward with the resolution of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] and vote to apologize. Let there be a first step. It would not hurt.

Continuing with Mr. Baker's article, ''Like every country, the United States has a lot of history to apologize for. After apologizing for slavery, we could move ahead to apologizing for what our forebears did to the Indians.''

I am quoting Mr. Baker. I agree, Mr. Baker, why not go ahead and apologize for what was done to the Indians? Who would it hurt?

''Was it genocide? No, the word hadn't been invented until it was all over,'' according to Mr. Baker. ''The words that had Americans spellbound back then were 'manifest destiny.' Destiny had given us a continent to populate. The Indians were in the way. Destiny demanded their removal. Such was the argument, anyhow. With that nasty history now far behind, would an apology not be civilized? Would it not show modern Indians how much nicer than our forefathers we are?''

''Sorry, folks, for the brutality of our morally inferior ancestors. If it had been us in charge with our enlightened new age sensitivity, instead of those immoral old-timers, it would never have happened.''

''Couldn't we garnish the apology with some substance?''

''Come on, guys. Be reasonable. It's too late to give it back. Anyhow, we gave you a legal crack at the gambling rackets.'' He is talking to the Indians now.

''Few will quarrel with the government for apologizing to Americans of Japanese ancestry who were put in concentration camps during World War II. Since many who had suffered this monstrous assault are still alive, the apology was not just another piece of posturing.''

In other words, he has introduced the idea of apologizing to the Indians. Then he ridicules the idea of apologizing to the Indians because, after all, the people who did the terrible things to the Native Americans are now dead and we have at least given them a crack at the gambling rackets through the casinos so why do we not just forget it.

I think it is most unfortunate that Mr. Baker in this little three paragraphs is ridiculing the whole idea of diplomacy and negotiations, the fact that our ancestors might have taken a different route. There was plenty of land and plenty of everything. The Indians, the native Americans did not have to be treated the way they were in order for America to be great. Maybe there is a lot that would have been different if we had the same sensitivity then that we do have now. Let us not trample or trivialize our present state of morality and our sense of what is right and what is wrong, how different it is now from then. Unfortunately, it came too late in the case of the slaves. It came too late in the case of the native Americans. But understand that there was a different option, a different route and the fact that our ancestors did not follow that route is something that might be worthy of apologizing for.

We can apologize, however, for the Japanese and the concentration camps because some of them are still alive. That is kind of weird reasoning. These things stay alive in the conscience of a people forever. They never go away. I am going to point that out in a few minutes from his own examples.

To get back to quoting Mr. Russell Baker, ''Many others are still alive who lived in that time and admired Franklin Roosevelt, the man who authorized those camps.''

My father thought Franklin Roosevelt was the greatest man in the world, that ever lived, except for Jesus Christ, I guess, and I almost place Franklin Roosevelt in a similar category. I still think he is a great man, the greatest of all American Presidents. But he made some mistakes. That was one of the mistakes that he made. Anybody who had to make so many decisions for such a long period in such a critical and stressful situation would make mistakes. Franklin Roosevelt made a mistake. We should apologize as we did officially apologize to the Japanese Americans for what happened in World War II. That, we can be proud of.

''For those of us who in 1942 patriotically accepted the camps as necessary for the country's defense, the apology forced us to admit that even we can be terribly wrong when being tossed around by the storms of history.''

That is the kind of reasoning that Mr. Baker applies to the apology to the Japanese for the concentration camps in World War II. Why can we not take the same logic and the same argument and apply it to any mistake that is made in history and that we as a matter of hindsight can see was a mistake? What is wrong with saying that slavery was a grave mistake, a very costly mistake, a very dehumanizing mistake, a very deadly mistake, but it was a mistake that is worthy of at least an apology.

Going back to Mr. Baker, ''Where history is concerned, saintly judgment is rarely possible until a century or two has passed.''

Again I agree with Mr. Baker. ''Where history is concerned, saintly judgment is rarely possible until a century or two has passed.''

Now he is contradicting himself in a wholesale manner, because if saintly judgement is only possible after a century or two has passed, then you can only apologize with integrity, with great vision, after people are dead for a while. He began his argument by saying why apologize for something that people did years ago and all of the victims and all of the oppressors are dead. Now he says you can only judge after a century or two has passed.

A century or two has passed. Slavery lasted for 232 years but it has been over for more than a century, almost two centuries. Now it is time to reflect and to look at the mistakes and to look at the residue of problems that were caused by the mistakes and to deal with it in a forthright, scientific, logical, reasonable manner. But he says that on the one hand because everybody is dead, why deal with it and on the other hand, you can only pass reasonable judgment until they have been dead for a century or two.

''England may be infected, too, with the apologizing fad.'' Now he is back to his sarcasm and his reductio ad absurdum. Apologizing now is going to be a fad.

''England may be infected, too, with the apologizing fad. There is talk there of apologizing for Britain's indifference to starvation in Ireland during the 19th century potato famine.''

Why not apologize for the indifference of a government? The government made a mistake. A lot of people suffered and died as a result. So why not apologize.

''Tony Blair,'' according to Mr. Baker, ''the new Prime Minister has suggested something of the sort might improve relations with Ireland. Yes, it sounds ridiculous. Northern Ireland is a place where one of the most passionate events of every year is the celebration of a battle fought in 1688 between Protestants and Catholics. The Protestants won and have never for an instant dreamed of apologizing. Ireland seems an unlikely country to relinquish its hatreds after a dose of feel-your-pain sensitivity.''

In other words, he is saying if Tony Blair, the new Prime Minister, should decide to apologize to Ireland for the conduct of the British Government during the potato famine, then it is ridiculous because the Irish would never accept it. They do not believe in apologizing. That is why in Northern Ireland the Catholics are at the necks of the Protestants and this conflict between Protestants and Catholics rages on and on.

I would take the opposite approach and say maybe we can break the cycle if Mr. Blair would apologize first and if it would encourage the Catholics to apologize to the Protestants or the Protestants to apologize to the Catholics, maybe you would end this bloodbath in Northern Ireland. Maybe you would begin to have healing and reconciliation in the place of violence.

Ireland defies all logic. Northern Ireland defies all logic. All these people are white and they are at each other's throats. All of them are of the same nationality, they are all Irish, and they are at each other's throats. All of them belong to the same religion. They are Christians. Why does the fighting go on and on in Northern Ireland? Probably because no one has dreamed of apologizing. Probably because the old Neanderthal caveman reaction that you must forever and ever consider your enemy an enemy, you must get revenge, you must seek justice, probably because that dominates the thinking of the leadership so much that they cannot entertain another approach.

In South Africa, 25 million blacks were dominated by 4 or 5 million whites. The blacks have now taken over. They are the majority. They have control of the government. They chose a different path. Instead of trying to punish, instead of seeking justice and retribution, they have a Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Their society is taking a very positive movement forward because they are refusing to go for the old Neanderthal caveman reaction of I must punish those who did wrong to me. The whole Judeo-Christian tradition of moving in a different manner has been accepted in South Africa but not in some other places, like Northern Ireland.

In Haiti, they have chosen not to go for revenge and justice but to go for reconciliation. Therefore, Haiti is not adding on top of its other many economic problems the problem of a new kind of violence between those who had the upper hand before and those who have the upper hand now.

