United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 20, 1999 No. 54

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 20, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES F. BASS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the East Front of the Capitol Grounds for performances sponsored by the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony in honor of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and welcoming the three newest members of NATO, the Republic of Poland, the Republic of Hungary, and the Czech Republic, into NATO.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 249. An act to provide funding for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. 330. An act to promote the research, identification, assessment, exploration, and development of methane hydrate resources, and for other purposes.

S. 361. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to John R. and Margaret J. Lowe of Big Horn County, Wyoming, certain land so as to correct an error in the patent issued to their predecessors in interest.

S. 426. An act to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, to provide for a land exchange between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Huna Totem Corporation, and for other purposes.

S. 430. An act to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, to provide for a land exchange between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Kake Tribal Corporation, and for other purposes.

S. 449. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the personal representative of the estate of Fred Steffens of Big Horn County, Wyoming, certain land comprising the Steffens family property.

S. 531. An act to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Rosa Parks in recognition of her contributions to the Nation.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

EARTH DAY 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this week, we celebrate Earth Day, Thursday, April 22. Many will use this occasion to highlight major policy issues, as well they should, issues dealing with greenhouse gases, the effects of global warming, and the pollution of our world's oceans.

However, I feel that the real power to be demonstrated is at the other end of the spectrum, dealing with individual actions. Many of us here on Capitol Hill will celebrate Earth Day with a bike ride. People from the Capitol, commuters, business people from all over the region, will converge on Freedom Plaza on Pennsylvania Avenue, illustrating the impact that people can have dealing with this very simple and efficient mode of transportation. Yet, we do not need to have everybody trade their car in for a bicycle. If people in our community will choose to take just one less trip a week, whether that is by foot, by transit, by bicycle, or simply consolidating their other journeys to produce that one trip reduction, it can have a phenomenal impact in terms of reducing air pollution, congestion, and the requirement for more investment in infrastructure.

The most important thing is for people to think about their behavior and think about the little things we can do to make things better: Shopping locally, or treating their own yard like they would like farmers and industry to conserve their property. Whether it is conserving water, dealing with native vegetations, using less toxic herbicides or fertilizer, we can all make a big difference.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is plenty of room for us in Congress to have an impact on the environment. To be sure, I hope this session will deal with things like water policy, spending our money in more environmentally responsible ways, in Superfund reform, but I would hope that this Congress will also continue the effort to try and focus on the little things that we can do to make a difference.

I am pleased that this year we have finally caught up with the rest of America, as the Federal Government has for years told the private sector to reduce employee commute trips by single-occupant vehicles. Congress has finally started to do what we have asked the private sector to do by providing

Printed on recycled paper.

an opportunity for our employees to have subsidized Metro passes.

I am, however, continually embarrassed, as I know most Members of Congress are, when the reports come out, as they did last week, about our abysmal record of recycling here on Capitol Hill. In the 3 years I have been a Member of Congress, the total proceeds from all of our recycling effort for over 8,000 employees on Capitol Hill has been less than $27,000. I am sure that there are Boy Scout troops in my community that have raised more money from recycling Christmas trees, bottles and cans than the entire U.S. Congress did in those 3 years. For the year of 1997, the net proceeds was $7.51 for recycling high-grade paper. There are homeless people around Capitol Hill that make more than that in a day recycling bottles and cans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope as we have a lot of rhetoric around Congress that we want to live by the rules that we apply to other people. I hope that in the final analysis we will apply that to our individual offices, and step up to behave the way we are asking the rest of America to behave in terms of recycling. I think our record ought to be something that we ought to be proud of, not something that makes us cringe, and I hope that each Member of Congress will dedicate themselves this Earth Day to make it a record that we can, in fact, show to the American people and be proud of.

SOCIAL SECURITY DEBT LIMIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is good news in terms of this Congress, this President, acknowledging that we must solve the Social Security problem.

Social Security was started back in 1935 with the anticipation that there would be a continuing growth in the labor force. What has happened with this pay-as-you-go program where existing workers are paying in their Social Security taxes, and that tax is immediately sent out to existing retirees, is the demographic changes. The number of individuals working and paying in that tax in relation to the increasing number of retirees is creating a situation where Social Security is becoming insolvent. It cannot be sustained.

Let me just give a couple of examples. In 1940 we had 41 individual workers paying in their tax for every one retiree. By 1950, it went down to 17 workers paying in their Social Security tax for every one retiree. Guess what it is today. Today there are three workers paying in their Social Security tax to pay the benefits for every one retiree.

The estimate is that by the year 2030 there will only be two people working. So we can see a huge problem in continuing to ask the fewer and fewer number of workers to pay in a higher and higher tax to accommodate every retiree. Taxes have already significantly increased over the last several years.

Since 1971, Social Security taxes have been increased 36 times. More often than once a year, we have increased the rate of the base for Social Security taxes to accommodate the increased requirement to pay benefits for existing retirees from a fewer number of workers.

So the question that we are now faced with is how do we change the Social Security system to keep it solvent? How do we either increase revenues coming into the system or reduce benefits so that the Social Security system can last for tomorrow's retirees and not put a huge burden on future generations to pay more and more taxes for Social Security?

I think the President suggesting that we have to put Social Security first has increased the awareness that something has to be done. In the next several days and weeks, I will be introducing my Social Security bill. It will be the third Social Security bill I have introduced that will keep Social Security solvent. Other Members, such as the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), will be introducing the bill that they worked up to keep Social Security solvent. Some are suggesting only temporary solutions.

I see problems in temporary solutions. I see even greater problems in solutions such as those proposed by some Democrats, the President, that have suggested that we simply add a new giant IOU to the Social Security Trust Fund and therefore somehow it is calculated that that is going to keep Social Security solvent without any changes in the program. It cannot happen. It will not work. Simply adding another IOU to the Social Security Trust Fund, in effect mandates that taxes will be increased on our kids and our grandkids to pay future benefits.

Mr. Speaker, we can only raise taxes so high, and right now taxes in this country are the highest in history. Partial solutions divert attention for long term solutions and also increase the likelihood of future tax increases.

Both Republicans and Democrats have suggested that until we come up with a long term solution, the Social Security Trust Fund surplus be used to pay down the public debt. However, some people in Washington want to replace the current public debt limit with two debt limits, one for Treasury securities held by the public, and one for IOUs held by the Social Security Trust Fund. This is a bad idea that would send a message that debt owed to the trust fund is less important than the debt owed to Wall Street.

Some want the new statistics so that they can brag about reducing the debt held by the public. That is true, but it does not matter because the total government debt would continue to increase. Others suggest that we could consider writing off the debt owed to the trust fund because really that is just what government owes itself. That is wrong and dangerous.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to fight against any proposal that simply adds a new giant IOU to the trust fund but does not change the system to keep it solvent. I ask my colleagues to oppose temporary solutions which again just demand a tax increase in some future years. Let us step up to the plate, let us do what is necessary to solve Social Security now and keep it solvent for future generations.

A STRONG U.S.-ARMENIAN PARTNERSHIP IS NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, among the international dignitaries coming to Washington this weekend to take part in the NATO summit will be President Robert Kocharian of the Republic of Armenia. Although Armenia is not currently a member of NATO, President Kocharian, like other leaders of new democracies that were captive nations under the Soviet bloc, has been invited to Washington as part of the Partnership for Peace program.

As NATO celebrates its first half century, and particularly now, with NATO forces involved in the first combat operation in the history of the alliance, it is important for us to consider how we can make NATO a meaningful force for peace and security in the next century. We recently took our first major step towards changing the composition of the alliance to recognize the realities of the post-Cold War by admitting three former Warsaw Pact nations: Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. We need to continue this momentum by identifying other democratic nations whose security is important to the United States, who may wish to join NATO in the future.

While Armenia may be a small country, its importance as a strategic asset for the Western alliance should not be minimized. In the months and years following the summit, I hope we will see greater efforts to build on the U.S.-Armenian relationship, and along these lines, I will be circulating a letter among the Members of the House asking the President to devote greater attention to establishing a strong U.S.-Armenian partnership.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, Armenia would be a logical candidate for future NATO expansion, and in the short term, as a closer partner on a wide range of security issues. Armenia is a pro-western Nation, despite its years as part of the Soviet Union. President Kocharian is a legitimately elected head of state who

must answer to a democratically-elected parliament and be held accountable to a free press.

Despite a lack of experience with democracy and despite the security threats posed by hostile nations, Armenia is moving rapidly to establish the institutions of civil society and democratic governments.

On the domestic economic front, Armenia has moved aggressively with a privatization campaign. Small businesses are blossoming. Armenia's success as a free democracy in a region of the world where both of these qualities are lacking makes it a notable example of an emerging Nation that has embraced many of our values against very daunting odds.

On the security front, Mr. Speaker, NATO Secretary General Javier Solano has already met with Armenia defense and national security officials. Armenia's central location at the crossroads between Asia and Europe has been recognized by American officials and our allies, but we need to pay more attention.

Armenia has also earned increased respect from the United States and the Western alliance for its constructive role in the Nagorno Karabagh conflict.

As I have mentioned in this Chamber on several occasions, Nagorno Karabagh is an Armenian-populated region that has declared its independence, but is still claimed by the neighboring Republic of Azerbaijan. A bloody war was fought earlier in this decade, with the Karabagh Armenians successfully defending their homelands. A ceasefire was accepted by both sides in 1994, but a political settlement has not been reached.

Under the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the United States is a cochair of the negotiating group formed to resolve this conflict.

The United States and our OSCE partners have put forward a peace plan to resolve this conflict. Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh have both accepted the American-supported plan as a basis for negotiation, and Azerbaijan unfortunately has rejected the approach. Considering how policymakers in Congress and the administration have identified an establish the Caucasus region as a vital interest, we should do more to reward those countries which are willing to work constructively to resolve longstanding differences.

Mr. Speaker, President Kocharian's visit coincides with an important and tragic date. April 24 is solemnly commemorated as the anniversary of the unleashing of the genocide by the Ottoman Turkish empire of 1915 through 1923 that ultimately claimed the lives of 1.5 million Armenians.

There will be a reception tomorrow evening in commemoration of the genocide, as well as a series of speeches by Members of Congress. We cannot allow the world to forget the genocide. The lesson of the Armenian genocide should not be lost on us as we witness the heartbreaking TV images from Kosovo. Truly, a major justification for the NATO campaign is to try to ensure that the 20th century, which began in genocide, not end in genocide.

Back in the waning years of the Ottoman Empire, when Armenians were being murdered and deported, and their homes and communities burned and destroyed, and all record of the Armenian presence erased, there was no Western alliance of democracies like NATO committed to stopping aggression, brutality and genocide.

I just want to say in conclusion, I want to take this opportunity to express my admiration for our men and women in uniform who are fighting to stop the horrible ethnic cleansing of the Kosovar Albanians. At the same time, I urge the administration to assert far more pressure on Azerbaijan to constructively participate in the Nagorno Karabagh peace process.

As we remember the martyrs of the Armenian genocide, and as we witness the tragic events unfolding today in the Balkans, we must do all in our power to prevent another genocide in the mountains and valleys of Nagorno-Karabagh.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to comment on the upcoming celebration this weekend of the 50th anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and, of course, on the ongoing military operation against Yugoslavia.

The NATO allies will also meet for its annual summit and formally welcome the three new members, Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republics.

I was watching Nightline on Friday evening, Mr. Speaker, and the subject was NATO and its 50th anniversary. In one segment of the program, they went around Washington, D.C. and actually asked different citizens what they believed the role of NATO should be.

Most answered that NATO should be ''peacekeepers for any conflict,'' or that NATO ''should protect humanity,'' or they should stop genocide. With all due respect to their opinions, each of these Americans were not correct about what NATO's initial responsibility should be.

NATO was created to be solely a collective security arrangement for the Western allies against Soviet and Eastern Bloc aggression. NATO came into being 50 years ago when the U.S. joined its allies in signing the treaty on April 4, 1949. The U.S. Senate went on to ratify the treaty on July 21, 1949.

