But overall I voted against the package. Since the Committee was set up, outside groups have generally been able to file charges against Members if they believe there is good evidence of possible misconduct that should be investigated. Some important cases have been brought before the Standards Committee in this way, including the charges against Speaker Gingrich that resulted in his being reprimanded by the full House and paying a $300,000 penalty.

Under the new Committee rules, however, people outside Congress can no longer file complaints with the Committee, even if they have personal and direct knowledge of egregious conduct by a Member. Now only a Member of the House could file charges against another Member. I believe the new rules make it even harder to hold Members accountable for serious misconduct. By this action the House does further damage to the integrity of the institution.

INVOLVING OUTSIDERS IN INVESTIGATIONS

I was also disappointed that the reform package failed to include a bipartisan proposal that I had introduced to involve outsiders in the investigation of charges against Members.

Under my proposal, the Speaker and the Minority Leader would jointly appoint a pool of ''independent fact-finders'' to be called upon by the Standards Committee to help in ethics investigations as needed, on a case-by-case basis. These individuals would be private citizens, and might include, for example, retired judges, former members, or just ordinary citizens. The findings and recommendations of these independent fact-finders would be reported back to the full Committee, which then makes recommendations to the full House. The basic idea is to restore credibility to the process by involving outsiders at a key point in the consideration of the charges against a Member—investigating the evidence and making recommendations on possible discipline—with the final judgment on the case still resting with the full House, as it must under the Constitution.

Our current process has simply lost too much credibility with the public and the media. There have always been inherent conflicts of interest when Members judge fellow Members—either to protect a friend or Member of the same party or to go after an opponent for political purposes. But in recent years those tensions have come to the forefront, as the ethics process has become highly partisan, bitter, and contentious.

Various other professions are increasingly calling on outsiders to help them police their membership—to reduce the tensions, stalling, and conflicts of interest. Several state legislatures, for example, are now successfully using independent ethics panels to help consider charges of misconduct against legislators. The House should do the same.

However, the House leadership opposed the idea of allowing outsiders to help investigate Member misconduct—perhaps fearing a loss of control over the disciplinary process—and it was not allowed to be considered by Members on the floor.

CONCLUSION

The unfortunate fact is that the House usually moves to reform its ethics process only after a major ethics scandal or a widely perceived failure of the system. The major problems we experienced with the Gingrich case gave us a rare opportunity to make some serious reforms that go to the heart of our difficulties in policing ourselves and, in turn, help restore credibility to the institution of the Congress. We should have passed more meaningful reforms.

Although we were not successful this time in including outsiders in the process, I believe that House movement in that direction is almost inevitable. I agree fully with the new Chairman of the Standards Committee, who said that next time the ''use of non-House Members will be a fait accompli''. Involving outsiders in the ethics process is not a panacea, but it is a significant step in the right direction. It means more openness in the spirit of good government, and it reflects confidence within the House that it is able to withstand the scrutiny.

IN HONOR OF ALOYSIUS HEPP

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1997

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Aloysius Hepp, recipient of NASA's Exceptional Achievement Medal. Dr. Hepp, a senior materials scientist at Cleveland's NASA Lewis Research Center, received the Exceptional Achievement Medal for his significant support of the socioeconomic business programs in the small business, technical, and procurement arenas.

Dr. Hepp graduated from Carnegie Mellon University as the top chemistry major in his class. After earning a Ph.D. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Dr. Hepp spent a year with NASA Lewis before moving onto stints with the Center for Naval Analyses and the Polaraid Corp. Dr. Hepp returned to NASA Lewis in 1987 to continue his accomplished career. In fact, 5 out of the last 7 years, NASA Lewis honored Dr. Hepp by awarding him the Research Achievement Award. In addition to his position with NASA Lewis, Dr. Hepp serves as an adjunct professor at the State University of New York-Albany and Cleveland State University. Dr. Hepp also spent a year as a visiting scholar at Harvard University.