To get back to quoting Mr. Baker, to end his article, ''Apologies for slavery, famine, the Indian wars, can these have any purpose beyond asserting, in a smugly self-congratulatory way, that we are better people than our ancestors? They surely cannot undo the past. A lot of every nation's past is terrible, atrocious, barbaric, but there it is, inescapable, monumental, the work of our dead ancestors many of them no doubt hateful, a few perhaps almost as genteel and high-minded as you and I. Apologizing for them would be as useless and absurd as shaking a fist at the Atlantic Ocean. It is painful to see them patronized by the pious sensitivity crowd.''

Anybody who wants to apologize is now a part of a pious sensitivity crowd. The pious sensitivity crowd is engaged in a fad of apologizing. This does not take us anywhere but back into the caves. It does not move our civilization forward at all. Reconciliation is more important than revenge. That is the lesson that they are learning and South Africa is illustrating. Haiti. In Bosnia we will not have any forward movement until they also accept the principle that reconciliation is more important than revenge. Reconciliation is even more important than justice. Revenge and justice usually require more conflict and more bloodshed. Reconciliation and healing require that victims and injured parties accept the losses of the past and the present as a way of fertilizing the future with promise and hope.

Of course in the case of slavery, if we do not recognize anything was done wrong in the past, we cannot complete the healing process. There is an understanding that is not stated in our culture, in our national life, that accepts the fact that slavery was wrong. We fought a great Civil War, and the lives of many white men were lost in the process of setting the slaves free. We recognized that it was wrong and that Abraham Lincoln, under his leadership and those who fought in the Civil War, we have corrected that great national wrong.

□ 1845

But on the surface we still need to have greater recognition and discussion of it and not just bury it in our subconscious.

If the descendants of the victims of injured parties can accept their losses, then certainly those who were the oppressors ought to accept it and move toward healing and reconciliation. Surely the descendants of oppressors who inflicted the injuries and the atrocities should be able to move on to seek reconciliation and healing.

Let me just conclude by saying when Jesus of Nazareth declared that if a man strikes you on one cheek you should turn the other cheek he introduced a radical formula for human behavior. Many Christians insist that this is one instruction they find it hard to follow. It is unnatural, it is a demand or a command for extreme discipline. Turn the other cheek is an acceptance of suffering that mutilates one's masculinity. It destroys one's normal concept of dignity. This is exalted advice that must have come from outside the Earth, for it requires that

honor and common sense be surrendered, traded in for a profile of pacifist courage which will probably be labeled as cowardly weakness. The man strikes you on the cheek, then turn the other cheek; we are not asking that kind of activity, that you engage in that kind of activity and you have to suffer when you apologize. It is far easier to apologize than to suffer being struck on the cheek or to carry someone's bag an extra mile when they ask you to carry baggage the extra mile.

Instead of Mr. Baker's opposition to apologizing, I propose that in the style of a Vietnam Memorial Wall we should erect a wall that is called the International Monument of Apologies. In the past we have glorified great warriors and conquerors. Now let us lift up and pay homage to all those who apologize. Let us usher in a new era of civilization with ceremonies of apologies.

Yes, it is true that most of the apologies will be emotional symbolism. However, symbols and symbolism are life and death matters among human beings.

Perhaps at the top of this International Monument of Apologies the Greeks, who have left us so many other symbols, could lead off with an apology. Let the Greeks begin by apologizing to the ghost of a Trojan nation that no longer exists. The Greeks assembled vast war mongering states, and they marched into Troy, they wrecked the place, and when they could not win the battle, they abandoned all international conventions and standards of diplomacy and they tricked the Trojans into getting inside the wall, and then they massacred the women and the children, especially all the males, and they ought to apologize for that. It may be only mythology, it may be fiction, but still it would symbolically lead off the apologizing.

Let the Italian Government apologize for the destruction of the ancient land of the Jews and dispersal of their population by the Romans. Let the Italian Government apologize for what Nero and the citizens of ancient Rome did to the early Christians. Let the Spanish and Portuguese apologize for their initiation of the Atlantic slave trade, African slave trade. Let all the nations who participated in slave trade apologize. Let the British apologize for the open war against the Chinese. Let the Japanese apologize for Pearl Harbor. All the nations of ages.

You know, why not go forward and build a new kind of civilization on apologizing? There is nothing wrong with having a great wall of international apologies for us to come and contemplate what our Governments have done in the past and are willing to own up to in the present.

Let us take our civilization to a new dimension. We readily go to Mars and we land on Mars and applaud the technology and science and how radical that is. Let us in the area of human behavior strike in a new direction. Let us follow the precepts of Judeo-Christian religion. Let us look at that turn the cheek proposition. Let us look at it and build on it and understand that reconciliation and healing are more important than revenge and justice. Let us understand what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] is trying to do. He is trying to open the door a little wider. Apology comes first, and after that acknowledgment, recognition, more reconciliation and more healing.

Our society as a whole and our whole decision making process are on social issues and critical educational issues will all benefit if we recognize that nothing is lost by beginning with a process of apologizing. We have conquered overwhelming external enemies, and now it is time to grow again in America. The stock market and the evidences of prosperity are at an all time high. This is a time for us to strike out for a new moral high ground, a new moral high ground which would be beneficial to all of us in America and to the whole world.

PROGRESS REPORT ON THE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to bring America some good news for a change and to talk to my colleagues about some of the progress that has been made out here in the last 3 years because it is significant and it really brings us to the question of what next.

We came here, many of us came here, out of the private sector with no political background, myself included, and we came here in 1995 set on the idea that it was our responsibility to do something about the deficit to get us to a point where this Government spent no more money than it brought in, to get us to do something about the high tax rates in this country, and we were very concerned about Social Security and Medicare as it related to our senior citizens.

It has been a great day in Washington because today we actually introduced a bill that deals with the next step, and in order to deal with the next step; that is, paying down some of that debt, you first have to recognize we are in the third year of a 7-year plan to balance the budget, we are on track and ahead of schedule, Medicare has been restored so our senior citizens can rest assured that Medicare is safe for at least another decade, and good news for virtually every American all over this country:

Taxes are coming down. We have got a $500 per child tax credit coming through. If you own stocks or bonds or have a retirement fund of any sort, the capital gains tax reduction will affect you and allow you to keep more of your own money instead of sending it to Washington. The death taxes are coming down.

And of course there is all sorts of other tax provisions in there: the $1,500. If you have got a student in college right now, the $1,500 to help you get that student through college.

But the good news, and we will see more of this as we go forward this evening, is there are more tax cuts coming in the plan.

The logical next step is to talk about paying down the debt, and before I get into this I think it is real important we pause and just make sure that we talk a little bit about the difference between the deficit and the debt.

Every year since 1969 the Federal Government has been spending more money than what it has in its checkbook. It is not a lot different than our home. In our home we have income, we get a paycheck every month or every week, depending on what kind of setup you have, but at any rate you get a paycheck, you put it in your checkbook, and you write out checks to pay your bills.

Well, in your home you cannot write out checks for more than is in your checkbook, or of course the checks are going to bounce. Well, what the Federal Government has been doing since 1969 is collecting taxes, putting those tax dollars that they take out of your pocket into the government checkbook and then writing out all kinds of checks.

The problem in the government is it is very different than in our homes. When the government writes these checks out, they write out checks for more than what is in their checkbook. That is called the deficit. Since 1969 every year the government takes money out of your pockets, puts it in their checkbook and then writes out checks for more money than they have in the checkbook. That is the deficit.

Well, what happens with that deficit? Since their checkbook is overdrawn, they really only have one thing that they can do; they go and borrow the money to put in their checkbook.

And here is what has happened over the course of the last few years:

From 1960 to 1980, the growth of the debt was fairly small. But from 1984 forward, you can see that government has been overdrawing their checkbook by a substantial amount.