I am concerned with the current operations against Yugoslavia as a NATO operation. NATO does not have the authority under the current treaty terms to engage in the actions against Yugoslavia. By doing so, the stakes have been raised dramatically high. The President has allowed NATO to be put into a position that in order to prove its validity and effectiveness in a post-Cold War world, NATO has to win this war at all costs. This rigidity has prevented the administration and our NATO allies to take the sensible steps on seeking diplomatic solutions.

In fact, the administration last week flatly refused to consider a possible diplomatic opening that Germany was trying to seek with Yugoslavia.

Again, the President is intentionally raising the stakes in this engagement that makes anything less than our all-out victory a defeat. This strategy places U.S. prestige and ability to carry out our will in the world at tremendous risk. As stated before, this operation also brings into question the purpose of NATO in today's world.

The current operation against Yugoslavia is draining our military capability. There are some reports that the Navy was down to 200 cruise missiles in the theater of operation.

Nightline reported last night that out of over 6,000 sorties flown in the last 28 days, only 1,700 have been bombing missions. After 6 years of stretching our military too thin, the administration has placed our Nation's military abilities at dangerously low levels.

The shrinking cruise missile supply, combined with our military having to convert our nuclear-tipped missiles to conventional warheads, places our abilities in a global scale at hazardous levels. If our Nation is faced with a second conflict, the security of the world is at great peril.

During this weekend's NATO summit, the NATO leaders will discuss changing the strategic concept of NATO from a defensive organization towards a more proactive force to combat new global risks such as proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. The administration seems to want NATO to be a global force ready to tackle any trouble in the world.

If this administration seeks to change the basic concept of NATO, it would violate the U.S. Constitution. Here is why. The treaty signed in 1949 was to provide for the defense of Western Europe. Any change to that treaty would require a new treaty, and therefore confirmation by the U.S. Senate by a two-thirds majority.

Mr. Speaker, it seems this administration is out to conduct a military action here. Secretary Madeleine Albright recently stated, ''The military are our regulars now, so this is their job. What else would they be doing if we didn't give them their battles to fight?''

Secretary Albright also recently testified before Congress and said, ''I would rather be up here defending myself for not having a plan than having to defend myself for not doing anything.''

So, Mr. Speaker, when we have this kind of rhetoric from the White House, choosing to use our military in a questionable war because the military has ''nothing better to do,'' or that their use without a strategy is better than ''not doing anything,'' is when events like Vietnam occur.

AMERICA'S EXPORT CONTROL POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss our Nation's export control policy. Obviously, economic growth is a key to a prosperous future in this country, but that fact points out how important exports are.

When we look at the world right now, we have a unique situation where, though the United States represents only 4 percent of the world's population, we currently consume 20 percent of the world's goods, services, and products.

In other words, if we are going to have economic growth in the country, we are going to have to open up foreign markets. We are going to have to export, and take advantage of that 96 percent of the world's population that does not reside in the United States.

When we look at it once again, the recent trade deficit figures just released today show another record trade deficit. There are a lot of issues that contribute to that. Today I would like to talk about just a couple that have to do with our export control policy, the policy of the United States in limiting the number of goods and products that can be exported from this country.

These are limited in a couple of ways. One of them is through what are called unilateral economic sanctions. That is basically where we as a country decide we disapprove of some action of another country, and then decide that we are not going to allow U.S. businesses to export to them.

I completely agree that we as a country need to stand up for things like democratic freedoms, religious freedoms, economic freedoms in the rest of the world, and do everything we can to encourage and promote those, but policies of unilateral economic sanctions do not get us there. Basically, all they do is force those countries to buy their goods from some other place.

The reason for this is the changing economy. As we have all heard, it has become a cliche now, we live in a global economy. What that means is if we attempt to impose our will on another country through unilateral economic sanctions, we will fail. It will not work, because that country can simply go to any one of the other members of this global economy and purchase what they want. All we accomplish in that situation is restricting our own companies' abilities to export.

Multilateral economic sanctions make a certain amount of sense. If we can get enough of our global partners together, as was in the case in South Africa, as is the case in Iraq, to institute export control policies so that it is not just us alone, the United States, then the policies can work and can exercise some influence to make some changes, as they did in South Africa.

What I am opposed to is the proliferation of unilateral economic sanctions that do not succeed in their stated goal and harm our economy. There are several bills in Congress right now that will attempt to change that policy. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the House bill, and I think we need to move in that direction.

I have brought a chart with me to illustrate the point. This chart shows the number of countries in the world that currently have some export controls on them; in other words, the number of countries which U.S. businesses are somehow limited in their ability to export to. We can see that it is a large number of countries, as they are represented in red. They cover a substantial portion of the globe and a substantial number of people; in other words, possible markets that we are losing out on as a country.

If we could change that policy and open up those markets, it could be a boon to U.S. industry, and I must once again point out these policies have not had much effect on changing the policies of the other countries that we want to see changed.

So unilateral economic sanctions have reached the point where they do not work. All they are is bad for U.S. companies. If we want to expand and grow, we are going to need access to these markets. We need to make those changes to get there.

There are a couple of other aspects of our export controls policy right now that are particularly troubling because they focus on technology. In other words, they focus on the highest-growing segment of our economy, and indeed of the world's economy. They are controls on encryption software and on computers.

Basically, the U.S. has a policy right now that basically looks at technology and says, we need to develop the best technology here in this country, and then for national security reasons, we are going to put our arms around it and prevent the rest of the world from getting it, it will be protecting our national security.

There are a number of flaws with this theory, but the biggest one I want to point out is, once again, the global economy. There is access to this technology from other countries other than the U.S. We cannot stop that. By implementing these policies, all we are doing is restricting U.S. companies' ability to participate.

The biggest point I want to make on restrictions of technology, this is not, and I repeat, not a choice between business and national security. If that was the case, absolutely, we would choose national security, end of story. The point is it does not help because these countries access the information elsewhere.

Take encryption as just one example, a simple software designed to protect programs. We restrict the exportation of top-of-the-line encryption technology, but top-of-the-line encryption technology is available from a number of other countries, and in fact we can download it off the Internet.

Our restrictions do not prevent these other countries from getting it, they only prevent our countries from being the ones that are able to sell it. In the long run this even harms national security by restricting our ability to develop the next best technology. We need to reexamine our policy of export controls for all of these reasons.

SUPPORT THE AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, it is crucial that the United States encourages economically reforming African countries. One of the ways to do that would be to pass the African Growth and Opportunity Act, a bill that will really put Africa on the course of joining the world economy.

Africa is the poorest continent today, largely because of the state-dominated development strategy that predominated for the first three decades of its era of independence. It was called African socialism, and it did not work for Africa. It did not work for Africa any better than it worked in Eastern Europe.

□ 1300

Those economic policies help explain the difference today between a country like Ghana in West Africa and South Korea. In the early 1960s these two countries had similar per capita incomes. Ghana and most of Africa took the route of socialism, and they paid a very heavy price as a result.

Now, fortunately, many African countries, including Ghana, have changed course ever since the Berlin Wall came down. Ever since the West and Third World countries began to look at what had actually happened in Eastern Europe and in the former Soviet Union, they began liberalizing their economies. They began permitting private ownership of assets and becoming more welcoming of foreign investment and implementing the rule of law.

These reforms, which were encouraged by the United States and were undertaken with considerable political difficulty, have produced desirable results in many African countries. Many countries are seeing consistent economic growth of higher than 5 percent.

In some, it is 10 percent, up to 17 percent growth rates per year.

These reforms advance America's many interests in Africa. It is very important when we think about this to realize that, realistically, the U.S. could not isolate itself from a 21st Century where Africa is suffering with increased war and social upheaval and environmental degradation or international terrorism and drug trafficking.

Growing economic means for Africa is an antidote for this scenario, translating into improved educational and health services, better environmental protections and greater social stability.

President Museveni said that to meet all of the health and education needs of Uganda, they would have to build the tax base through economic reforms and introduce free enterprise. That is exactly what they have done, with very positive results.

So recovering African economies already offer the U.S. significant commercial opportunities. While African countries are still in the early stages of economic reform, America's growing exports, exports to Africa already total $6 billion per year. That supports 100,000 American jobs. American investment on the continent is increasing. American corporations, looking beyond the headlines of civil strife, are clearly recognizing opportunities in Africa.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act would strengthen these positive trends by putting Africa more firmly on the trade and investment map. This legislation would encourage qualifying African countries in annual, high-level trade forums, modeled after forums the U.S. holds with other regions of the world, to continue along this route of reducing tariffs and reforming the economy. These forums would have symbolic value, demonstrating that the world's most powerful economy takes Africa's economic development seriously.

American exporters and investors stand to benefit by the African Growth and Opportunity Act. Qualifying African countries would be reducing barriers to American goods and investment, including reducing tariffs and regulatory burdens and protecting private property. In other words, this legislation treats trade and investment as a two-way street.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act has received strong support from American businesses, particularly those already engaged in Africa and aware of the opportunities. There should be a sense of urgency about the African Growth and Opportunity Act. There should be a sense of urgency about Africa itself.

While several African countries are making encouraging economic progress, others are not. Africa's share of world trade and developing world foreign direct investment is small. Unless these trends are reversed, Africa runs a real risk of becoming economically irrelevant. I urge passage of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

AGOA promises to make Africa more relevant to the world economy. That is why it enjoys the support of virtually every African country.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act is not a panacea for Africa's many challenges. But it would help.

While modest from an American perspective, AGOA promises tangible benefits and a psychological boost to those African countries wishing to become economic partners with the U.S.

This is the least we can do for countries fighting their best against the continent's economic marginalization, and worse.

Having encouraged difficult market-opening reforms, denying greater market access for a modest amount of African goods disrespects our many interests in Africa.

It is also indefensible policy toward the world's poorest continent just as it is developing some momentum.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this Act when it reaches the House floor.

CHINESE ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, I came to the floor to speak about the escalating rush of illegal immigrants coming from the People's Republic of China directly into Guam. Just within the past week, another 257 more illegal immigrants coming from the People's Republic were apprehended at sea and brought to shore.

Last Thursday, on April 15, 152 Chinese nationals suspected of trying to enter Guam were interdicted by the U.S. Coast Guard. Fortunately, as a result of the efforts of my office, the governor's office, and I think a sensible policy pursued by the White House, and the cooperation of the government of the Northern Marianas, this vessel, instead of being taken to Guam, was taken to the Northern Marianas, where it was assumed because of the differing laws which are applicable to the Commonwealth, these nationals of the People's Republic of China will be more easily repatriated back to China.

Immediately after that vessel was detained, another vessel carrying 105 nationals from the People's Republic of China docked at Apra Harbor on Guam. This was yet the largest single apprehension on Guam, with 34 women and at least 6 juveniles.

According to the INS, the number of apprehended illegal immigrants from the People's Republic caught on Guam since January this year is now up to 585. As I have informed the House before and people of this country, these immigrants are coming directly from Fukien Province, are paying crime syndicates anywhere from $10,000 to $30,000 to ship them to the United States. Guam being the closest American territory, these criminal organizations then funnel them right into our island, and we are now experiencing boat landings nearly every 2 to 4 days.

Upon arrival, these people who are being sent to Guam by criminal organizations are eventually apprehended by primarily local officials, turned over to Federal officials, and they are expected to apply for some form of asylum.

Mr. Speaker, what we see here is a clear exploitation of INA, the Immigration and Naturalization Act, as it is applicable to Guam, by Chinese crime syndicates. Chinese nationals who succeed in finding employment inside the United States, who have come to this dream, are actually turned into indentured servants with no legal papers and immense debts to pay. They continue to pay off these Chinese crime syndicates, even after they are in the United States, for well over a decade. This is a criminal activity which must end.

Now we have this humanitarian crisis on the high seas. It takes approximately anywhere from 10 to 15 days on these decrepit vessels, which are expected to simply take a one-way trip from Fukien Province in China.

This has created a number of crises on Guam. It has created a resource crisis. The INS does not have any funds to attend to these, so it has been left up to the government of Guam to feed them, house them, and clothe them. Now over 400 Chinese nationals are currently being housed in a Guam facility with a capacity of 150 at a cost of approximately $97 per immigrant per day.

The government of Guam estimates that the total expense for apprehending, staffing, housing, and detaining these illegal immigrants from the People's Republic has cost the people of Guam nearly $2.5 million. This is a Federal responsibility. No State in the Union would put up with this.