Dr. Hepp has played an active role in promoting diversity at NASA Lewis and increasing opportunity for minorities in education and business. For example, Dr. Hepp works with a NASA Lewis program to provide high school and college minority students with summer internships. Over the years, these internships have provided a valuable experience to many of Cleveland's youth. In many cases, these students have collaborated with scientists to produce presentations and publications.

The work done by Dr. Hepp is yet another example of the excellent work done by the scientist, engineers, and administrative personnel at the NASA Lewis Research Center. My fellow colleagues, please join me in recognizing the contributions made by Dr. Aloysius Hepp to the scientific community and the community of Cleveland in general.

HONORING KATHY WALLACE OF BELLAIRE, OH

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1997

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following to my colleagues.

Kathy Wallace, of Bellaire, OH, has been named the Ohio Valley Medical Center's 1997 Ree Cook-Reiter Women's Center Woman of the Year. Kathy is the first recipient of the award which honors women who are devoted to helping their communities.

Kathy is special to many people in the Ohio Valley whose lives she has touched through her caring and giving attitude. Some of those people are residents of the Country Club Retirement Center in Bellaire where she gives weekly manicures. She always has a warm smile and friendly conversation for them. Kathy also donates sweet treats to nursing home residents from the Dairy Queen she owns in Martins Ferry, OH.

Kathy has taught Bellaire and Belmont County about the importance of volunteering and dedication to one's community. She leads by example. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking Kathy Wallace for her service to Belmont County, and to congratulate her as she is honored as the first recipient of the 1997 Ree Cook-Reiter Women's Center Woman of the Year. I wish Kathy Wallace continued success, health and prosperity.

TENNESSEE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SYMBOLICALLY POST-RATIFIES CONSTITUTION'S 15TH AMENDMENT

HON. HAROLD E. FORD, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1997

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the recently concluded 1997 regular session of the 100th Tennessee General Assembly took a very historic and symbolic action. On April 2, 1997, both the Tennessee House of Representatives and the Tennessee Senate adopted House Joint Resolution 32, ''to post-ratify Amendment 15 to the Constitution of the United States of America guaranteeing the right of citizens to vote regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude''. On April 8, 1997, the Governor of Tennessee officially signed House Joint Resolution 32.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Constitution's 15th amendment is a fundamental legacy from the Reconstruction period following the Civil War. While the 13th amendment abolished slavery in 1865, and the 14th amendment defined citizenship by 1868, it was not until the 15th amendment came along in 1870 that the right to cast a vote was extended to African-American males uniformly in all regions of the Nation. Of course, the 19th amendment, ratified in 1920, further extended ballot access to females of all ethnic backgrounds.

Mr. Speaker, up until just this year, Tennessee was the only State—which had been in the Union both well before the 15th amendment was proposed and long after it had gained ratification in 1870—to have never gone on record, albeit symbolically, in support of this vital section of our Nation's highest legal document. As a matter of fact, a resolution specifically denouncing the 15th amendment was adopted by the 36th Tennessee General Assembly in 1870 and that resolution of rejection had remained Tennessee's only official pronouncement on the matter for the ensuing 127 years. But this embarrassing chapter of history was duly remedied when House Joint Resolution 32 was presented last spring in the Tennessee House of Representatives by the Honorable Tommie F. Brown of

Chattanooga, who was joined by the other 15 members of the legislative black caucus as cosigners. Subsequently, all remaining members of both chambers of the general assembly added their names to House Joint Resolution 32 as cosigners.

To appropriately document this notable correction of history, I respectfully ask that the full text of House Joint Resolution 32 be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following my remarks. After that, I request that an article appearing in the April 21, 1997, issue of Jet magazine, reporting on Tennessee's action, likewise be placed in the RECORD. And, finally, to recognize the person who discovered and confirmed this historical omission, and who labored to bring it to the attention of my State's 16 African-American lawmakers, I would like to have entered in the RECORD the full text of a proclamation executed in the city of Nashville on April 28, 1997, and cosigned by the Speaker of the Tennessee House and by all members of the Tennessee legislative black caucus, which pays tribute to Mr. Gregory D. Watson of Texas, a constitutional scholar of some renown. The material follow:

STATE OF TENNESSEE HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 32

By Representatives Brown, Brooks, Bowers, Langster, Armstrong, Towns, Ulysses Jones, Pruitt, Miller, Larry Turner, Cooper, Lois DeBerry, John DeBerry, Arriola, Beavers, Bird, Bittle, Bone, Boner, Boyer, Buck, Burchett, Caldwell, Chumney, Clabough, Ralph Cole, Ronnie Cole, Cross, Curtiss, Davidson, Davis, Dunn, Eckles, Farguson, Fitzhugh, Ford, Fowlkes, Fraley, Garrett, Givens, Godsey, Goins, Gunnels, Haley, Halteman Harwell, Hargett, Hargrove, Hasell, Head, Hicks, Hood, Huskey, Jackson, Sherry Jones, Kent, Kernell, Kerr, Kisber, Lewis, Maddox, McAfee, McDaniel, McDonald, McKee, McMillan, Mumpower, Newton, Odom, Patton, Phelan, Phillips, Pinion, Pleasant, Rhinehart, Ridgeway, Rinks, Ritchie, Roach, Robinson, Sands, Sargent, Scroggs, Sharp, Stamps, Stulce, Tidwell, Tindell, Brenda Turner, Walker, Walley, West, Westmoreland, White, Whitson, Williams, Windle, Winningham, Wood and Mr. Speaker Haifeh; and Senators Atchley, Burks, Carter, Cohen, Cooper, Crowe, Crutchfield, Davis, Dixon, Elsea, Ford, Fowler, Gilbert, Graves, Harper, Haun, Haynes, Henry, Herron, Jordan, Koella, Kurita, Kyle, Leatherwood, McNally, Miller, Person, Ramsey, Rochelle, Springer, Williams, Womack and Mr. Speaker Wilder.

A Resolution to post-ratify Amendment 15 to the Constitution of the United States of America guaranteeing the right of citizens to vote regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Whereas, on February 26, 1869, the Fortieth Congress of the united States of America, at its third session, by a two-thirds (2/3) majority of both Houses, submitted to the legislatures of the several states for ratification a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

''AMENDMENT 15

''Section 1. The right of citizens of the united States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

''Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.''; and

Whereas, by proclamation of Federal Secretary of State Hamilton Fish, dated March 30, 1870 (16 Stat. 1131–2), this proposed amendment to the United States Constitution was officially declared to have been duly ratified by the legislatures of the constitutionally-required margin of at least three-fourths (3/4) of the several states, there being at the time 37 states in the Union; and

Whereas, after Amendment 15 had made its way into our Nation's highest law in early 1870, the legislatures of five other states which had been in the Union prior to its adoption—but which, like Tennessee, had not approved the amendment—post-ratified it, many years after 1870, as follows: Delaware in 1901 (Senate Joint Resolution No. 13); Oregon in 1959 (Senate Joint Resolution No. 7); California in 1962 (Senate Joint Resolution No. 9); Maryland in 1973 (Senate Joint Resolution No. 56); Kentucky in 1976 (House [Joint] Resolution No. 75); and

Whereas, for the past 21 years, Tennessee has stood alone as the only State in the Union, both well before Amendment 15 was proposed and long after it was adopted, whose legislature has never placed its own unique imprimatur upon these fundamental two sentences of the United States Constitution; now, therefore,

Be it Resolved by the house of Representatives of the one Hundredth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, the Senate concurring, That Amendment 15 to the United States Constitution, quoted above, is hereby post-ratified by the Tennessee General Assembly.

Be it further Resolved, That House Joint Resolution No. 98 (Act ''Number LXXX'') of the Thirty-Sixth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, in which Amendment 15 was rejected by the Tennessee House of Representatives and by the Tennessee Senate, be hereby revoked, repealed, and utterly rescinded.

Be it further Resolved, That a properly inscribed copy of this Resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of State of Tennessee to the Archivist of the United States, Washington, D.C., in compliance with Pub. L. 98–497.