So what happens?

Well, in the year 1980, for example, they wrote out more checks than what they had in their checkbook, and they borrowed the money, and the debt started growing. By 1985 you can see the debt was growing more and more, and every year they kept writing out more checks than what they had money in their checkbook, and the debt just kept growing.

Now I point to this chart because it is about the best picture that I have seen to show just how serious this problem of debt is, because every year when they go out and borrow that money to make their checkbooks solvent, of course, it just gets added on to the debt.

To show you how serious this problem is, we are currently about here on this debt chart. It is a very, very serious problem facing this country.

Now, when Washington tells the American people that they are about to balance the budget, what that actually means is they are going to quit spending more money than they have in their checkbook.

Now most Americans would ask the same question they do in Wisconsin. They would ask the question:

Well, if you balance your checkbook; that is, you stop spending more money than you have in your checkbook, what about that debt that is still out there?

And I should show just how big that number is, that we actually put a number to it as we would in our own homes with our own checkbooks.

The debt, the amount of money that the government has overdrawn their checkbook by, in 1969, they borrowed it, and then in 1970 they borrowed some more, 1971, and all the way through to and including this year; that debt adds up to $5.3 trillion. The number looks like this, but let me translate that into English.

It is effectively the same as $20,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States of America. Again, this is the debt, this is the amount of money they have actually borrowed. This is the money that we will pass on to our children if we do not do something about it.

Another way of looking at this is for a family of five, like mine, the Federal Government has actually borrowed $100,000 basically over the last 15 years.

Put another way, the Federal Government spent $100,000 more than what it took in in taxes from an average family of five, like mine, and here is the real problem with that:

A lot of people in this community would like to say, well, do not worry about the debt, it is no big deal, it will go away, but here is the real problem:

The real problem is that an average family of five in America today sends a check for $580 every month to Washington, D.C., to do nothing but pay the interest on the federal debt.

Now, the families out there should be thinking about, well, what could we do if we did not have that debt. Well, you would keep the $580 in your own pocket, and a lot of them are going, well, I do not know what he is talking about because I do not really pay $580 in income taxes.

But I would like to point out that when you walk in a store and you buy a loaf of bread and the store owner makes a small profit on the loaf of bread, part of that profit gets sent out here to Washington in the form of a tax, and that is part of the $580 a month that our families are paying in interest on this Federal debt.

So again there are 2 different topics here. One is the deficit. The deficit is the amount that the Federal Government overdraws their checkbook by every year. When the people in Washington talk about balancing the budget, what they are talking about is their checkbook. They are talking about stopping the practice of spending more money than they have in their checkbook every year.

Well, what that means is after we balance the budget, we have still got this $5.3 trillion debt hanging over our head.

Now I started this evening by saying it is a wonderful night tonight because today we introduced a piece of legislation that goes to the what next. The what next of course is what do we do about this $5.3 trillion debt? Do we pass it on to our children?

And I am talking some flack over this bill, to be perfectly frank were you. We had a former Vice Presidential candidate that said that we do not have to worry about the debt. In fact, Jack Kemp said that the debt will take care of itself over a long period of time and we really do not need to worry about paying the debt back. When we start running surpluses; that is, when we start collecting more taxes than what we write out checks, why do we not just do all tax cuts and not worry about this debt?

Well, I want to tell you there is two gentlemen, and we are not allowed to show them here because of House rules. On the floor here with me this evening, my son is here, and the reason we cannot look the other way is because it is not acceptable for us in our generation to pass this $5.3 trillion debt on to our children. Is it really fair that our generation spend this money and look the other way and say, ''Well, let's hope it takes care of itself,'' or do you think we more have a responsibility to do something about the debt much like any homeowner would do with any debt against their home?

The bill we introduce today is much like repaying a home loan. It is much like any family in America would do where you simply start making payments on the debt, and over a 30-year period of time we repay the Federal debt. Here is what the bill does:

After we reach a balanced budget we cap the growth of government spending 1 percent below the rate of revenue growth. That creates a surplus because, if you are in balance to start with, spending goes up by one amount a little bit less then revenues go up. That creates a surplus. That surplus, we take two-thirds and we apply it toward paying down the Federal debt. We take one-third and supply additional tax cuts to the American people.

Well, 2 things happen under this bill, actually 3 things. One is there are additional tax cuts for the American people. But 2 other very significant things happen. The first and what I consider to be the most important: We pass this Nation on to our children debt free. By the year 2026 under our plan, the Federal debt is repaid in its entirety. Again by 2026 the debt could be repaid in its entirety under this plan.

The other thing that happens is equally significant. Today we collect more dollars in the social security then what we pay back out to seniors in benefits. That money is supposed to be sitting here in a savings account someplace. Well, it is not here, and I do not think this is any big surprise to anyone. The money has been spent on other Washington programs, and in fact the Social Security trust fund is all part of this $5.3 trillion debt.

□ 1900

As we pay back the Federal debt, the second thing that happens is we put the money back into the Social Security trust fund that has been taken out, so our senior citizens can again be assured that Social Security is solvent at least to the year 2026.

So this bill really has something in it for all generations. To the young people, they will not have to make that $580 a month payment to Washington to do nothing but pay the interest on this debt. Instead, they can keep that money in their own homes for their own families and decide how to best spend their own money. That is what this should be all about. So to the young people, they get a debt-free nation. What a wonderful opportunity that is in this bill.

For the people that are working today, one-third of those surpluses are dedicated to additional tax cuts for working families in America today, so the good news is for people in the work force, taxes go down some more.

For our senior citizens, the Social Security trust fund, the money that has been taken out by the Washington bureaucrats and spent on all kinds of other programs, that money gets put back into the Social Security trust fund and Social Security once again becomes solvent for our senior citizens.

A good day in Washington, a good day in Washington is where we can introduce a bill that actually talks about paying off the Federal debt, lowering taxes and restoring the Social Security trust fund. That is what happened today.

What kind of support do we have on this? Let me start with the Members of Congress. In the House of Representatives we have roughly 100 sponsors from both sides of the aisle. I am happy to say there are Democrat cosponsors in this as well as Republican in the House. We have people such as Speaker GINGRICH. The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. NEWT GINGRICH is a cosponsor of the bill; the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. BOB LIVINGSTON, a cosponsor of the bill; the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. JOHN KASICH, a cosponsor of the bill; the honorable chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York, Mr. JERRY SOLOMON, a cosponsor of the bill; the gentleman from New York, Mr. BILL PAXON, a cosponsor of the bill; 100 cosponsors in the House of Representatives already on this idea.

It goes beyond that. It goes beyond that. We had an interesting conversation. Think about this range of support, from the Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. NEWT GINGRICH to the conversation I had yesterday with a well-known American citizen, Ross Perot.

We are going to see Ross Perot tomorrow and present the rest of the details of the plan in person to him, but he is very optimistic and very supportive of the plan, because of course it does what he talked about doing for the last 5, 7, 8, 10 years, and that is balancing the budget and paying off the Federal debt. So we have a wide range of support for this.

It goes beyond that. Two hundred fifty thousand members of Capitol Watch have signed off as endorsing the plan. United Senior Citizens Association, let me see what they say about it: Since its inception, the United Senior Citizens Association has lobbied Congress to restore the stability of the Social Security trust fund. The introduction of the National Debt Repayment Act is a step toward making Social Security solvent.

The Council for Government Reform: On behalf of over 250,000 members of the Council for Government Reform, I urge you to cosponsor and support MARK NEUMANN's legislation entitled the ''National Debt Repayment Act.''