There is also a potential environmental crisis as these boats deliberately run aground on our reefs. There is also a potential health crisis. In one shipment of these illegal immigrants, well over half of the illegal immigrants were tested positive for TB.

Over the past few days, I have had several meetings, including officials at the Department of Justice, officials in the National Security Council and the White House, and I am happy to report that they have taken some action on this. But the Federal Government needs to take clearly more responsibility over this.

It is very interesting to note that, as widely reported in the news about 2½ weeks ago, Guam was considered a possible destination point for Kosovar refugees. It was estimated that Guam may have to house as many as 5,000 to 10,000 Kosovar refugees.

Everyone willingly acknowledged that the Federal Government would be responsible for such an eventuality on Guam. Yet, in this particular instance where we are talking about 400 illegal

Chinese immigrants for a Federal responsibility, the Federal Government today has not paid the government of Guam and is now only beginning to become engaged in the process.

I urge my colleagues to take a good look at this issue. I have introduced H.R. 945 to address the issue of the applicability of the INA to Guam.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2:00 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2:00 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Here in the peaceful beauty of this place, we remember those who at this moment experience the stress of conflict and know not the peace that we enjoy. In our prayer we bring to mind the men and women who face risk this day in a far off land.

We remember all who suffer and know the travail of hunger and violence. We commend those who care for the refugee and the homeless, those who give food to the hungry and shelter to those in great need.

We earnestly pray for resolution to the conflict, a resolution, as the Scripture says, where justice will flow down as waters and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream.

You have promised in Your word, O gracious God, that Your spirit abides with each one, and we pray this day that Your spirit will abide with us and with every person, whatever their place or special need. In Your name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ 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.

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF PRIVATE CALENDAR ON TODAY

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous concept to dispense with the call of the Private Calendar today.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 800, EDUCATION FLEXIBILITY PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 1999

Mr. GOODLING submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 800) to provide for education flexibility partnerships:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 106–100)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 800), to provide for education flexibility partnerships, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Education Flexibility Partnership Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) States differ substantially in demographics, in school governance, and in school finance and funding. The administrative and funding mechanisms that help schools in 1 State improve may not prove successful in other States.

(2) Although the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and other Federal education statutes afford flexibility to State educational agencies and local educational agencies in implementing Federal programs, certain requirements of Federal education statutes or regulations may impede local efforts to reform and improve education.

(3) By granting waivers of certain statutory and regulatory requirements, the Federal Government can remove impediments for local educational agencies in implementing educational reforms and raising the achievement levels of all children.

(4) State educational agencies are closer to local school systems, implement statewide educational reforms with both Federal and State funds, and are responsible for maintaining accountability for local activities consistent with State standards and assessment systems. Therefore, State educational agencies are often in the best position to align waivers of Federal and State requirements with State and local initiatives.

(5) The Education Flexibility Partnership Demonstration Act allows State educational agencies the flexibility to waive certain Federal requirements, along with related State requirements, but allows only 12 States to qualify for such waivers.

(6) Expansion of waiver authority will allow for the waiver of statutory and regulatory requirements that impede implementation of State and local educational improvement plans, or that unnecessarily burden program administration, while maintaining the intent and purposes of affected programs, such as the important focus on improving mathematics and science performance under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program), and maintaining such fundamental requirements as those relating to civil rights, educational equity, and accountability.

(7) To achieve the State goals for the education of children in the State, the focus must be on results in raising the achievement of all students, not process.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY; STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY; OUTLYING AREA.—The terms ''local educational agency'', ''State educational agency'', and ''outlying area'' have the meanings given the terms in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(2) ELIGIBLE SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AREA; SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AREA.—The terms ''eligible school attendance area'' and ''school attendance area'' have the meanings given the terms in section 1113(a)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

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

(4) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and each outlying area.

SEC. 4. EDUCATION FLEXIBILITY PARTNERSHIP.

(a) EDUCATIONAL FLEXIBILITY PROGRAM.—

(1) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out an educational flexibility program under which the Secretary authorizes a State educational agency that serves an eligible State to waive statutory or regulatory requirements applicable to 1 or more programs described in subsection (b), other than requirements described in subsection (c), for any local educational agency or school within the State.

(B) DESIGNATION.—Each eligible State participating in the program described in subparagraph (A) shall be known as an ''Ed-Flex Partnership State''.

(2) ELIGIBLE STATE.—For the purpose of this section the term ''eligible State'' means a State that—

(A) has—

(i) developed and implemented the challenging State content standards, challenging State student performance standards, and aligned assessments described in section 1111(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for which local educational agencies in the State are producing the individual school performance profiles required by section 1116(a)(3) of such Act; or

(ii)(I) developed and implemented the content standards described in clause (i);

(II) developed and implemented interim assessments; and

(III) made substantial progress (as determined by the Secretary) toward developing and implementing the performance standards and final aligned assessments described in clause (i), and toward having local educational agencies in the State produce the profiles described in clause (i);

(B) holds local educational agencies and schools accountable for meeting the educational goals described in the local applications submitted under paragraph (4) and for engaging in technical assistance and corrective actions consistent with section 1116 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, for the local educational agencies and schools that do not make adequate yearly progress as described in section 1111(b)(2) of such Act; and

(C) waives State statutory or regulatory requirements relating to education while holding local educational agencies or schools within the State that are affected by such waivers accountable for the performance of the students who are affected by such waivers.

(3) STATE APPLICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each State educational agency desiring to participate in the educational flexibility program under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require. Each such application shall demonstrate that the eligible State has adopted an educational flexibility plan for the State that includes—

(i) a description of the process the State educational agency will use to evaluate applications from local educational agencies or schools requesting waivers of—

(I) Federal statutory or regulatory requirements as described in paragraph (1)(A); and

(II) State statutory or regulatory requirements relating to education;

(ii) a detailed description of the State statutory and regulatory requirements relating to education that the State educational agency will waive;

(iii) a description of clear educational objectives the State intends to meet under the educational flexibility plan;

(iv) a description of how the educational flexibility plan is consistent with and will assist in implementing the State comprehensive reform plan or, if a State does not have a comprehensive reform plan, a description of how the educational flexibility plan is coordinated with activities described in section 1111(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(v) a description of how the State educational agency will evaluate, (consistent with the requirements of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), the performance of students in the schools and local educational agencies affected by the waivers; and

(vi) a description of how the State educational agency will meet the requirements of paragraph (8).

(B) APPROVAL AND CONSIDERATIONS.—The Secretary may approve an application described in subparagraph (A) only if the Secretary determines that such application demonstrates substantial promise of assisting the State educational agency and affected local educational agencies and schools within the State in carrying out comprehensive educational reform, after considering—

(i) the eligibility of the State as described in paragraph (2);

(ii) the comprehensiveness and quality of the educational flexibility plan described in subparagraph (A);

(iii) the ability of the educational flexibility plan to ensure accountability for the activities and goals described in such plan;

(iv) the degree to which the State's objectives described in subparagraph (A)(iii)—

(I) are clear and have the ability to be assessed; and

(II) take into account the performance of local educational agencies or schools, and students, particularly those affected by waivers;

(v) the significance of the State statutory or regulatory requirements relating to education that will be waived; and

(vi) the quality of the State educational agency's process for approving applications for waivers of Federal statutory or regulatory requirements as described in paragraph (1)(A) and for monitoring and evaluating the results of such waivers.

(4) LOCAL APPLICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each local educational agency or school requesting a waiver of a Federal statutory or regulatory requirement as described in paragraph (1)(A) and any relevant State statutory or regulatory requirement from a State educational agency shall submit an application to the State educational agency at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the State educational agency may reasonably require. Each such application shall—

(i) indicate each Federal program affected and each statutory or regulatory requirement that will be waived;

(ii) describe the purposes and overall expected results of waiving each such requirement;

(iii) describe, for each school year, specific, measurable, educational goals for each local educational agency or school affected by the proposed waiver, and for the students served by the local educational agency or school who are affected by the waiver;

(iv) explain why the waiver will assist the local educational agency or school in reaching such goals; and

(v) in the case of an application from a local educational agency, describe how the local educational agency will meet the requirements of paragraph (8).

(B) EVALUATION OF APPLICATIONS.—A State educational agency shall evaluate an application submitted under subparagraph (A) in accordance with the State's educational flexibility plan described in paragraph (3)(A).

(C) APPROVAL.—A State educational agency shall not approve an application for a waiver under this paragraph unless—

(i) the local educational agency or school requesting such waiver has developed a local reform plan that is applicable to such agency or school, respectively;

(ii) the waiver of Federal statutory or regulatory requirements as described in paragraph (1)(A) will assist the local educational agency or school in reaching its educational goals, particularly goals with respect to school and student performance; and

(iii) the State educational agency is satisfied that the underlying purposes of the statutory requirements of each program for which a waiver is granted will continue to be met.

(D) TERMINATION.—The State educational agency shall annually review the performance of any local educational agency or school granted a waiver of Federal statutory or regulatory requirements as described in paragraph (1)(A) in accordance with the evaluation requirement described in paragraph (3)(A)(v), and shall terminate any waiver granted to the local educational agency or school if the State educational agency determines, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing, that the local educational agency or school's performance with respect to meeting the accountability requirement described in paragraph (2)(C) and the goals described in paragraph (4)(A)(iii)—

(i) has been inadequate to justify continuation of such waiver; or

(ii) has decreased for 2 consecutive years, unless the State educational agency determines that the decrease in performance was justified due to exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances.

(5) OVERSIGHT AND REPORTING.—

(A) OVERSIGHT.—Each State educational agency participating in the educational flexibility program under this section shall annually monitor the activities of local educational agencies and schools receiving waivers under this section.

(B) STATE REPORTS.—

(i) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The State educational agency shall submit to the Secretary an annual report on the results of such oversight and the impact of the waivers on school and student performance.

(ii) PERFORMANCE DATA.—Not later than 2 years after the date a State is designated an Ed-Flex Partnership State, each such State shall include, as part of the State's annual report submitted under clause (i), data demonstrating the degree to which progress has been made toward meeting the State's educational objectives. The data, when applicable, shall include—

(I) information on the total number of waivers granted for Federal and State statutory and regulatory requirements under this section, including the number of waivers granted for each type of waiver;

(II) information describing the effect of the waivers on the implementation of State and local educational reforms pertaining to school and student performance;

(III) information describing the relationship of the waivers to the performance of schools and students affected by the waivers; and

(IV) an assurance from State program managers that the data reported under this section are reliable, complete, and accurate, as defined by the State, or a description of a plan for improving the reliability, completeness, and accuracy of such data as defined by the State.

(C) SECRETARY'S REPORTS.—The Secretary, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, shall—

(i) make each State report submitted under subparagraph (B) available to Congress and the public; and

(ii) submit to Congress a report that summarizes the State reports and describes the effects that the educational flexibility program under this section had on the implementation of State and local educational reforms and on the performance of students affected by the waivers.

(6) DURATION OF FEDERAL WAIVERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall not approve the application of a State educational agency under paragraph (3) for a period exceeding 5 years, except that the Secretary may extend such period if the Secretary determines that such agency's authority to grant waivers—

(i) has been effective in enabling such State or affected local educational agencies or schools to carry out their State or local reform plans and to continue to meet the accountability requirement described in paragraph (2)(C); and

(ii) has improved student performance.

(B) PERFORMANCE REVIEW.—Three years after the date a State is designated an Ed-Flex Partnership State, the Secretary shall review the performance of the State educational agency in granting waivers of Federal statutory or regulatory requirements as described in paragraph (1)(A) and shall terminate such agency's authority to grant such waivers if the Secretary determines, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing, that such agency's performance (including performance with respect to meeting the objectives described in paragraph (3)(A)(iii)) has been inadequate to justify continuation of such authority.

(C) RENEWAL.—In deciding whether to extend a request for a State educational agency's authority to issue waivers under this section, the Secretary shall review the progress of the State educational agency to determine if the State educational agency—

(i) has made progress toward achieving the objectives described in the application submitted pursuant to paragraph (3)(A)(iii); and

(ii) demonstrates in the request that local educational agencies or schools affected by the waiver authority or waivers have made progress toward achieving the desired results described in the application submitted pursuant to paragraph (4)(A)(iii).