Be it further Resolved, That properly inscribed copies of this Resolution be individually transmitted by the Secretary of State of Tennessee to each of the following persons in Washington, D.C. with the respectful request that this Resolution be published in the Congressional Record: the Vice-President of the United States, as presiding officer of the United States Senate; the Parliamentarian of the United States Senate; the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; and the Parliamentarian of the United States House of Representatives.

Adopted: April 2, 1997.

JIMMY NAIFEH,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

JOHN S. WILDER,
Speaker of the Senate.

Approved this 8th day of April 1997.

DON SUNDQUIST,
Governor.

[From Jet Magazine, Apr. 21, 1997]

TENNESSEE BECOMES LAST STATE TO RATIFY 15TH AMENDMENT

Just after the Civil War, the 15th Amendment to the U.S. constitution guaranteed that no one could be denied the right to vote because of their ''race, color or previous condition of servitude.''

Today, 127 years later, Tennessee recently became the last state to formally agree with the amendment.

The state's House of Representatives and the Senate voted to make amends by unanimously approving a resolution that ceremoniously ratified what has been the law of the land since 1870.

The resolution was sponsored by Rep. Tommie Brown of Chattanooga, who learned in September from constitutional scholar Gregory Watson of Austin, TX, that Tennessee had never post-ratified the amendment.

The 15th amendment was submitted to the states for ratification after it was approved by the 40th U.S. Congress in February 1989. Three-quarters of the 37 states in existence at the time approved it; the bill was ratified in March 1870.

Sen Keith Jordan of Franklin reminded his colleagues that because Tennessee was the first state to rejoin the Union after the civil War, it was not required to ratify the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments as were other Southern states.

Many states post-ratified the amendment later, including Delaware in 1901; Oregon in 1959; California in 1962; Maryland in 1973 and Kentucky in 1976.

STATE OF TENNESSEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, it is appropriate for this Legislative Body to honor those persons who through their outstanding accomplishments in public service have established a legacy that others can merely hope to emulate; and

Whereas, Gregory D. Watson of Austin, Texas is one such noteworthy public servant, whose watchful eye and attention to microscopic, and often overlooked, detail are legendary to all who have come to know, or know of, him; and

Whereas, during his meritorious tenure with the Texas Legislature, Gregory Watson championed numerous and varied causes in the quest for better government at both state and federal levels; and

Whereas, Mr. Watson is best known for the May 1992 ratification of the 27th Amendment to the United States Constitution; the ratification of the 27th amendment was the culmination of a decade of hard work on his part and on the part of those state lawmakers across the nation who joined with him in the endeavor; and

Whereas, in March of 1982, a government class at the University of Texas in which Mr. Watson was enrolled was assigned by the instructor the task of writing a report about ''a governmental process'. While at the Austin Public Library, Mr. Watson happened upon a book about the U.S. Constitution which contained a chapter devoted exclusively to those constitutional amendments which the U.S. Congress had adopted and transmitted to the state legislatures for ratification, but which a sufficient number of the state legislatures had never ratified; and

Whereas, in the chapter, Mr. Watson noticed the proposal: ''No law, varying the compensation for the services of the (U.S.) Senators and (U.S.) Representatives, shall take effect, until an election of (U.S.) Representatives shall have intervened''; having researched the issue of time constraints on the ratification of proposed amendments to the U.S. Constitution, Mr. Watson knew intuitively that the quoted amendment, which had been submitted by Congress to the state legislatures with no expiration date, was not only still pending business before the state legislatures, but indeed, was a vehicle to correct what many Americans during recent years had come to view as something of a conflict of interest within the Congress; and

Whereas, to his astonishment, Mr. Watson received a grade of ''C'' on the report, because the professor disagreed with his conclusion that what was then a 192-year-old constitutional amendment could still be subject to full ratification by modern-day legislative bodies; and

Whereas, not only to provide her wrong, but also to achieve something positive for the nation as a whole, Mr. Watson, in April of 1982, vigorously embarked on a nationwide crusade to secure ratification of the constitutional amendment; and