Coalitions for America: Coalitions for America supports the National Debt Repayment Act of 1997. We do so for the simple reason that your bill sheds some sadly needed light into the tremendous load of red ink America is drowning under.

Business-Industrial Council: On behalf of 1,000 member companies, the U.S. Business and Industrial Council, USBIC, I would like to extend our support for the National Debt Repayment Act of 1997.

The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. NEWT GINGRICH in a press release strongly supporting it: The Debt Repayment Act takes us in exactly the right direction to lead a national dialogue on how to best deal with the surpluses once the budget is balanced.

I can keep going on this, but the bottom line is the support for this thing and the range of support, from Republicans to Democrats, from the Speaker of the House to Ross Perot, the support for this particular idea grows because it is a commonsense, straightforward approach for this great Nation we live in.

What a dream for America. What a dream for this great country: a balanced budget, lower taxes, Medicare restored. And now the next step: We pay off the debt so our children can get this Nation debt free, we restore the Social Security trust fund so it becomes solvent again, and we continue the process of reducing the tax burden on working families in America. What a dream for this great Nation we live in.

I would like to next go to a little bit about what has been happening before 1995, what has happened from 1995 to today, and then how we can get to the point where this bill is actually put into place and actually used.

To begin this discussion, I want to start with the past. I have to say that the past is before I was actively involved in politics. Before 1990 I was never in politics. I was working very hard building a business out in Wisconsin. We built the business from the ground up. In the end we were providing about 250 job opportunities in southeastern Wisconsin and in northern Illinois.

What was going on out here in Washington is that people in Washington were making a series of promises to the American people, and they kept getting broken. That is what drove many of us out of the private sector, and with a concern for our children and future generations of this great Nation, we left the private sector to serve our country for a period of time, undo what was done in those broken promises, hopefully straighten this out, and then return back to the private sector.

Let us look at the promises. Let us think back to before 1995. This is the past. This is before the American people basically provided the impetus or the revolt, if you like, of what was going on. They did that in 1994.

Let us go back before then and talk about what was promised in the late 1980's and early 1990's. I have up here the Gramm–Rudman–Hollings Act. This blue line shows how they promised they were going to get to a balanced budget. Notice, it reaches zero in 1991. That is to say, they promised the American people they would balance the budget by 1991.

I watched this thing from its inception, only when they promised it was going to get balanced; instead what happened is this red line. That is the deficit line. That is how much they overdrew their checkbook by. I was out there working hard to run a business, make sure those 250 people got paid every week, and I was watching Washington overdraw their checkbook every week. It was very frustrating to watch.

When they made this promise and then broke it, they overdrew their checkbook by even more than they said they were going to, many Americans got very angry at this situation as they felt threatened for the future of our country. I do not care what anybody in this community says, the American people do care about this country. They care about what kind of a country we are going to pass on to our children.

So they saw they could not live up to what they had promised in 1985 and they put a new plan into place. They called it the Gramm–Rudman–Hollings Act of 1987. This one provided another blue line, another series of promises. It was supposed to be balanced in the early 1990's, but instead of following their promise, again they broke it and overdrew their checkbook by massive amounts of money.

This is what led to the 1994, if you would like, I would call it an uprising of the American people. It was not a revolt in Washington, it was the American people saying, we are sick and tired of these people making promises to us out there in Washington. We are sick and tired of those promises that were broken.

At this point I might add that the Democrats were in control of both the House of Representatives and the Senate and the Presidency. They said, we are sick and tired of those broken promises. So we got to 1993. This was going on.

In 1993, they said well, we had better get serious about this. Our checkbook is really overdrawn. The people that were in Washington in 1993 said well, the only thing we know to do to balance our checkbook is to reach into the pockets of the American people and take out more money. That was the tax increase of 1993: broken promises and higher taxes. That is before 1995. That is before the American people sent a new group to Washington to change these broken promises and higher taxes.

I would hope all of my colleagues take a moment tonight to remember the tax increases of 1993, because we need to remember what that environment was back in 1993, the broken promises and the higher taxes, to understand just how far we have come in the last 3 years.

Remember, in 1993 they raised gasoline taxes, they raised Social Security taxes, the biggest tax increase in history, and there was a huge fight out here in Washington. As a matter of fact, they passed the bill by one single, solitary vote in the House of Representatives, and not a single Republican would vote for the tax increase.

So it went over to the Senate. In the Senate they again passed it by one single, solitary vote, the biggest tax increase in American history, and it passed both houses by one single vote and was, of course, then signed into law by the President.

What was the result? The result was the American people said, I am sick and tired of these promises being broken. I am sick and tired of the people in Washington thinking that the right solution to their spending habits is to reach into the pockets of the American people and take more money out to Washington. We have had it with that.

So in 1994, they elected a new group of people and sent them on out here to Washington. Again, I would emphasize that at that point the House of Representatives was taken control of by a new party, by the Republican Party. The Senate also was taken over by the Republican Party at that point.

But it is not the party difference that is important here, it is the change in what was happening and the concept of the way to solve the problem of balancing the budget, reaching into the pockets of the people and taking more money out to Washington, or the very

different view that was brought in in 1995.

The different view went like this: Instead of reaching in the pockets of the American people and taking more money out here to Washington so we can maintain big government, instead of doing that, what we are going to do is curtail the growth of government spending. When we curtail the growth of government spending, since the government spends less, that means they will not need as much money out of the pockets of the American people. When they spend less, of course, they are going to borrow less.

Here was the theory. If the government borrowed less money out of the private sector, that would mean there would be more money available in the private sector. More money available in the private sector would keep the interest rates down, and when the interest rates stayed down, people would probably buy more houses and cars, because they could afford them. When they bought more houses and cars, people would have to go to work building those houses and cars. Of course, when they went to work they were leaving the welfare rolls and went into the work force.

I have good news. We have now moved out of the past and into the present. Our motto was put into place in 1995. The American people deserve the credit for this. The American people sent a new group to Washington. That new group sent to Washington with their ideas of curtailing the growth of government spending have laid this down, and now we are in the third year of this.

The American people have every right in the world, they should be checking us. They should now be asking the question: Is this group that we put in charge in 1995 doing anything different than what the people did before them, the broken promises of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings? Is there anything different going on?

I brought a chart along to help see just how different it really is out here. In 1995 we promised the American people a balanced budget by the year 2002. We laid out the deficit stream just like they did with Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. In the first year we promised the deficit would be below this red column, below $154 billion. The deficit in the first year was actually $107 billion. Here is what was promised. That is the red column. Here is what the deficit actually was. Please note, the deficit that actually occurred was smaller than what was promised to the American people. We not only hit the target, but we were ahead of schedule.

The second year, we said it would be under $174 billion. It is actually now well under 67. In the second year of this plan, again, the promises, the red column, and the blue column is what actually happened. Conceptually, the idea of controlling the growth of government spending worked. The idea of the government borrowing less money and leaving more available in the private sector, keeping the interest rates down so people would buy more houses and cars, providing more job opportunities, it worked.

We are now in the third year of that plan, and again, in the third year we are not only on track but ahead of schedule. That is the debate going on in Washington today. We are well ahead of schedule to be to a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Has anything changed? Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that under the Gramm–Rudman-Hollings, they never hit the targets. Under the new group that is here since 1995, we have not only hit the targets, but we are ahead of schedule in the first year. We not only hit the target, but we are ahead of schedule in the second year. We not only hit the target, we are ahead of schedule in the third year.