(7) AUTHORITY TO ISSUE WAIVERS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary is authorized to carry out the educational flexibility program under this section for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2004.

(8) PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT.—Each State educational agency seeking waiver authority under this section and each local educational agency seeking a waiver under this section—

(A) shall provide the public with adequate and efficient notice of the proposed waiver authority or waiver, consisting of a description of the agency's application for the proposed waiver authority or waiver in a widely read or distributed medium, including a description of any improved student performance that is expected to result from the waiver authority or waiver;

(B) shall provide the opportunity for parents, educators, and all other interested members of the community to comment regarding the proposed waiver authority or waiver;

(C) shall provide the opportunity described in subparagraph (B) in accordance with any applicable State law specifying how the comments may be received, and how the comments may be reviewed by any member of the public; and

(D) shall submit the comments received with the agency's application to the Secretary or the State educational agency, as appropriate.

(b) INCLUDED PROGRAMS.—The statutory or regulatory requirements referred to in subsection (a)(1)(A) are any such requirements for programs carried out under the following provisions:

(1) Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (other than subsections (a) and (c) of section 1116 of such Act).

(2) Part B of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(3) Subpart 2 of part A of title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (other than section 3136 of such Act).

(4) Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(5) Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(6) Part C of title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(7) The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998.

(c) WAIVERS NOT AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary and the State educational agency may not waive under subsection (a)(1)(A) any statutory or regulatory requirement—

(1) relating to—

(A) maintenance of effort;

(B) comparability of services;

(C) equitable participation of students and professional staff in private schools;

(D) parental participation and involvement;

(E) distribution of funds to States or to local educational agencies;

(F) serving eligible school attendance areas in rank order under section 1113(a)(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(G) the selection of a school attendance area or school under subsections (a) and (b) of section 1113 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, except that a State educational agency may grant a waiver to allow a school attendance area or school to participate in activities under part A of title I of such Act if the percentage of children from low-income families in the school attendance area of such school or who attend such school is not less than 10 percentage points below the lowest percentage of such children for any school attendance area or school of the local educational agency that meets the requirements of such subsections (a) and (b);

(H) use of Federal funds to supplement, not supplant, non-Federal funds; and

(I) applicable civil rights requirements; and

(2) unless the underlying purposes of the statutory requirements of the program for which a waiver is granted continue to be met to the satisfaction of the Secretary.

(d) TREATMENT OF EXISTING ED-FLEX PARTNERSHIP STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (3) and (4), this section shall not apply to a State educational agency that has been granted waiver authority under the provisions of law described in paragraph (2) for the duration of the waiver authority.

(2) APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—The provisions of law referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) Section 311(e) of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act.

(B) The proviso referring to such section 311(e) under the heading ''EDUCATION REFORM'' in the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 1996 (Public Law 104–134; 110 Stat. 1321–229).

(3) SPECIAL RULE.—If a State educational agency granted waiver authority pursuant to the provisions of law described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (2) applies to the Secretary for waiver authority under this section—

(A) the Secretary shall review the progress of the State educational agency in achieving the objectives set forth in the application submitted pursuant to section 311(e) of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act; and

(B) the Secretary shall administer the waiver authority granted under this section in accordance with the requirements of this section.

(4) TECHNOLOGY.—In the case of a State educational agency granted waiver authority under the provisions of law described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (2), the Secretary shall permit a State educational agency to expand, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, the waiver authority to include programs under subpart 2 of part A of title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (other than section 3136 of such Act).

(e) PUBLICATION.—A notice of the Secretary's decision to authorize State educational agencies to issue waivers under this section, including a description of the rationale the Secretary used to approve applications under subsection (a)(3)(B), shall be published in the Federal Register and the Secretary shall provide for the dissemination of such notice to State educational agencies, interested parties (including educators, parents, students, and advocacy and civil rights organizations), and the public.

SEC. 5. FLEXIBILITY TO DESIGN CLASS SIZE REDUCTION PROGRAMS.

Section 307 of the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 1999, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting ''(except as provided in subsection (c)(2)(D))'' before the period; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2), by adding at the end the following:

''(D) If a local educational agency has already reduced class size in the early grades to 18 or fewer children and intends to use funds provided under this section to carry out professional development activities, including activities to improve teacher quality, then the State shall make the award under subsection (b) to the local educational agency without requiring the formation of a consortium.''.

SEC. 6. ALTERNATIVE EDUCATIONAL SETTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 615(k)(1)(A)(ii)(I) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1415(k)(1)(A)(ii)(I)) is amended to read as follows:

''(I) the child carries or possesses a weapon to or at school, on school premises, or to or at a school function under the jurisdiction of a State or a local educational agency; or''.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to conduct occurring not earlier than the date of enactment of this Act.

And the Senate agree to the same.

BILL GOODLING,
PETER HOEKSTRA,
MICHAEL N. CASTLE,
JAMES GREENWOOD,
MARK SOUDER,
BOB SCHAFFER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JIM JEFFORDS,
JUDD GREGG,
BILL FRIST,
MIKE DEWINE,
MICHAEL B. ENZI,
TIM HUTCHINSON,
SUSAN COLLINS,
SAM BROWNBACK,
CHUCK HAGEL,
JEFF SESSIONS,
TED KENNEDY,
CHRIS DODD,
TOM HARKIN,
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,
JEFF BINGAMAN,
PATTY MURRAY,
JACK REED,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 800) to provide for education flexibility partnerships, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

SHORT TITLE

1. Both the House bill and the Senate amendment are identical in this section.

FINDINGS

2. The findings are identical in both the House bill and the Senate amendment except for finding (6). See note 3.

Descriptive note.

3. The House bill, but not the Senate amendment, mentions the important focus on math and science in the Eisenhower Professional Development Program as an example of the intent and purposes of programs to be maintained under Ed-Flex.

The Senate recedes.

DEFINITIONS

4. The House bill, but not the Senate amendment, contains two additional definitions. Those are: ''attendance area'' because this term is mentioned in (c)(F), which defines an unauthorized Title I school eligibility waiver and ''Ed-Flex Partnership State'' in order to make clear that the term refers to an eligible state. The Senate amendment, but not the House bill includes a definition of ''outlying areas''. The House bill refers to this definition under ESEA.

The Senate recedes on attendance area. The House recedes on Ed-Flex Partnership State and the Senate recedes with an amendment to include cross-reference to the definition of ''outlying area.''

EDUCATION FLEXIBILITY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

5. The Senate amendment, but not the House bill, in Part (a)(1)(A) does not permit the State to waive requirements on itself.

The House recedes.

ELIGIBLE STATE

6. The House bill requires a state to have implemented more of their Title I plan than the Senate amendment. See Notes 7 and 8. The House bill and the Senate amendment differ in how they measure the performance of local applicants. See Note 9.

7. The Senate amendment but not the House bill, includes the phrase, ''including the requirements of that section relating to disaggregation of data.'' The House bill refers to disaggregation of data by reference.

The Senate recedes. Provisions regarding disaggregation of data are included in the portion of section 1111(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which deals with assessments. These provisions were highlighted in the Senate bill, but specific reference to them was not included in the conference agreement. Conferees were concerned that a specific reference to only one of the requirements of section 1111(b) could create the inaccurate impression that States wanting to participate in the educational flexibility programs would be held to requirements beyond those currently in the law.

8. The House bill requires content standards and interim assessments to be in place, in addition to having made substantial progress towards developing and implementing performance standards and final aligned assessments. The Senate amendment requires substantial progress for content and performance standards as well as final aligned assessments.

The Senate recedes. The Conferees would like to clarify congressional intent with respect to State compliance with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I, Part A, standards and assessment requirements (Sec. 1111(b)) as an eligibility criterion both for Ed-Flex authority under H.R. 800 and for participation in ESEA, Title 1, Part A. Under both Ed-Flex and Title 1, Part A, uniform State standards and uniform State assessments are not required as a condition for either being granted Ed-Flex authority or continuing to receive financial assistance under Title 1, Part A. However, if a State does not have uniform State standards and assessments, the State must have in effect, or be making substantial progress toward having in effect, local standards and assessments approved by the State in order for the State to be granted Ed-Flex authority. The Conferees expect the Department of Education to maintain its current interpretation of the provisions of ESEA, Title 1, Section 1111(b) as published in the policy guidance in 1997. This guidance reflects the understanding of the Conferees that States, such as Nebraska and Iowa, can comply with section 1111(b) of Title 1, Part A if the State has implemented uniform statewide standards and assessments, has a statewide system with local standards and assessments approved by the State; or has local standards or assessments approved by the State on the basis of models or criteria to ensure challenging standards and high quality, aligned assessments.

9. The House bill requires states to hold LEAs and schools accountable for meeting goals listed in waiver applications to be eligible. The Senate amendment has an additional requirement that States are implementing corrective action measures under Title I for schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress.

The Senate recedes with an amendment to insert the words ''and for engaging in the technical assistance and corrective actions consistent with section 1116 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, for the local educational agencies and schools that do not make adequate yearly progress as described in section 1111(b) of that Act'' after ''paragraph (4)''.

STATE APPLICATION

10. The House bill and Senate amendment differ in how States are to measure and set objectives. See Note 11–14.

11. The House bill, but not the Senate amendment, requires states to describe specific objectives in their application.

The Senate recedes with an amendment to delete ''specific'' and insert ''clear.''

12. The Senate amendment, but not the House bill requires state applications to reference State comprehensive plans or Section 1111(b) of ESEA (Title I standards and assessments).

The House recedes.

13. The House bill, but not the Senate amendment, requires local *progress* to be measured by using the local applicants' objectives, as defined by the section of the bill (a)(4)(A)(iii) requiring local applicants to set specific and measurable goals for schools and groups of students affected by waivers. The Senate amendment, but not the House bill, requires States to evaluate the *performance* of local applicants and students affected by waivers in general, not defined by local applications.

The House recedes.

14. Both the House bill and the Senate amendment require States to describe how they will notify the public of waivers granted. The House bill requires States to provide assurances that it will provide notice with a minimum requirement of 30 days or in accordance with state law. The Senate amendment requires ''adequate and efficient'' notice and opportunity for comment. See note 18 for local comment and notice.

The House recedes.

APPROVAL AND CONSIDERATIONS

15. The Senate amendment, but not the House bill, explicitly requires the Secretary to consider a state's eligibility for Ed-Flex in approving their application. The House bill, but not the Senate amendment requires the Secretary to evaluate their objectives according to their specificity and their connection to students, schools and districts.

The Senate recedes with an amendment to add (B)(i) from the Senate bill and to revise (B)(iii) of the House bill to read as follows: ''(iii) the degree to which the State's objectives described in subparagraph (A)(iii)—

''(I) are clear and have the ability to be assessed; and

''(II) take into account the performance of local educational agencies or schools and students, particularly those affected by waivers.''

LOCAL APPLICATION

16. Both the House bill and the Senate amendment are identical with the exception of (iii) and (v). See notes 17 and 18.

17. The House bill, but not the Senate amendment, requires goals for each *group of students* affected by a proposed waiver, in addition to the LEA or school.

The Senate recedes with an amendment to revise ''(iii)'' to read as follows:

(iii) describe, for each school year, specific, measurable, educational goals for each local educational agency or school affected by the proposed waiver and their students;

18. Local public notice and comment: See Note 14.

The House recedes.

EVALUATION OF APPLICATIONS

19. Both the House bill and the Senate amendment are identical.

20. The Senate amendment stipulates that the SEA should consider how a waiver will help improve school and student performance when evaluating applications. The House bill requires the SEA to be satisfied that the LEA or school will continue to meet the underlying purposes of the statues included in this legislation.

The House and Senate recede taking both provisions.

21. The House bill requires a statistically significant decrease for two consecutive years until waivers can be terminated. The Senate amendment requires termination if performance has been ''inadequate'' to justify continuing the waiver.

The House recedes with an amendment to have the title read ''Termination'' and to insert at the end of (5)(B) of the Senate bill the following: ''or has decreased for two consecutive years (unless the State educational agency determines that the decrease in performance was justified due to exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances).''