Whereas, Mr. Watson's astute efforts with respect to the 27th Amendment have been chronicled in many different places; he was featured in the June 1, 1992, issue of People's magazine and in the February 22, 1993, issue of U.S. News and World Report magazine; he was also prominently featured in such legal periodicals as 10 Glendale Law Review (92–109) during 1991 and 61 Fordham Law Review (497–557) in late 1992; he was cited in the Congressional Record by U.S. Representative J.J. Pickle on March 24, 1987; and

Whereas, Mr. Watson is an integral part of the 393 page novel, Amending America, by Richard B. Bernstein with Jermone Agel, which novel explores various amendments proposed to (some of which later successfully became part of) the U.S. Constitution; and

Whereas, Mr. Watson's work has been noted in countless newspaper articles, including, such trusted as the Los Angeles Times, The New York Times, USA Today and The Washington Post; and

Whereas, the 15th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution of the United States of America, guaranteeing the right of citizens to vote regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, made its way into our Nation's highest law in early 1870, the legislatures of five other states which were part of the Union prior to its adoption, but which, like Tennessee, had not approved the amendment, post-ratified its many years after 1870; and

Whereas, for the past 21 years, Tennessee has stood alone as the only state in the Union, both well before Amendment 15 was proposed and long after is was adopted, whose legislature had never placed its own unique imprimatur upon these fundamental two sentences of the United States Constitution; and

Whereas, on April 8, 1997, the 15th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America was ratified and signed by the Honorable Don Sundquist, Governor of the State of Tennessee; and

Whereas, it is fitting and appropriate that the elected Representatives of the State of Tennessee should pause to pay tribute to an exemplary gentleman who has given unreservedly of himself, his time and his talent to perpetuate the public good; now, therefore,

I Jimmy Naifeh, Speaker, of the House of Representatives of the One-Hundredth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, at the request of and in conjunction with Representative Joe Armstrong, Chairman, Tennessee Legislative Black Caucus and its members do hereby proclaim that we recognize, honor and thank Gregory D. Watson for the intregal part he played in ''Amending America'' and his many contributions to constitutional law.

Proclaimed in Nashville, Tennessee on this the 28th day of April, 1997.

Jimmy Naifeh, Speaker of the House of Representatives. Joe Armstrong, Representative, Knoxville. Henri Brooks, Representative, Memphis. John Deberry, Representative, Memphis. Larry Turner, Representative, Memphis. Joe Towns, Representative, Memphis. Barbara Cooper, Representative, Memphis. Tommie Brown, Representative, Chattanooga. Roscoe Dixon, Senator, Memphis. Thelma Harper, Senator, Nashville. Edith Taylor Langster, Representative, Nashville. Mary Pruitt, Representative, Nashville. Kathryn Bowers, Representative, Memphis. Lois Deberry, Speaker Pro Tempore, Memphis. John Ford, Senator, Memphis. Ulysses Jones, Jr., Representative, Memphis. Larry Miller, Representative, Memphis.

EDUCATIONAL CHOICE

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1997

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to encourage my colleagues to read the following articles about educational choice. One is an editorial from the Wall Street Journal, the other, an article by Lindsay Sobel from The Hill, entitled ''Voucher Opponents Send Own Children to Private Schools.'' I believe that it is crucial that every child of every background in every neighborhood is given the opportunity to access the best education possible. It amazes me that many of our colleagues continue to arrogantly refuse to offer the children in the failing District of Columbia schools the same educational opportunities that are available to their own children.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 8, 1997]

SIDWELL LIBERALS

Our vote for the worst scandal in America right now is the education monopoly that keep poor, inner-city kids trapped in awful public schools. Special mention here goes to the politicians who oppose giving these children the choice to escape even as they send their own kids to private schools.

Let's call them Sidwell Liberals, after the famous Washington, D.C., school where President and Mrs. Clinton sent their daughter. That school turned out to be a splendid choice for Chelsea Clinton, who is now moving on in impressive style to her freshman year at Stanford. Vice President Al Gore and his four children have also benefited from elite private education. Despite this personal experience, both men oppose giving the same kind of choice to kids who must walk through school metal detectors within miles of the White House.