The good news for the American people is that we may very well have a balanced budget by next year, we are so far ahead of schedule on our plan. Because the idea of the government borrowing less, keeping the interest rates down so people can afford to buy houses and cars and provide job opportunities, that working model of 1995 worked so well that we are probably going to have a balanced budget by the year 1998. That is great news for the American people.

A lot of people cannot figure out exactly how this happened. I brought another chart along to help show what this curtailing the growth of government spending really means. Before 1995, the average growth of spending under the old regime was 5.2 percent annually. I went back 7 years and took the average growth in spending of the 7 years before the 1995 group took over, before the American people put the Republicans in charge of the House and Senate.

Since then, spending is still going up by 3.2 percent but the growth of government spending in Washington has been slowed by 40 percent in 2 short years. This is how fast it was going up before 1995, this is how fast it is now going up after 1995.

Is spending still going up, or are we making draconian cuts that virtually every American has been told about? I have news, there are no draconian cuts. Spending in government is still going up by 3.2 percent a year. Government is still getting bigger, and a lot of us do not like that. A lot of us would prefer to see this number at zero. Government does not need to be bigger. Cut out the waste and get down to the programs that people actually need.

But the facts are, government spending is still going up by 3.2 percent a year. If we look at inflation in adjusted dollars, it is going up by about .6 percent per year. If we take a look at what is really happening to government spending, it was going up in real dollars by 1.8 percent a year. It is now still going up by about .6 percent. That is after inflation.

Government, unfortunately, is still getting bigger, so we have plenty of room to move this plan forward to the next step and stop government from growing at all. But at this point, what has been done is the growth of government spending has been slowed. It is the slowing of that growth of government spending that has led us to a point where we can actually both balance the budget, probably by 1998 or 1999, well ahead of schedule, and reduce taxes on the American people at the same time.

What a wonderful situation this is and what great news this is for America. Instead of in 1993 talking about higher taxes, we have in fact curtailed the growth of government spending to a point where we can both balance the Federal budget and at the same time provide tax relief for the American people.

It is good news for America. That is what I said when I started this evening, it is a great day in Washington. And there are not a lot of great days in Washington, believe me; but it is a great day, because we know that what has been tried in 1995, that model that was put into place, we know that model actually works, and it is very, very important.

I have one more thing here that shows just how important the work that has been done is, and credit for this should go to a lot of the different leadership in both Houses for this, but most important, to the American people, because after all it is the American people that had the common sense in 1994 to change what was happening in this community. It would not have changed without the American people.

□ 1915

It cannot change without the support of the American people. What this chart shows is where the deficit was headed.

If the group that came here in 1995 played golf and basketball instead of doing their job, this line shows where the deficit was headed when we got here in 1995. The yellow line shows how much progress was made in the first 12 months under a new party in control.

My colleagues will notice that the deficit projections came down, but they still were not going to zero at that point. The green line is the 1995 plan that we put into place, and the blue line, this is the good news, the blue line shows us what is actually happening.

Again, here is what would have happened; here is how much progress was made in 12 months. Here is our plan. This is what we hope for. This is like the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings promise to the American people, and here is what is actually going on.

We are not only on track in our plan, we are ahead of schedule to the point where the budget will probably be balanced next year or the year after and we can provide a tax reduction to the American people.

I have got to pause for a moment in this presentation and say, I have been upbeat, very positive about where we are going with this country and very positive about the possibilities for what can happen. I want to pause for just 1 minute and make sure we have a dose of reality in here.

This is a topic that I think is very important for all Americans to understand, whether they are in their thirties or forties or fifties and thinking about at some point receiving Social Security, or whether they are in their fifties and sixties and are nearly ready to start receiving Social Security, or whether they are 65 or 62 and over and are receiving Social Security. This is a very important thing to understand.

When Washington says they are going to balance the budget, what they do not tell the American people is they are still taking money out of the Social Security trust fund to do it. Let me explain that. Every year the Social Security trust fund takes money in out of the paychecks of the American people. It takes in more money than what it gives back to the seniors in checks. That is to say, there is a surplus. They are collecting more money.

The reason for that is very simple. The baby boom generation is moving toward retirement, and when the baby boom generation gets there, there will not be enough money to pay Social Security. That happens in 2001. So they are collecting more money than what they are paying out right now. The idea is that money gets set aside in a savings account, and the savings account then provides the money in 2012 when the baby boom generation starts retiring and there is not enough money there to write out the Social Security checks.

The only problem in Washington, this should come as no big surprise to anyone, when Washington saw that extra money being collected out of the paychecks, instead of putting it aside in a savings account they spent the money. They put it in their big government checkbook and spent the money.

So at this point the only thing we have in that savings account is a bunch of IOU's. It is all part of the $5 trillion debt. So when Washington says they are going to balance the budget, it is important to understand that what they actually mean is they are going to use that Social Security trust fund money to actually count toward their checkbook and call that balanced.

Again I have a picture here to help make that clearer. The surplus in the Social Security trust fund for 1996 was about $107 billion. So they have got this extra money coming in, about $100 billion extra coming in. When they say balance the budget, what they mean is, I am sorry, the deficit was $107 billion in 1996. On top of that there was $65 billion in the surplus Social Security money. So there was $65 billion extra came in to Social Security more than what they paid out. The deficit had originally been reported as $107 billion; the true deficit then $172 billion.

When Washington says they are going to balance the budget, what they really mean is they are going to zero out this blue area. So even after they zero out this blue area, that is the deficit, what they call the deficit out here, they are still using the Social Security trust fund money to make their checkbook look balanced.

So in 2002, or whenever we hit a balanced budget and Washington proclaims victory, we need to understand that that victory still means they are using the money out of the Social Security trust fund. That leads us again to the National Debt Repayment Act and why it is so important.

Under the National Debt Repayment Act, of course, what we would do is, after we balanced the budget we would cap the growth of government spending at a rate 1 percent lower than the rate of revenue growth so as to create a surplus. That surplus is what we use to put the money back in the Social Security trust fund that has been taken out.

So over a period of time, then, when we get to a true balanced budget, that is, we get to a point where we are not using that Social Security money to mask the true size of the deficit or to make the budget look like it is balanced when it is really not. We get past that in our National Debt Repayment Act and we actually get to a point where all of this money that has been taken out of the Social Security Trust Fund gets put back in. If that happens, Social Security again becomes solvent through the year 2029.

I want to talk again, we talked about the past and the present, I want to go again into the future, because understanding the problems in the Social Security Trust Fund and understanding how significant this debt is on our children and what it means to them and how much interest they would have to pay or how much they do not have to pay so they can keep the money in their own home. A lot of folks are talking about our budget plan as being pie-in-the-sky; we cannot really balance the budget.

I put together a little chart that looked at the average Federal revenue growth over the last 3 years, revenue to the Federal Government; that is, if we just look at how much money is coming in to Washington, it has been growing by 7.3 percent average over the last 3 years. Over the last 5 years it went up by 7.3 percent. A 10-year average is 6.2 percent. A 17-year average is 6.8 percent.

In our budget resolution, in the budget plan that balances the budget by 2002, we only projected revenue growth of 4 percent. That is to say the plan we laid on the table was extremely conservative. The reason there are projections out there that the budget will be balanced in 1998 or 1999 is because revenue is in fact growing even faster than the 4-percent number. When it grows faster, of course, that gets us closer to a balanced budget.

I put together a little table. I asked the question: What if revenue grows at a more historical level, say 6 percent? That is what this chart shows. If we can hold the spending in line, as we have been doing, and meet the spending targets that are in the budget resolution that has just passed, and revenue grows by 6 percent instead of the 4 percent, still lower than it has been growing but faster than what was projected in the budget resolution, what happens is we do in fact balance the budget by the year 2000 and start running a surplus.