OVERSIGHT AND REPORTING

22. The House bill entitles this section OVERSIGHT AND REPORTING. The Senate amendment entitles this section ''MONITORING AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW.''

The Senate recedes.

23. The House bill, but not the Senate amendment, stipulates that monitoring ''shall include a review of relevant audit, technical assistance, evaluation, and performance reports.'' Both the House bill and the Senate amendment require states to submit an annual report, but the House bill states this in (ii) and the Senate amendment states this in (i).

The Senate recedes with an amendment to strike ''Such monitoring shall include a review of relevant audit, technical assistance, evaluation, and performance reports.'' While not listing in statute the specific reports to be reviewed, the conferees anticipate that State educational agencies will utilize these resources in their monitoring of local educational agencies and schools which have received waivers.

24. The House bill and the Senate amendment require states to submit performance data. However, the House bill, but not the Senate amendment, requires States to submit performance data after two years of being an Ed-Flex state.

The Senate recedes.

PROGRESS REPORTS

25. The House bill requires the Secretary to report to Congress on an annual basis the impact of Ed-Flex on performance objectives and to make state reports available to Congress. The Senate amendment requires a report to Congress after the first year and biennially thereafter. In general, the Senate amendment requires the Secretary to report what the House bill prescribes for the states. The Senate amendment in (1) requires the Secretary to describe the federal statutes and regulations for which they have received waiver authority. The House bill but not the Senate amendment specifies the type of information to be reported on waivers granted. The Senate amendment only requires information on waivers of state regulations and statutes. The House bill, but not the Senate amendment requires specific data on types of waivers granted and requires a report on the relationship between the waivers and meeting objectives. The Senate amendment in 3 and 4 requires that they describe ''the effect'' on implementation of reforms and student performance. (cf. Note 38).

The Senate recedes with an amendment to: (a) change (B)(i)(II) to read as follows—''information describing the effect of waivers granted on the implementation of State and local educational reforms pertaining to school and student performance;'' (b) add a new (B)(i)(III) to read as follows—''information describing the relationship of waivers granted to the performance of schools and students affected by the waivers.'' (c) add a new (B)(i)(IV) ''an assurance from State program managers that the data reported under this section are reliable, complete, and accurate, as defined by the State, or a description of a plan for improving the reliability, completeness, and accuracy of such data as defined by the State.'' (d) change (B)(ii)(II) to read as follows—''submit to Congress a report that summarizes the State reports ensuring that such reports address the effect that the educational flexibility program under this section has had on the implementation of State and local educational reforms and on the performance of students affected by the waivers.''

DURATION OF FEDERAL WAIVERS

26. The Senate amendment, but not the House bill, requires that states ''continue to meet the accountability requirements described in subsection (a)(2)(B), and has improved student performance'' in order for authority to be extended.

The House recedes.

PERFORMANCE REVIEW

27. The House bill requires that the Secretary review the performance of States after three years of being an Ed-Flex State. The Senate amendment requires the Secretary to review the performance of States ''periodically.''

The House recedes with an amendment specifying that the review be conducted three years after designation and to insert '', including meeting the objectives described in paragraph (3)(A)(iii),'' after ''performance''.

AUTHORITY TO ISSUE WAIVERS

28. The House bill authorizes this program beginning in FY 1999. The Senate amendment begins this authorization in FY 2000.

The Senate recedes.

PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT

29. See Notes 14 and 18.

The House recedes with an amendment to insert after ''waiver'' in line 6 '', including a description of any improved performance of students that is expected to result from the waiver authority or waiver,'' and to insert after ''received'' on line 11 ''and made available for review by any member of the public,''.

INCLUDED PROGRAMS

30. The House bill and the Senate amendment are identical except that subsection 4(b)(1) of the Senate amendment excludes the Local Review and School Improvement sections of Title I.

The House recedes. It is the intent of the conferees that, if an LEA has higher standards than the State standard, then locally approved standards may be used for purposes of determining schools in need of improvement or need for corrective action.

WAIVERS NOT AUTHORIZED

31. The Senate amendment specifies that the Secretary and the State may not waive these provisions. The House bill only addresses the Secretary.

The House recedes.

TITLE I WAIVERS

32. The House bill prohibits Title I school eligibility waivers unless they are marginally below the necessary poverty level. The Senate amendment prohibits waivers of Title I rank-order requirements for schools with more than 75% poverty.

The House recedes on Senate language and the Senate recedes on House language with an amendment changing the low-income percentage from within 5 percentage points to 10 percentage points, and clarifying the applicable subsections of section 1113 of Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

TREATMENT OF EXISTING ED-FLEX STATES

33. The House bill protects the authority of current Ed-Flex States by stating that this Act does not apply to them until they apply to renew their authority. The Senate amendment permanently exempts existing Ed-Flex States from being affected by this statute.

The Senate recedes with an amendment which makes clear that the performance of the current 12 Ed-Flex States will be judged, when they re-apply for Ed-Flex status at the end of their current 5 year period, on the basis of section 311(e) of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. The application itself, must conform to the new requirements of the Education Flexibility Partnership Act. The amendment also provides that, upon enactment of this Act, the 12 existing Ed-Flex States may exercise Ed-Flex waiver authority with respect to the technology programs under subpart 2 of part A of Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (other than section 3136 of such Act).

RENEWAL

34. The House bill stipulates when renewing Ed-Flex Authority, the Secretary must determine whether SEAs have made measureable progress in accordance with their measurable objectives, as well as whether SEAs demonstrate that LEAs or schools have made measurable progress. The House bill also exempts current Ed-Flex States (see Note 33). The Senate amendment requires the Secretary to review generally the progress of those affected by Ed-Flex authority or waivers towards meeting goals set in local applications.

The Senate recedes with an amendment striking the word ''measurable'' in (e)(1)(A) and (B) and changing the word ''Accountability'' in the heading to ''Renewal''.

35. The House bill, but not the Senate amendment, clarifies that when current Ed-Flex States apply to renew their authority, their progress should be measured in accordance with the terms under which they were granted their authority. However, when their authority expires and they receive renewed authority this law will apply to them.

The Senate recedes. The conferees have addressed renewal for the 12 Ed-Flex States in note 33.

PUBLICATION

36. The Senate amendment, but not the House bill, requires the Secretary to include the rationale for granting a State Ed-Flex authority when publishing notice in the Federal Register.

The House recedes.

EFFECTIVE DATE

37. The House bill, but not the Senate amendment, sunsets this law when ESEA reauthorization is enacted.

The House recedes. The Conferees believe that when the Congress considers the Elementary and Secondary Education Act it will have to take into consideration the changes made to this Act and make whatever changes and adjustments are required to ensure that both laws operate in a coordinated fashion so as to provide as much flexibility as possible to States and local educational agencies.

FLEXIBILITY TO DESIGN CLASS SIZE REDUCTION

38. The Senate amendment, but not the House bill, includes findings stating the impact of fully funding IDEA and amends the 1999 Omnibus Appropriations Act to allow LEAs to use class size reduction funds for IDEA part B.

The Senate recedes with an amendment providing that, if a local educational agency has a class size in grades 1 through 3 of 18 or fewer children, the local educational agency may use the funds made available for class-size reduction under the Department of Education Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999 for professional development without entering into a consortia.

Currently, a local educational agency that is eligible for amounts less than the starting salary for a teacher must form a consortium in order to receive any class-size reduction funds. Under the conference agreement, such an agency would still have to form a consortium if it does not meet the criteria of having a class size in grades 1 through 3 of 18 or fewer children or if it plans to use the funds to reduce class size. Such an agency would not have to form a consortium if it has a class size in grades 1 through 3 of 18 or fewer children and plans to use the funds for professional development.

In addition, the conferees note that—under current law—any local educational agency that has a class size of 18 or fewer children may use class-size-reduction funds made available to take further class size reductions in grades 1 through 3, to reduce class size in kindergarten, or other grades, or to carry out activities to improve teacher quality—including professional development.

FLEXIBILITY TO DESIGN DROPOUT PREVENTION PROGRAMS

39. The Senate amendment, but not the House bill includes findings stating that fully funding IDEA would free up funds at the local level to develop dropout programs to best address their needs and amends the 1999 Omnibus Appropriations Act to allow LEAs to use class size reduction funds for IDEA part B.

The Senate recedes.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

40. The Senate amendment, but not the House bill authorizes $150 million in additional funds for IDEA.

The Senate recedes.

FLEXIBILITY TO DEVELOP AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS

41. The Senate amendment, but not the House bill includes findings stating that fully funding IDEA would free up funds at the local level to develop after-school programs to best address their needs and amends the 1999 Omnibus Appropriations Act to allow LEAs to use class size reduction funds for IDEA part B.

The Senate recedes.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

42. The Senate amendment, but not the House bill, authorizes $600 million in additional appropriations for IDEA part B.

The Senate recedes.

FLEXIBILITY TO DEVELOP PROGRAMS TO REDUCE SOCIAL PROMOTION AND ESTABLISH SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY PROCEDURES

43. The Senate amendment, but not the House bill includes findings stating that fully funding IDEA would free up funds at the local level to develop programs to reduce social promotion, establish school accountability programs or any other programs to best address their needs and amends the 1999 Omnibus Appropriations Act to allow LEAs to use class size reduction funds for IDEA part B.

The Senate recedes.

ALTERNATIVE EDUCATIONAL SETTING

44. The Senate amendment, but not the House bill, includes an amendment to IDEA that subjects a child with a disability to the discipline provisions if they *possess* a weapon at school, in addition to *carrying* a weapon to school (current law) and applies this new provision to conduct occurring not earlier than the date of enactment of this Act.

The House recedes.

FURTHER AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

45. The Senate amendment, but not the House bill, authorizes $500 million in additional appropriations for IDEA part B.

The Senate recedes.

BILL GOODLING,
PETER HOEKSTRA,
MICHAEL N. CASTLE,
JAMES GREENWOOD,
MARK SOUDER,
BOB SCHAFFER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JIM JEFFORDS,
JUDD GREGG,
BILL FRIST,
MIKE DEWINE,
MICHAEL B. ENZI,
TIM HUTCHINSON,
SUSAN COLLINS,
SAM BROWNBACK,
CHUCK HAGEL,
JEFF SESSIONS,
TED KENNEDY,
CHRIS DODD,
TOM HARKIN,
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,
JEFF BINGAMAN,
PATTY MURRAY,
JACK REED,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

AMERICA'S TRADE DEFICIT

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, last month's trade deficit hit another record, $20 billion. One month, $20 billion. If it keeps up, $240 billion a year, a quarter of a trillion dollars.

Japan and China are now taking $10 billion a month out of our economy. Beam me up. It is not going to stop because of our current Tax Code that rewards imports. I say it is time to throw out income taxes, throw out the IRS, and pass the national retail sales tax program. It will reward our exports.

Let us tell it like it is. Our Tax Code stinks so bad, if we sprayed it with Chanel No. 5, it would still smell like the Environmental Protection Agency.

I yield back 400,000 jobs lost last month due to our trade deficit.

LIFE 101 ORGAN DONATION PROGRAM

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, every 18 minutes a new name is added to the list of those who wait for an organ transplant. With the current supply of donors, unfortunately, someone dies every 2 hours and 24 minutes because an organ was not available. These are the grim statistics.

The University of Miami Organ Procurement Organization and the Transplant Foundation of South Florida, however, are doing something to improve these dismal numbers. They have undertaken a donor education program designed to target young audiences, helping them to understand at an early age the need for organ donations and the benefits of transplants.

This program, entitled ''Life 101,'' has been presented at 58 high schools, reaching over 50,000 local area students in Miami-Dade and Broward County in South Florida.

This Friday, ''Life 101'' will be unveiling its new web site dedicated to providing an exciting and informative forum for students to learn more about organ donations. I encourage America's youth to visit their web site beginning Friday and learn how they can make the difference in the lives of others.

ORANGE COUNTY ONION FARMERS AND DISASTER ASSISTANCE

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, in May of last year, New York's Hudson Valley farmers were hard hit by a severe hailstorm that devastated their crops. Particularly impacted were our onion growers.

Already facing difficulties due to a prior storm, our Orange County onion growers found themselves confronted by a new hardship. Their hardship was compounded by a failed Federal Government crop insurance program.