Now comes a survey of Congress showing the same kind of Sidwell hypocrisy. Nina Shokraii, an education analyst at the Heritage Foundation, spent the summer asking Members of Congress where their kids go to school. She got answers from about nine of 10 House members and 77 Senators. Of those responding, 34.4% in the House and 50% of Senators with school-age or older kids have sent them to private schools.

Members of Congress are upper-middle-class folk with the income to afford private school tuition. This isn't true of most American families, which is one reason only 14% of school-age kids go to private school nationwide. For black and Hispanic children, the number is 8%. Yet the Heritage study shows that 32% of the Congressional Black Caucus, and 44% of the Hispanic Caucus, educate their children outside the same public school system they claim to hold so dear.

Many parents are satisfied with public schools, of course, and if you live in the likes of Winnetka, Ill., or Scarsdale, N.Y., or the state of Utah this is at least rational. Many of these parents figure they've already exercised ''choice'' in where they've decided to live. Their ''tuition,'' if you will, comes in the form of high-priced real estate. This is one reason many middle-class voters have been reluctant to embrace a full-fledged voucher program, especially with the teachers' union demagoging the issue.

But where this opposition is insane, and becomes a form of national self-destruction, is in the big urban school systems that work like the Mir space station. Some of the best of these schools have 50% dropout rates. Many teachers wouldn't dream of sending their own kids to the same urban schools they work in everyday.

It is precisely these horrendous schools that education reformers have begun to target with school-choice proposals that offer some kind of financial or tax help to low-income families. The Republican House passed a bill last year for the District of Columbia, 241–177, only to see it opposed by Senators who send their children to private schools. Ted Kennedy's kids went to private school, of course. Arlen Specter, a Republican from Pennsylvania, has also opposed the D.C. choice bill, but chose private schools.

The Heritage study doesn't get into individuals, but our own reporting shows plenty of Sidwell Liberals in the House, too. A couple of them belong to committees holding hearings this week on both the D.C. proposal and broader school choice. Missouri's Bill Clay is the ranking Democrat on the Education Committee and voted against the D.C. bill last year. So did Democrat Matthew Martinez of California. Yet both didn't object to private schools for their own offspring. Overall, according to the Heritage study, nearly 40% of the Members on the House Education committee, which has jurisdiction over school choice, have chosen private schools for their kids.

The political fashion among GOP pollsters now is that ''school choice'' doesn't sell to the middle class. But how about junking the polls for once and making the case based on justice and the national interest? America can't stay a great nation with millions of inner-city kids held hostage to a public school monopoly that turns them into truants or worse. Not every American kid can go to Sidwell, but none of them should be consigned to schools no liberal would accept for his own flesh and blood.

[From The Hill, Wednesday, Oct. 1, 1997]

VOUCHER OPPONENTS SEND OWN CHILDREN TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS

(By Lindsay Sobel)

Sen. Carol Moseley-Braun (D-Ill.) sends her only son to a private parochial school in Illinois. Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass) sent his children to private schools in the D.C. area, while Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton (D-D.C.) sent at least one of her children to Georgetown Day School, a private school.

Others who sent their children to D.C. area private schools include Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle (D-S.D.) and Sens. James Jeffords (R-VT.) and Byron Dorgan (D-N.D.)

But none of them favor a proposal to give 2,000 D.C. students federally funded vouchers that would enable them to attend private schools.

Mosely-Braun said such a program would be ''a dilution of support for public education,'' a sentiment echoed by the others.

But supporters of the measure argue that low-income families should have the same choices about where to send their children to school that members of Congress do. ''The nation should be outraged that [congressional opponents'' insist that school choice should not be an option when they send their children to private schools,'' said Star Parker, president of the Coalition on Urban Renewal and Education.

Although at least 20 members of Congress whose families live in the Washington area have school-age children, a survey by. The Hill revealed none who send their children to