That is the real importance of passing the National Debt Repayment Act. These surpluses could start as soon as 1999 or 2000. And when those surpluses start, there is going to be a frenzy in Washington, DC, with a strong desire to spend more of the American people's money. By passing the National Debt Repayment Act, we would assure that two-thirds of this surplus goes to repaying the debt, including paying off the Social Security trust fund, and that one-third of this surplus is provided for additional tax cuts to the American people.

That is what the National Debt Repayment Act is about. It was introduced today, and I would strongly encourage my colleagues to be actively involved in supporting it. And equally important, I think, the American people need to get actively involved in this, because inside the beltway there is this strong sense that somehow the debt is irrelevant. It is almost like we do not care if we pass it on to the children. We want to give more tax cuts because that will be politically popular.

I deep down inside believe that the American people understand that the right and proper thing to do, the morally and ethically right thing to do, is to pay the bills that we ran up over the last 15 years. The National Debt Repayment Act will allow us to do just that. Before people in my age group leave the work force, we would have the debt repaid in its entirety.

For the people who want more tax cuts, I would just point out that as we pay off the Federal debt, as we implement this sort of a plan, the interest payments to the Federal Government will be reduced. And when we reduce those interest payments, of course, taxes can be correspondingly held down.

There are two important things in order to bring all of this about. There are two very important things. One of them is that we curtail the growth, we continue curtailing the growth of government spending. We do not have to have draconian cuts. We do not have to wipe out all kinds of programs that are important to people.

What we do have to do is, we have to curtail the growth of government spending. That may mean that a program gets killed on one side that was wasteful or not as productive or not as important as another program someplace else. If we were to say limit the

growth of government to the rate of inflation, some program might grow faster than inflation, such as Medicare. Some other program might have to grow slower than the rate of inflation.

I would point to one of these. Last year we sent $35 million to Russia so Russia could launch monkeys into space. I do not think we needed to send that $35 million. We took $35 million of the taxpayers' money. We sent the money to Russia for the Russians to launch monkeys into space for research.

Those things should be eliminated. The dollars spent on those sorts of programs should be redirected to programs that are more important, say Medicare, for example, and that should allow us to keep the growth of government spending at the inflation rate or even lower.

The beauty of this whole idea, the National Debt Repayment Act, is that we have one-third of the surplus going to additional tax cuts, two-thirds going to repay the debt. We get to pay off the entire debt by the year 2026 and give this Nation to our children debt free. The Social Security trust fund is restored, and we get to provide additional tax cuts to the American people.

I cannot think of much better that we could spend our time and effort on. I cannot think of a better vision for the future of this great country.

I have got a few minutes left tonight. I would like to jump over into another topic that I think is very important out here. I would like to go into a little more detail on the tax cuts that are coming for the American people.

There is a lot of debate in this community right now about whether people who are not paying any income taxes should get a tax cut or not. Many of us feel that if a person is not paying taxes, it is probably pretty hard to get a tax cut. There is a debate about whether the Social Security taxes that are withheld out of a paycheck should be applied or not. I guess that debate will go on.

But the bottom line is, when it is all over and done with, people with children, families with children with incomes below $110,000 a year, or $75,000, if they are single, they get $500 per child back in their home. If they are in a house where they have got one child headed off to college and two kids in school yet, they will get $500 for each one of those kids. On top of that, for the one that went off to college they will get an additional $1,500.

This is not like they get from Washington. This is their hard-earned money that, instead of sending it out here to Washington to let Washington decide how to spend it, they get to keep this money in their own home and spend it in the way that they think is most desirable for their own family.

I was talking to a family with three children in church the other day. They said to me, the first thing I am going to do with this money, $500-per-child, I am not going to go and spend that money. That is going into a college fund for my kids so I know when they get there, and I will have three in college at that point, I know when they get there we can pay the college bills.

What a great statement that is for America. American families care. This country is not dead and gone. The people of this country care, not only about the country, they care about their family. When the $500-per-child tax cut comes through, families are not going to go out and blow that money. They are going to use that money to provide a better life for their children. In this case they are going to put it away for a college fund. That is great news for the future of this country. That is the way it should be.

I would like to address another group of people, and this is not often discussed in the tax cut plan that is currently on the table out here. I talk with a lot of folks where their kids are grown and gone. I have a 20-year-old, an 18-year-old; the 18-year-old heads off to Carthage College next year. The 20-year-old is going to New Ulm, MN, to college. I have a 14-year-old at home that I am sure will head off to college in three or four years.

At that point my wife and I become empty nesters. An empty nester is a family where the kids have grown and they have left the house and are no longer living there. There are a lot of American people out there in their middle forties that are empty nesters. They are in this big house that they built to raise their children. They do not need that big house anymore.

The dilemma, under the Tax Code right now, is this: If they sell their house today and they are 48 years old, their kids are gone, they decide they want to go into a smaller home, lower payments, and start saving for their own retirement, if that is what they would like to do, under today's rules they sell that bigger house and move into a smaller house and the tax burden comes out and grabs lots of money from them.

Under the tax cut package that is here today, this is very significant for empty nesters, if they wish to downsize their house, the government is not going to come and take a portion of the inflated price of their old home, their bigger home.

Let me walk through this. Suppose a family has three kids and they are young kids, and when they were 35 years old they bought a house for $35,000, $40,000. They kept that home, and now they are 48 years old and their kids are all gone and they need a smaller house. The home that they bought for $35,000 is now worth $85,000, so there has been a $50,000 inflation in there.

Under the old rules, if they sold the house before age 55, they pay taxes on that $50,000. They pay a capital gains tax on it. Under the new rules, if they sell their house even before the age of 55, they do not have to pay the taxes on it. So if they want to sell their big house, move to a smaller house, lower payments and save for themselves for retirement, go ahead and do it. That is what the new tax rules are saying. It is a significant change for a lot of Americans that has not really been talked about out here.

There is another area of tax cuts that I think is very significant. Lots of people, especially my age group, 20's, 30's, on up into the 40's, we started saving in a pension plan of some sort for our own retirement, many times even outside our employer's plan. We started some other sort of a savings plan to get ready for our retirement, or if it is our place of work and they provide us with a pension plan of some sort.

In that pension plan they have been buying maybe stocks and bonds or whatever they buy in that pension fund. By the time they reach retirement, the value of those stocks is going to have increased, we hope. That is why they are buying them, so they will increase in value under the old rules.

□ 1930

When we pull those stocks out of the pension fund, we pay a 28 percent tax on them. It is called a capital gains tax. Under the new rules, instead of paying 28 percent, we will only pay 20 percent. That is a very significant reduction. That is an 8 percent reduction.

If we pull money out of our pension funds, and let us say we are taking out $1,000 of this profit a month, instead of paying 28 percent, $280 in taxes out of that thousand dollars we are taking out, we are now only going to pay $200; and we get to keep an extra 80 bucks in our own home to spend as we see fit instead of sending it to Washington to spend on our behalf. Another very significant change in the tax code.

There is lots of good news out there in the tax code. A lot of times the American people get bogged down in all the bickering and fighting going on down here in Washington, but I think it is important as we are listening to that that we remember the huge difference in transition that has taken place from before 1995 to today.

Before 1995 there was no fighting about tax cuts. For goodness sakes, there was no tax cuts even being discussed. The only thing being discussed were which taxes should be increased and how far. Today, yes, there are some disagreements over which taxes should be cut and how far, but is it not a wonderful situation for the country to be in, where we are talking about which taxes to reduce on the American people and how far they should be reduced?