Most of our farmers who had no significant yields as a result of this storm were forced to zero out their crops. And when they applied for crop insurance, they found a cumbersome, poorly managed system that provided absolutely no relief.

Following last year's disaster, Congress passed the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1999, appropriating $5.9 billion for emergency assistance. To date, our farmers have not received one penny of these funds, while payments were made shortly after its enactment to dairy, to cotton, to wheat and hog farmers.

The Agriculture Department has not responded to our farmers' needs. Following this storm, starting in February, Secretary Glickman instituted a sign-up period for disaster funding, stating that the delay was due to working out a proper formula.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Secretary Glickman to release these funds immediately to prevent any further delay so that our growers may be able to continue their farming.

THANKS TO OUR SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN

(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, just 3 days ago, I was in the war-torn region of Kosovo along with many of our colleagues from the House and Senate.

And, as a veteran of two wars, I know the great sacrifice that our U.S. military men and women are making for our country and for world peace. And I am thankful that I was able to travel to the Kosovo region to personally thank these brave soldiers, sailors, and airmen for their service to our great Nation.

I want to take this opportunity to reinforce my commitment to them in what may very well be the most trying time in their life. I thank them and America thanks them for having the courage to carry out this selfless duty to our country.

From both the Vietnam and Persian Gulf Wars, I am personally and gravely aware of the enormous challenges that these brave men and women face. Having been deployed far away from my family for countless weeks and months, I can relate to the myriad of emotions that these troops and their families must be experiencing during this very traumatic time in the world.

Our prayers and our full support are with them. May God speed and bring each of them home safely and as soon as possible.

STATE OF MONTANA WANTS TO BE PART OF ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

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

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, every day it seems that we get some good economic news: Unemployment is down, incomes are up, the stock market at a new high. But in parts of America that are not doing so well, my colleague from North Dakota often comes to the floor and talks about the increase, the record number of farm bankruptcies in his home State.

My home State of Montana now ranks last in the Nation with average income. Why has rural America been left out of this economic prosperity? Well, it is because our economy relies on agriculture and timber and mining and oil and gas, commodities, and it is because this administration has failed to pursue fair trade policies.

This administration has pursued extreme environmental policies that lock up our public land and our natural resources, and this administration has neglected the importance of international markets.

Mr. Speaker, we do not want to be left out. We want to be part of this prosperous economy, but we need common sense. We need a common sense agriculture policy. We need a common sense environmental policy. We need a common sense trade policy.

Mr. Speaker, bring us into this new economic prosperity.

DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, today Senator TIM HUTCHINSON and I introduced the Dollars to the Classroom Act, to benefit schoolchildren and teachers all across this country in our public schools by directing that Federal funding for elementary and secondary education goes directly to classrooms and to teachers where the learning process actually takes place, by restricting how much money can be spent on bureaucracy.

By requiring that 95 cents of every Federal dollar gets into the classroom, the children and teachers of this Nation will see an additional $870 million out of existing appropriations. That is $10,000 per school, translating into $450 for every single classroom in America.

I have with me a check that the Senate and House Members signed earlier today in the amount of $870 million. We presented this directly to the children.

My colleagues have an opportunity to help bring needed change. Join me and the 127 cosponsors in sponsoring and introducing the Dollars to the Classroom Act today.

TOM LEYDEN, TEXAS PRINCIPAL OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring special

attention to an outstanding individual who is making a real difference in the lives of children in my district. He is Principal Tom Leyden of the Plano Independent School District in Plano, Texas.

Tom Leyden was recently named the Texas principal of the year by the Texas Association of Secondary School Principals. This honor qualifies Mr. Leyden for eligibility as the National Principal of the Year, which will be announced in October.

Tom Leyden is a shining reminder of what a difference our local officials can make in the lives of our children. I am proud to represent Tom Leyden, and I plan to do everything I can to make sure we help all the Tom Leydens of America by keeping the Federal Government out of their way and putting education back in the hands of local principals, parents, and teachers.

EDUCATION FLEXIBILITY BILL

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for too long, our educational system has been handcuffed by the misguided ideas of Federal bureaucrats. For too long our children have been used as pawns in this political game.

The time for that to end is now. It is time for us to stop the partisanship, to stop the bickering, and roll up our sleeves and get to work. We cannot, as a Nation, allow our children to become adults without the tools to succeed. The key to unlocking the powers of first-rate education is the freedom to make choices, giving parents the power to choose their children's education.

Let us pass the Education Flexibility bill, which was announced just moments ago by the chairman of the committee. It will be on the floor this week. Let us pass the bill to allow the States to move past bureaucratic rules that actually inhibit success and bring new and innovative solutions to their classrooms.

This bill will expand education flexibility to all 50 States. It will empower every school district to move past the bureaucracy and do what they believe is best to help their students learn. Let us return education decision-making to those who know what is best for America's students. We will find them in each student's community, not in Washington.

SUPPORT DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the opportunity to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) at a press conference for the Dollars to the Classroom Act. And also present were students from around the country and teachers and administrators speaking in support of the bill.

Unfortunately, as the system is set up now, as little as 65 cents on the dollar makes it to the classroom. That is wrong. Many children are being shortchanged. Congress must downsize bureaucracy to ensure students get the best possible education.

What the Dollars to the Classroom Act would do is to mandate that at least 95 percent of Federal education dollars end up where it is needed most. Teachers, and most importantly our children, will be direct beneficiaries of the spending, and not the bureaucrats. And under this legislation each school would receive an increase of $10,000.

Cole Allen is an 8th grader. He is from Pennsylvania. He spoke at today's conference about the need for more money in the classroom. He said his geography book is titled ''World Geography Today,'' but it should be called ''World Geography 13 Years Ago.''

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, we need the money in the schools for the books.

HONORING EMILY GREGOR OF THE BUCKEYE TRAIL ASSOCIATION

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues know of my strong support for trails throughout this beautiful Nation. No trail is more dear to my heart though than the Buckeye Trail in the great State of Ohio. Today I would like to pay tribute to Emily Gregor, an icon of the Buckeye Trail. Emily Gregor's devotion to the preservation of the trail as a long-time member of the Buckeye Trail Association spans the entire 40 years of its existence. She has served as its historian and legislative coordinator and is its president for 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I often tell people that the greatest legacy we can leave is not what we put in our will, but what we put in our communities. On the 40th anniversary of the Buckeye Trail Association, I today would like to commend Emily Gregor for the legacy she has given and continues to give to the people of Ohio through the Buckeye Trail. Her tireless commitment to the trail will be cherished for generations to come as they explore the wonders of nature in the great State of Ohio.

OUR SERVICEMEN HAVE OUR TOTAL, UNQUALIFIED SUPPORT

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

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, there is a 20-year-old airman out there who is working incredible hours, 7 days a week, all for a cause that he trusts is just.

He puts his faith in his government, in officers above him and in the people of the United States that he will only be put in harm's way for noble and worthy reasons.

That 20-year-old is stationed in Aviano, Italy, and elsewhere across the globe. He does not have time to read the New York Times or to watch CNN to see how the war is going because he is too busy doing his job, making sure that the planes being flown in actual combat missions are as safe and effective as humanly possible. He is unaware of the debates going on in Congress about the wisdom of our policy in the Balkans. He cares little for politics, but he does expect his political leaders to put one concern above all others, do whatever it takes to see that our mission is successful.

We are only Americans now, and that 20-year-old airman and all of his fellow servicemen have our total, unqualified, full support. May God bring him home safely.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8, rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 rule XX.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

AUTHORIZING AWARDING OF GOLD MEDAL TO ROSA PARKS

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 573) to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Rosa Parks in recognition of her contributions to the Nation, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 573

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Rosa Parks was born on February 4, 1913, in Tuskegee, Alabama, the first child of James and Leona (Edwards) McCauley.

(2) Rosa Parks is honored as the ''first lady of civil rights'' and the ''mother of the freedom movement''; her quiet dignity ignited the most significant social movement in the history of the United States.

(3) Rosa Parks was arrested on December 1, 1955, in Montgomery, Alabama, for refusing to give up her seat on a bus to a white man, and her stand for equal rights became legendary.

(4) News of Rosa Parks' arrest resulted in 42,000 African Americans boycotting Montgomery buses for 381 days beginning on December 5, 1955, until the bus segregation laws were changed on December 21, 1956.

(5) The United States Supreme Court ruled on November 13, 1956, that the Montgomery segregation law was unconstitutional, and on December 20, 1956, Montgomery officials were ordered to desegregate buses.

(6) The civil rights movement led to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which broke down the barriers of legal discrimination against African Americans and made equality before the law a reality for all Americans.

(7) Rosa Parks is the recipient of many awards and accolades for her efforts on behalf of racial harmony, including the Springarn Award, the NAACP's highest honor for civil rights contributions, the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Nation's highest civilian honor, and the first International Freedom Conductor Award from the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center.

(8) Rosa Parks has dedicated her life to the cause of universal human rights and truly embodies the love of humanity and freedom.

(9) Rosa Parks was the first woman to join the Montgomery chapter of the NAACP, was an active volunteer for the Montgomery Voters League, and in 1987 cofounded the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self-Development.

(10) Rosa Parks, by her quiet courage, symbolizes all that is vital about nonviolent protest; she endured threats of death and persisted as an advocate for the simple, basic lessons she taught the Nation and from which the Nation has benefited immeasurably.

(11) Rosa Parks, who has resided in the State of Michigan since 1957, has become a living icon for freedom in America.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The President is authorized to award to Rosa Parks, on behalf of the Congress, a gold medal of appropriate design honoring Rosa Parks in recognition of her contributions to the Nation.

(b) DEISGN AND STRIKING.—For the purposes of the award referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (in this Act referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 2 under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, and at a price sufficient to cover the costs thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 4. STATUS AS NATIONAL MEDALS.

The medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 5. FUNDING.

(a) AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund an amount not to exceed $30,000 to pay for the cost of the medals authorized by this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals under section 3 shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to honor the mother of the civil rights movement, Rosa Parks. As an Alabamian, I am proud to stand side by side with my friends on both sides of the aisle and pay respects to a native Alabamian and a civil rights heroine. Before saying more, I would also like to commend the bill's author, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON), for obtaining well over 290 signatures necessary to move this bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, Rosa Parks is an American heroine because she is an ordinary citizen with extraordinary courage. She had the fortitude to claim for herself the most ordinary, the most basic of civil rights, to be treated fairly and equally.

She was born in Tuskegee, Alabama in 1913. She was the first child of James and Leona McCauley.

Rosa Parks took a heroic stand and refused to give up her seat on a bus. Montgomery buses were boycotted for 381 days. After court cases, legislative upheaval, the bus segregation laws were changed on December 21, 1956.

An aside to that, Mr. Speaker, is that Dr. Martin Luther King was appointed spokesman for the bus boycott and taught nonviolence to all the participants, and there were over 40,000 participants in that boycott.

But more importantly, Rosa Parks led a prairie fire for freedom which helped ignite and inspire the civil rights movement. Ultimately, this act of courage played a major role in breaking down the barriers of legal discrimination and continues to play a role in making equality an imperative goal in America.

Rosa Parks is the recipient of many awards for her efforts on behalf of racial harmony. Among them, the Springarn Award, the NAACP's highest honor for civil rights contributions, the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Nation's highest civilian honor, and the first International Freedom Conductor Award from the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center.

Rosa Parks has dedicated her life to the cause of universal human rights. She truly embodies the spirit of respect for humanity and personal freedom that is central to the American ideal.

Rosa Parks by her quiet courage symbolizes all that is great in the American spirit. She endured threats of death in defending and demanding for all the most basic rights embodied in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. This Nation has benefited immeasurably from her heroic efforts, and the U.S. Congress is proud to celebrate her achievements by awarding her the Congressional Gold Medal.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) be permitted to control 10 minutes of the time allocated to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, every now and then God places in our midst an angel, a human being of extraordinary character and immeasurable compassion with the energy and courage to fuel their undying commitment to justice. Rosa Parks is that person. Rosa Parks is that angel, a woman of divine inspiration who, on December 1, 1955, refused to move from the white only section of the bus in Montgomery, Alabama. When she was told to move to the back of the bus, she was arrested.

Rosa Parks was a working woman, a seamstress of very modest means. She had neither political power nor influence. She simply had the courage of her convictions. Mrs. Parks did not move to the back of the bus. She took a stand.

She was arrested. Her arrest sparked a revolution on December 5, 1955. The defiant spirit of Rosa Parks ignited the long suppressed longing for freedom, and the contagious sparks of new possibilities sailed through the Montgomery air. Men, women and children decided they would no longer suffer the indignities of a city that discriminated against them, marginalized them, brutalized and disrespected them.

Montgomery's most egregious manifestation of segregation was in public transportation, in particular the bus company where African Americans were cursed and sometimes assaulted by bus drivers without provocation, forced to board from the rear door after depositing the fare in the driver's box and then often left behind after paying their fare, strictly forbidden from ever sitting in the first four rows reserved for whites.

Black pride and self-determination took hold. Blacks got off the bus and the plantation. Blacks carpooled, blacks walked, blacks found a way to get around without bus transportation. They boycotted.

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP).

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage and to applaud Congress for putting this resolution before us to honor Rosa Parks. Rosa Parks changed the course of history when, on December 1, 1955, she refused to give up her seat to a white man. The fact is I would like to think that there were white folks in her city that wanted things to change, that wanted equal opportunity and equal access and equal rights to all parts of society in her community, but they did not act.

Rosa Parks did act, and she had the courage, the quiet courage, to make a profound difference. By her actions, she encouraged and created a movement that was largely credited for passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act in the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

Today we still do not have the harmony that we seek in this country. We are still not a country that has figured out how to live together with all the good and best interests for every child, every individual in this country.

Rosa Parks served as an inspiration to us in 1955. I hope that by awarding this congressional medal she will continue to serve as an inspiration to all of us and to our children.

Many times today people do not believe that one person can make a difference. They feel cynical and they feel hopeless and helpless, and because of that, they do not act.

So, as we award this medal, maybe what Rosa Parks did will give us all courage and confidence that one person does make a difference and that if we are to have equality and a common sense of good and love across racial lines, that all of us have to stand up and take that action, that courageous action that Rosa Parks did.

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

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the other 329 Members of the 106th Congress who joined me in unprecedented numbers to award the Congressional Medal of Honor to the Honorable Rosa Parks, a human being extraordinaire.

This is my first bill that I will pass from Congress, and there is no better way for me to inaugurate my service in the United States Congress than to introduce a bill that will give a Congressional Gold Medal to Rosa Parks. Her courage propelled her to great heights. She is profiled as the leader of the century by major news media universally.

□ 1430

Her selflessness embraced the spirit of the British National Anthem: ''My country 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty.''

Mrs. Parks in Montgomery, Alabama, sought to, tried to validate this pledge of ours, one nation under God, with liberty and justice for all people. Her steadfastness and unmovable decision revisited the words of Abraham Lincoln, the great emancipator, in his Gettysburg Address, that we would have a government of the people, by the people and for the people.

Mrs. Parks, thank you very much for watching this long-delayed honor by the United States Congress in celebration of your 86th birthday present. What a great present, Mrs. Parks, for the United States Congress to give to you in this particular way.

I am grateful for your steadfastness, your perseverance, the kind of contribution that you made to America almost 44 years ago, and it is because of your good work and your determination, the fact that you sacrificed yourself and went to jail. And a woman that was not of color, Mrs. Virginia Foster Durr, who was known as the matron of the civil rights movement, bailed Mrs. Parks out, which underscored that there were people who were not people of color necessarily who came to the forefront to ensure that justice prevails.

So, Mrs. Parks, while you watch this live from California and while both you and I are alive to see it pass, I want to publicly, for America, thank you very much, Rosa Parks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded that their remarks are to be addressed only to the Chair.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to a great civil rights leader, Rosa Parks. It was a great honor to see Rosa Parks at the State of the Union address earlier this year. Looking up at her in the gallery, sitting there with the First Lady and other distinguished guests, it gave me great pride and reminded me of what America is and how great it is.

The Gold Medal is a fitting tribute. Congress has honored more than 100 great Americans and world citizens, including George Washington and most recently Mother Theresa and Nelson Mandela. It is the highest award that can be given by Congress and we know that she deserves the Gold Medal of Honor.

Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to a great civil rights leader as we prepare to vote on awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to Rosa Parks. Her quiet, non-violent refusal to adhere to racist segregation helped break open the flood gates of freedom in this country. That act put us all on the road to a more equal society and to an integrated society.

It was a great honor to see Rosa Parks in person as a guest of the President at the State of the Union address earlier this year. Looking up at her in the gallery, sitting with the First Lady and other distinguished guests, gave me great pride and reminded me why America is the land of great potential.

The Gold Medal is a fitting tribute. Congress has honored more than 100 great Americans and world citizens, including George Washington and most recently Mother Theresa and Nelson Mandela. The highest award given by Congress to civilians, it is my honor to be a co-sponsor and supporter of this legislation.

Since that historic day on December 1, 1955, in Montgomery, Alabama, when she took a stand against a fundamentally unfair and immoral system, Rosa Parks has served as a source of inspiration and courage to those who continue the struggle for civil rights and equality for all Americans. She taught us that one individual can make a profound difference, that one individual can bring down the walls of division in our society, that one individual can clear the path to a better tomorrow. Rosa Parks has earned this medal.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE).

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution of the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON), authorizing a Congressional Gold Medal for Rosa Parks in recognition of her contributions to this Nation.

Rosa Parks is known as both the first lady of civil rights and the mother of the civil rights movement.

She began to earn these titles back in 1955 for her courageous refusal to comply with the Montgomery, Alabama, law which required her to give up her seat on a public bus for a white man. For this, she was thrown in jail. However, an interesting historic footnote is that Rosa Parks was ejected from a bus further back in time, in 1943, for entering through the front door instead of the back door as then prescribed by the law.

To protest the segregated public bus system and Rosa Parks' arrest, a fledgling civil rights group, the Montgomery Improvement Association, organized a historic boycott of the Montgomery, Alabama buses, led by a young civil rights leader named Martin Luther King, Jr. The boycott lasted 381 days.

Thanks to Rosa Parks' conviction and the steady determination of the civil rights movement, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down the Montgomery, Alabama, segregated seating law and the buses were legally integrated.

Mr. Speaker, many history books stop there, but I believe it is important to note that Rosa Parks' courageous stand was not without cost to her and to her family. Rosa Parks was harassed continuously. She lost her job. Her husband lost his job and suffered a nervous breakdown. Rosa Parks and her husband could not find work anywhere near Montgomery, so they moved to Detroit where her husband had to be hospitalized further.

Ultimately, Rosa Parks began working for the congressional office of our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), and she still remains active to this day in the civil rights movement.

Mr. Speaker, as we fast forward to today, I find it amazing how much we take for granted thanks to Rosa Parks' courageous stand almost 45 years ago. For this reason, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution. I congratulate my colleague from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) for introducing it.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the awarding of the Congressional Gold Medal to Mrs. Rosa Parks. Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King once said that anybody can be great because anybody can serve. You do not have to have a college degree to serve. You do not have to make your subject and your verb agree to serve. You do not have to know Einstein's theory of relativity to serve. You only need a heart full of grace and a soul generated by love.

In 1955, at the time of Mrs. Parks' heroic act, I was 6 years old, a daughter of a skycap and a factory worker, a student of the civil rights movement and now, thank God, a Congresswoman,

able to vote to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Rosa Parks. I only hope that many young people, African-American, Caucasian, Asian, Indian, Hispanic, brown, black, white or yellow, will continue to be inspired by the integrity and work of Mrs. Rosa Parks and will be willing to stand and make a public gesture.

Mr. BACHUS, Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 1 minute to my fellow Alabaman and friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD)

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I have the great good fortune of having known Mrs. Rosa Parks for many years. It was in my congressional district that she lived and it was in my congressional district that she refused to move to the back of the bus.

Rosa Parks' courage ignited a movement. Her courage provided the spark for a movement that was smoldering. I am a personal benefactor of Mrs. Parks' act and I am very grateful to her.

Rosa Parks was an ordinary citizen who performed an extraordinary act which changed America in a positive way forever. Rosa Parks is an American hero. As my Spelman College sisters would say, she is an American shero.

To Mrs. Parks, I say thank you for not moving to the back of the bus. Thank you for a lifetime of service to civil rights. I am humbled and deeply grateful for this opportunity to personally say to you I appreciate your courage.

Mr. Speaker, America is a better place because Rosa Parks came its way.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), in whose district Mrs. Parks is now a legal resident.

(Ms. KILPATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) for yielding me this time on this very special day as we honor one of America's greatest heroes, she-roes, I might add, Mrs. Rosa Parks. As was mentioned, Mrs. Parks lives in my district in Michigan. She came to my district as she left Alabama and for all of these years has been a hero of courage and inspiration for all of us, near and afar.

I am here today to add my voice to those who have said, let us award Mrs. Parks a medal that is long overdue, the highest honor that this body can offer, the Congressional Gold Medal. I am here further to ask for something again. Mrs. Parks in 1987 established the Raymond and Rosa Parks Institute in Michigan. She cared for and assisted hundreds of children across America to learn about civil rights, to learn about their history.

We are asking in this budget year, fiscal year 2000, in the Labor-HHS budget for $3 million for the Raymond and Rosa Parks Institute for Self-Development so she can continue inspiring and motivating children. I hope this body will accept and adopt the appropriation. It is just a small amount of what has already been put in through her courage, through her work and through the funds that we have collected over the last 10 years. Let us support the Raymond and Rosa Parks Institute for Self-Development so that our children can know, as we have lived through this 20th Century, that as we move forward, let us take the spirit of Raymond and Rosa Parks with us and fund the institute adequately.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, over 40 years ago, Rosa Parks, a Montgomery, Alabama seamstress, showed how one woman, no matter what her background, can light a spark which changes the world. By refusing to give up her bus seat to a white man on a dark December day in 1955, Rosa Parks defied the oppressive legal system of segregation and set off a bus boycott that became one of the first victories in the civil rights revolution of the '50s and the '60s. For this brave stand for liberty and her many other contributions to our Nation and her community, she definitely deserves the Congressional Gold Medal which we are voting to award her today.

Her heroic action resulted in her arrest and the loss of her job, but the ensuing struggle resulted in a U.S. Supreme Court ruling just a year later which declared that the Montgomery segregation law was unconstitutional and that Montgomery officials must desegregate their bus system.

This courageous act changed her life and our Nation forever, but it did not change the character and the humility of Rosa Parks, who still shuns the spotlight and has never sought the recognition which she so richly deserves. After moving to Detroit in 1957, in which she continued to work hard for the many causes which benefited both our Nation and her community, she worked for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), running his Detroit office until her retirement in 1988.

Rosa Parks also founded the Detroit-based Raymond and Rosa Parks Institute for Self-Development, which helps young people gain self-esteem through a variety of programs, as well as assists them with their education.

By honoring Rosa Parks today, we are also endorsing her message which she so eloquently addressed in her book ''Quiet Strength: The Faith, the Hope and the Heart of a Woman Who Changed a Nation.'' It ends with a plea for people of all races to work together for a world free of violence and racism, where all races and religions unite to improve the quality of life for everyone. Amen.

Passage of this bill will be our contribution to her legacy today.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for yielding, and I thank her and the sponsors of this bill for putting it forward at this time.

This body seeks to honor a woman upon whom honors have been heaped. It is worth asking, why so many honors? What is her personal appeal, beyond what she has accomplished? It is worth asking why it is that this is such a revered woman of our times. I think it is for much the same reason that we honor Nelson Mandela.

Three reasons: First, courage against overwhelming odds; two, the action that few would have taken, remember, this was Alabama, circa 1955; and, three, modesty. She claimed to be too tired to move to the back of the bus. The fact is she had complained of segregation and had spoken of being tired of segregation for years.

It was bravery, Mr. Speaker. Two huge and historic effects flow from her act. Her act led to the Supreme Court decision barring segregation in public transportation and, of course, she sparked an entire movement, the Montgomery bus movement.