Let us have that debate. And the good news is that under the National Debt Repayment Act there is more tax reductions coming for the American people.

I would encourage every American to get actively involved in this debate. If for some reason somebody can find a way that they are not affected by the

tax cuts that are currently on the table, I think it is important that their representatives know about that so that in the next round of tax cuts, as the National Debt Repayment Act is put into place, and one-third of the surplus is allocated to additional tax cuts, Congressional Representatives should know exactly what it is that their constituents would like to do with those tax cuts to make sure it affects them too.

Let us make sure everybody in America that is working and paying taxes gets a reduction of some sort, because that is what this is all about. Washington does not need to take as much money from the American people as it is taking. I believe very deeply that the American people, our families out there, our singles out there, that the American people can do a much better job of spending their own money than the people out here in Washington can.

So as we go through tax cut round after tax cut round after tax cut round, think back to 1993 and just think, as we are going through some of these debates, what a wonderful thing it is that we are actually having these debates out here in Washington as opposed to the alternative which was here in 1993.

What I want to do now is just wrap up this discussion. I would like to go back to the past, the present and the future, just quickly through it.

I will start with the past and again just remind folks exactly how far we have come. I always use this chart of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings promises because of the past.

Before 1995. A different party in control of the House of Representatives. The Democrats in control of the Senate and the presidency. What was the world like before 1995, before the American people made a change? It is not Washington that made the change. In 1994 the American people decided to make a change. Before they made that change, what was going on and what brought the American people to make that change?

Well, in the 1980's, they promised under the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act to get us to a balanced budget, following this blue line for deficits. But they did not meet their targets. They broke their promises to the American people. And it was more than money, it was the fact that the people in Washington had made promises to the American people. When they could not keep their promises, they said, we know what to do, let us make a whole new set of promises, and they passed Gramm-Rudman-Hollings II and made a whole new set of promises to the American people and again broke those promises to the American people.

The past, folks. Broken promises, pre-1995. Someone else in control of Congress. The past. These broken promises of a balanced budget. The past, 1993. Which taxes should we raise to get us to a balanced budget and how far should we raise those taxes? The gasoline tax, Social Security tax. Everybody's taxes went up. If one owned an automobile, they paid more taxes. The past. Broken promises, higher taxes.

The present. The American people revolted in 1994 and they put the Republicans in control of both the House and the Senate. To see how different things are, those broken promises of the past, that is not the group that is here now. The American people should evaluate this change. They should look out here now and say did the Republicans fulfill their commitments or are they like all the rest and broke their promises, too.

Well, here are the promises the Republicans made. In 1995 we laid out a plan to balance the Federal budget. We said in the first year of that plan the deficit could not be more than this red column. Well, it was the blue column. We not only hit our target but we were ahead of schedule.

Year 2. We promised not more than the red column. Blue column is what actually happened. Year 2, on track, ahead of schedule. Very different. We not only hit our targets, we were ahead of schedule in the first 2 years.

We are now in year 3. In year 3, even if we go into a rescission, which is what is currently projected, this is what was promised back in 1995, and this is where we actually are. A very different group of people with very different results.

How did we make this happen? What brought this picture about? What brought this picture about is not raising taxes, not reaching into the pockets of the American people and giving more money to Washington. What brought this chart about is curtailing the growth of Government spending. Looking at our Government, asking ourselves which programs do we not need. What can we do to do a better job? How can we curtail the growth of Government spending.

Government spending is still growing. It is still going up by 3½ percent, a little faster than the rate of inflation, but not as fast as it was before. And since it is not going up as fast as it was before, Government spending goes up slower; since we are not spending as much money, that means the Government did not borrow as much out of the private sector. When they did not borrow as much, our theory was that with more money available in the private sector, because the Government borrowed less, more money would be available in the private sector and interest rates would stay down, law of supply and demand.

With interest rates down, people could afford to buy houses and cars, which they did. And when people bought houses and cars, other people had to build them, which meant they left the welfare rolls and got a job.

That is exactly what has led to this picture up here of being not only on track but ahead of schedule. So what happened? That group that got sent here in 1995, they fulfilled their commitment and curtailed the growth of government spending. Not draconian cuts. Spending still went up, but at a much slower rate. We curtailed the growth of spending to a point where we cannot only balance the budget, but also reduce taxes on the people at the same time.

That is where we are at now today. We are actually at a balanced budget. In 1998 we will stop spending more money than we have in our checkbook. As soon as 1998. And at the same time we are providing tax relief to the American people. That is what has happened and that is a very different picture than 1993.

The past, the present, the future.

The future of this party. The future of this great Nation. Much more important than the party itself. The future of our country needs to recognize that even after we get to a balanced budget, we still have a huge debt hanging over our heads. Five trillion dollars. We need to live up to and accept the responsibilities of our generation, a generation who has spent this money.

Our generation has overdrawn its checkbook each year since 1969. The future, folks. We must do what is right for the future of this country and live up to our moral and ethical responsibilities to do something about the $5.3 trillion debt. We do not want to pass that on to our children. I think it is totally inappropriate for our generation to look the other way and pass that debt on to our children.

Our job is to do something about it, and that is the National Debt Repayment Act. We introduced it today in Congress. The National Debt Repayment Act goes like this. It says after we reach a balanced budget, that is, the same number of dollars coming in as what the government is writing out checks for, after our budget is in balance, we cap the growth of spending at a rate 1 percent lower than the rate of revenue growth.

If revenues go up faster than spending, that creates a very small surplus to begin with. The surplus grows each year. One-third of that surplus goes to providing additional tax cuts to working families; two-thirds to repay the Federal debt.

The future? The future is paying off the entire Federal debt under this plan by the year 2026, giving our Nation to our children debt-free. And, of course, as we are paying off the debt, we restore the Social Security trust fund.

The future? The future is the National Debt Repayment Act providing additional tax cuts to working families. A secure future and debt-free Nation for our children and restore the Social Security trust fund so our seniors, once again, are secure in this great Nation that we live in.

That is a very different vision than the past that we have had here. This is such good news for America. It is such good news it should be put out on every station to let all the people know just how changed this place is.

The past. Broken promises, higher taxes. The present. Third year of a 7-year plan to balance the budget. On track and ahead of schedule. Very changed place. Curtailing the growth of government spending to the point where we can both balance the budget and, at the same time, reduce taxes on our families out there. And, after all, that is what this is all about, the future.

The future is about our children and future generations of Americans. The future. The National Debt Repayment Act, where we repay the entire Federal debt by the year 2026 and give this Nation to our children debt-free. The National Debt Repayment Act, where we are paying off the debt and restoring the Social Security trust fund. The National Debt Repayment Act, where we allow additional tax cuts for working families. Additional tax cuts for working families, a restored Social Security trust fund for our seniors and a debt-free Nation for our children.

That is a vision for the future of this great Nation that we live in. That is what I sincerely hope happens out of what has started here today as we have introduced the National Debt Repayment Act, and that is my vision for the future of America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FORBES (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), until August 1, 1997, on account of medical reasons.

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. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DICKS, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. GEJDENSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. FORBES.

Mr. BRYANT.

Mr. GALLEGLY.

Mr. COLLINS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NEUMANN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COBLE.

Mr. PACKARD.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

Mr. ENGEL.

Mr. MCCOLLUM.

Mrs. CUBIN.

Mr. POMEROY.

Mr. MURTHA.

Mr. MENENDEZ.

Mr. FOGLIETTA.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

Mr. KUCINICH.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado.

Mr. GEJDENSON.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 768. For the relief of Michel Christopher Meili, Giuseppina Meili, Mirjam Naomi Meili, and Davide Meili.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 21, 1997, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4228. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report to Congress that suspension for 6 months beyond August 1, 1997, of the right to bring an action under title III of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 is necessary to the national interests of the United States and will expedite a transition to democracy in Cuba, pursuant to Public Law 104—114, section 306(c)(2); (H. Doc. No. 105—107); jointly to the Committees on International Relations and the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

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:

Mrs. MYRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 189. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2169) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes (Rept. 105–189). Referred to the House Calendar.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT FILED

Mr. LIVINGSTON: Committee on Appropriations. Supplemental Report on the revised subdivision of budget totals for fiscal year 1998 (Rept. 105–185 Part II). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

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. COBLE:

H.R. 2180. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide limitations on copyright liability relating to material on-line, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. GEKAS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 2181. A bill to ensure the safety of witnesses and to promote notification of the interstate relocation of witnesses by States and localities engaging in that relocation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEXLER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 2182. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to clarify the authority of the inspector general of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself, Mr. BOYD, Mr. COOK, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRADY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FORD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. JOHN, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. REDMOND, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. WEYGAND):

H.R. 2183. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. BRYANT:

H.R. 2184. A bill to permit reviews of criminal records of applicants for private security officer employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each

case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CLAYTON (for herself, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DIXON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Ms. WATERS, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii):

H.R. 2185. A bill to establish equitable service for customers and equal opportunity for employees of the United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CUBIN:

H.R. 2186. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance to the National Historic Trails Interpretive Center in Casper, WY; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 2187. A bill to designate the U.S. Courthouse located at 40 Foley Square in New York, NY, as the ''Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. FOWLER (for herself, Mr. COX of California, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 2188. A bill to ensure that commercial activities of the People's Liberation Army of China or any Communist Chinese military company are not extended normal tariff treatment by the United States or treated as normal commercial intercourse with the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on International Relations, National Security, and Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 2189. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Social Security Act to repeal provisions relating to the State enforcement of child support obligations and to require the Internal Revenue Service to collect child support through wage withholding and other means, and to authorize the Social Security Administration to distribute child support collections; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. COX of California, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

H.R. 2190. A bill to provide for an annual report to Congress on the intelligence activities of the People's Republic of China directed against or affecting the interests of the United States; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. NEUMANN (for himself, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. KASICH, Mr. PAXON, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BASS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BONO, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DREIER, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. EWING, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HORN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MINGE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. NEY, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RYUN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. WICKER):

H.R. 2191. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 regarding procedures for budget resolutions and to amend title 31, United States Code, to direct repayment of the public debt; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NORTHUP:

H.R. 2192. A bill to establish a National Panel on Early Reading Research and Effective Reading Instruction; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SANDLIN:

H.R. 2193. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to clarify the definition of depot-level maintenance and repair as the definition applies to the Department of the Army; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FROST, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WALSH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. KLINK, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. FAZIO of California, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. SANDLIN):

H.R. 2194. A bill to provide for telephone access to the FBI database that tracks the movement and whereabouts of sexual offenders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. COX of California, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON):

H.R. 2195. A bill to provide for certain measures to increase monitoring of products of the People's Republic of China that are made with forced labor; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself, Mr. COX of California, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. SHADEGG):

H.R. 2196. A bill to reduce the Federal funds to be provided to any international financial institution by the United States portion of any subsidy provided by the institution to the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 2197. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to specify the entities eligible to purchase pharmaceutical products from the Federal Supply Schedule; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 2198. A bill to establish limitations with respect to the disclosure and use of genetic information in connection with group health plans and health insurance coverage, to provide for consistent standards applicable in connection with hospital care and medical services provided under title 38 of the United States Code, to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of genetic information and genetic testing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight, Education and the Workforce, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FORD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. JACKSON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 2199. A bill to reform the financing of Federal elections; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each

case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO):

H.R. 2200. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide restitution to the people of Guam who suffered atrocities such as personal injury, forced labor, forced marches, internment, and death during the occupation of Guam in World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MANTON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 2201. A bill to establish the Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida (for himself, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HORN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. QUINN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WISE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FROST, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BOYD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. PORTER):

H.R. 2202. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the bone marrow donor program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. DICKS, Mr. WHITE, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, and Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington):

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the interference of the European Commission in the merger of the Boeing Co. and McDonnell Douglas; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COX of California, and Mr. MARKEY):

H. Res. 188. Resolution urging the executive branch to take action regarding the acquisition by Iran of C–802 cruise missiles; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. COX of California (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H. Res. 190. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Taiwan should be admitted to the World Trade Organization without making such admission conditional on the previous or simultaneous admission of the People's Republic of China to the WTO; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SKAGGS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 38: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 44: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 58: Mr. TIAHRT and Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

H.R. 66: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 127: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 145: Mr. CAMPBELL and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 234: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 305: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 387: Mr. OWENS, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. EHRLICH, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 407: Mr. ROEMER.

H.R. 600: Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 641: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 695: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. KIM, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 715: Mr. GEKAS, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 727: Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 755: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 805: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 866: Mr. COLLINS.

H.R. 875: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 977: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 981: Mr. FAZIO of California and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 982: Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 983: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1002: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1010: Mr. HEFLEY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 1015: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1059: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1108: Mr. MCCRERY.

H.R. 1114: Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 1128: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 1151: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1175: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1176: Mr. CAMPBELL and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1288: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1437: Mr. YATES and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 1500: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1504: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1507: Mr. CLAY and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1525: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1531: Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1550: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 1583: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1608: Mr. MASCARA, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. NEY, Mr. HORN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 1614: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 1671: Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 1710: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. TALENT, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 1711: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 1719: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. DANNER, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 1737: Mrs. CLAYTON and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1754: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 1836: Mr. COX of California and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1839: Mr. BURR of North Carolina and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1842: Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 1849: Mr. LARGENT, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 1859: Mr. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 1872: Mr. KLUG, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1876: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1880: Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 1915: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1951: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. YATES, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1955: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 1972: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1984: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. REGULA, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 2003: Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KLUG, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado.

H.R. 2064: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. SCHUMER.

H.R. 2135: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 2143: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2174: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BENTSEN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. FARR of California.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. OWENS and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. GILLMOR.

H. Con. Res. 41: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. REYES, and Mr. OXLEY.

H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. FROST, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BONIOR.

H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H. Con. Res. 83: Mr. QUINN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WHITE, Mr. KLINK, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H. Con. Res. 112: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. YATES.

H. Con. Res. 114: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Res. 22: Mr. MENENDEZ.

H. Res. 26: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 110: Mr. FARR of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 151: Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. EHRLICH.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 35: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

ASSISTANCE FOR ETHIOPIA

SEC. 572. The Department of State should closely monitor and take into account human rights progress in Ethiopia as it obligates funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for Ethiopia.

H.R. 2159

OFFERED BY: MR. PAUL

AMENDMENT NO. 36: At the end of title I (page 5, after line 14), insert the following new paragraph:

REDUCTION IN AMOUNTS

Each amount otherwise provided in this title is hereby reduced to $0.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. NEUMANN

AMENDMENT NO. 17: Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to carry out, or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture who carry out, a nonrecourse loan program for the 1998 crop of quota peanuts with a national average loan rate in excess of $550 per ton.

H.R. 2160

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 18: Page 51, line 6, insert after the dollar amount ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 56, line 15, insert after the second dollar amount ''(reduced by $5,470,000)''.