Those of us who participated in the sit-in movement regard the day of the college sit-ins as when that movement began. In point of fact, that movement began when Rosa Parks sat where she insisted on sitting. The Congressional Gold Medal cannot add glory to a woman who has never sought it. We can only express our appreciation through this medal today.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

□ 1445

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I am pleased to join today with the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) as a cosponsor of this long-overdue legislation honoring Rosa Parks with the Congressional Gold Medal. Mrs. Parks is a courageous woman, a woman who stood up for justice and equality, and in the process, changed the course of our Nation's history.

In the early 1950s, blacks were still facing the hardships inflicted by segregation. The term ''separate but equal'' was not really equal, but rather a loophole used to deny rights to blacks. This began to change, though, in Montgomery, Alabama on December 5, 1955 when Mrs. Parks, then a passenger on a Montgomery, Alabama bus, refused to give up her seat to a white passenger on that bus. She was promptly arrested for violating a city law requiring that whites and blacks sit in

separate rows on buses. Mrs. Parks' courage triggered a boycott of the entire Montgomery bus system. That lasted for almost a full year, until the U.S. Supreme Court declared segregated seating on the city's buses unconstitutional.

While Mrs. Parks' refusal to relinquish her seat on that December day and the ensuing boycott ended in success, the effects of her actions were much more far-reaching. Specifically, the boycott's success triggered the civil rights movement of the 1960s, and in addition, it paved the way for the boycott organization's President, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to press forward for full racial equality.

Mrs. Parks' efforts were integral to the civil rights movement, and it is my pleasure to be associated with this legislation presenting Rosa Parks with the Congressional Gold Medal.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON); my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), the remaining civil rights leader that worked with Dr. King and Rosa Parks for many years, and to all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol.

Now, there are several reasons why Rosa Parks' name can be lifted up with such eloquence today. First is that she developed this theory that applies to every human being that struggles for justice: ''I am only one person, but I am one. I cannot do everything, but I can do something.'' For her to sit down on the bus that day was an enormously courageous act that still thrills the world when they realize this seamstress had determined what she would do, not with Dr. King, not with the civil rights movement, not with the NAACP, not with anyone.

Secondly, she, by her act, brought Dr. King into the movement, and we will have more on that very shortly. But that an oppressed people could take upon themselves to change the de jure and de facto status of race relations by their own action was thought to be impossible by many at that time.

Finally, it was the theory of nonviolence that a woman faced with violent oppressors could say, ''You can do whatever you want.'' Remember, the bus driver begged her to please sit down. And the theory of nonviolence later enunciated by Dr. Martin Luther King makes the Gold Medal a very appropriate response to her today.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard speaker after speaker who has described how Rosa Parks' quiet and courageous act changed America and redirected the course of history, and for that we are all for the better.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), one of the leaders of that movement.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague from Alabama, my native State, for yielding me this time.

On December 1, 1955, Rosa Parks sat down on a bus in Montgomery, Alabama and refused to give up her seat to a white man. By sitting down, Rosa Parks was standing up. With dignity, with pride, and with one simple defining act, she began a nonviolent revolution in the American south, a nonviolent revolution that swept across America and swept aside segregation and the laws that divided us into two nations, one black and one white.

As a 15-year-old boy growing up in rural Alabama, 50 miles from Montgomery, I was deeply inspired, moved and touched by this simple act of civil disobedience. Rosa Parks taught me and an entire generation the power that one individual can have in standing up for what is right and for what is just.

The history books of the civil rights movement will recall Rosa Parks as one of the founders of the new America. This woman, this one woman, was tracked down by the spirit of history. She saw indignity and she exposed it. She saw inequality and she confronted it. She saw injustice and she defeated it.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and appropriate that we honor Rosa Parks by awarding her the Congressional Gold Medal. By honoring Rosa Parks, we honor all of us. We honor America. We honor unborn generations.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, Congressional Gold Medals are awarded to individuals who have made significant contributions to our Nation or humanity. Why bestow this honor on a woman who refused to give up her seat in the white section of a segregated Montgomery bus? The answer is very simple. Rosa Parks' selfless fortitude became the symbol of a commitment to freedom, equality and justice that paved the way to the end of legal segregation in America.

As we salute our matriarch of civil rights, I am reminded of the words of Dr. King: ''We are caught up in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny.''

Mrs. Parks recognized that in order for our Nation to move from what it has been to what it can be, our garment of destiny must be tightly woven with the policies of justice and inclusion as opposed to discrimination and separation. Again, I congratulate Mrs. Parks for her heroism, and challenge all Americans to embrace her concept of freedom and equality for all people.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 20 minutes on this measure, 10 minutes to myself and 5 minutes to each of the gentlewomen.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I think every American over 45 years of age remembers the heroic stand that Rosa Parks took. That stand inspired the Nation, and the inspiration of the Nation ultimately inspired Congress—both the House and the Senate.

She did this at the beginning of the last half of the decade of the 1950s. She set an example of what one person can do to change a Nation. And she did change a Nation, because from her act of resistence on a segregated bus and the organization that followed led to the role of Dr. Martin Luther King. Rosa Parks gave recognition to all who might have doubted about conditions in the South.

Of course, the Supreme Court ruled that what she fought was unconstitutional, and that was one of the many particular state segregation laws that the Supreme Court of the United States struck down in the decade of the 1950s and the 1960s.

There was still going to be a longer struggle ahead. I was on the Senate staff at that time working on these bills. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was certainly one of them. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was another.

Rosa Parks' definance showed that black Americans—African-Americans—could organize themselves, could do the right thing in line with the Constitution. That is exactly what her inspiration meant. Whether it was segregation in the South or in the North, or in the West, or in the East, no group would stand for any form of discrimination against any group because of their race, color or creed.

She began with the defiance of one human being. She deserves the Congressional Gold Medal. Few Americans have had an impact which touched this country and put it on the right course as has Rosa Parks.

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly hope that all Members will support this particular resolution. It is a vital example of the impact one can have in the legislative process. Martin Luther King had a great impact, but he would not have had that impact if it were not for the actions of Rosa Parks, showing that there will be no more discrimination on the buses of Montgomery, Alabama.

What Rosa Parks did is a good lesson in civics for every American: one person can make a difference in our government. She did. She has. We should recognize that significant accomplishment which changed our nation.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding me this time. I want to commend her, and I want to commend the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) for her leadership and persistence in this bill.

I rise today to join my colleagues in this House in paying tribute to Rosa Parks, the mother of the civil rights movement. All of us will recite the facts, but they cannot be recited enough.

On a cold day in December 1955, Rosa Parks decided that she would sit down in order to stand up and stand up for America. She sat down to stand up for equal rights for all across this Nation. The quiet ''no'' of this gentle southern lady to the demand that she give up her bus seat to a white man gave a new meaning to the word ''courage.''

The courage of this ordinary seamstress who worked in a department store pricked the conscience of the Nation in an extraordinary way. As the bus boycott mounted, activity came to a screeching halt and the world stopped and paid attention.

Rosa Parks spoke quietly, but the whole world heard and understood that it was indeed time for a change. She took a stand that will be forever remembered and appreciated by people all across this Nation. And thanks to Rosa Parks, I now stand proudly as a Congresswoman here, able to pay tribute to her and to do business for the American people.

□ 1500

I intend later to vote, as I hope all of my colleagues will, for the Congressional Medal of Honor to go to a most worthy American. Few people are deserving of such an honor. Rosa Parks indeed is.

I again commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. JULIA CARSON) for introducing this measure and being persistent, and because of that we are here today. All of us should pass this unanimously.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am really delighted to be here as this resolution comes before us. I was one of the original cosponsors, and I want to add my accolades to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) for introducing the legislation and persevering, on both sides of the aisle, so we have a bipartisan measure before us.

Mr. Speaker, Rosa Parks, the mother of the civil rights movement, with one simple act of defiance in Montgomery, Alabama, Rosa Parks set off a revolution that made this country live up to its constitutional ideals.

When Dr. Martin Luther King, Junior, proclaimed his famous ''I have a dream speech'' atop the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, he lay before America a vision of a society free of hatred and inequality. Rosa Parks provided the initial spark for this broad movement on December 1, 1955, by bravely refusing to give up her bus seat to a white passenger after a long day of work.

Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate her courage with the passage of legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal to this remarkable woman. Her action helped to trigger the civil rights movement. Rosa Parks' simple refusal brought her, Martin Luther King, Jr., and the arduous struggle for equality to the attention of our Nation.

In a later interview, Mrs. Parks stated that during critical moments on the bus she felt determined to take the opportunity ''to let it be known that I did not want to be treated in that manner, and that people had endured it for far too long.''

The leadership, confidence, and faith that she displayed was a glorious achievement. Rosa Parks' courageous act was one of tremendous significance. Her outstanding accomplishment deserves to be recognized by a Congressional Gold Medal.

I am proud to join with my colleagues today in support of H.R. 573, recognizing the contribution that Rosa Parks has made to our society. Today we join together to salute her courage. But let us also renew our commitment to work together for a more just and equitable society.

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

Mr. Tavis Smiley, who is a great commentator across the country, said something last week that I will never forget. He said that each of us must live for a cause, and not just because. Rosa Parks emulates that spirit in a very profound way, and Tavis Smiley does, too.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the State of Texas (Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for her eloquence and for her leadership, and to the ranking member and the chairman, I thank them both for their guidance on this very important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, is it not a great day that we rise to the Floor of the House in a bipartisan and collaborative way to acknowledge Rosa Parks, to give her her due, the Congressional Gold Medal? It is important that we acknowledge that when Rosa Parks sat down, for all of the young people of America who were born after this most heroic act, in a segregated Alabama, almost frightened for her life, America won.

The most important thing that happened, and my colleague, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) has lived it in her life, is that we infused into America the best of what America stands for, and that is, the human resolve to change what is evil and what is wrong.

Forty-two thousand people entered into a Montgomery boycott of the buses because of the quiet spirit of Rosa Parks. Again, I say to the young people, when Rosa Parks sat down, America won.

So today I am most honored to be able to stand and join my colleagues in acknowledging that many of us whould not be here today, would not be on the Floor of the House, would not have the opportunity, had Rosa Parks not sparked the infusion of energy that brought about the civil rights movement in this country, that helped to gel it, that helped to give those who were moving towards it the courage to stand up and be counted.

We would not have had the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Affirmative Action Executive order of Richard Nixon, the opening of doors of institutions of higher learning, none of that would have occurred without Rosa Parks.

So I say to Rosa, wherever she might be today, my sister, the mother of civil rights, thank you for giving me the opportunity to stand free in America and to stand with my brothers and sisters today.

Rosa Parks said in her book, when she decided not to stand up and to remain in her seat, it was not a selfish viewpoint. She said, I did not feel any fear. All I felt was tired, tired of being pushed around, tired of seeing the bad treatment and disrespect of children, Mr. Speaker, women, and men, just because of the color of their skin.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to now stand up for Rosa Parks as she stood up for all of us to win. With this vote and this honor given to Rosa Parks today, America wins always.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today with my Colleagues to honor a true American's-hero, Rosa Parks. Today, we come one step closer to giving the ''Mother of the Civil Rights Movement'' the honor she is due by voting to award Ms. Park the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Rosa Parks embodies the spirit of American Freedom and is wholly deserving of this honor. Her single act of courage was the catalyst that transformed this land from a nation divided to a nation striving for unity.

Rosa Parks's story is familiar to us all. On December 1, 1955, she boarded a bus in Montgomery, Alabama, paid her fare and took a seat. As the bus got crowded, Ms. Parks was ordered to give up her seat by the bus driver for a white man. She refused and was arrested. Her simple refusal to give up her seat initiated the Montgomery bus boycott that began the Civil Rights Movement.

In her book, Quiet Strength, Ms. Parks reflected on her feelings when she refused to give up her seat, ''When I sat down on the bus the day I was arrested, I was thinking of going home. I made up my mind quickly about what it was that I had to do, what I felt was right to do . . . I did not feel any fear. . . All I felt was tired. Tired of being pushed around. Tired of seeing the bad treatment and disrespect of children, women and men just because of the color of their skin.''

In her quiet manner, Rosa Parks ignited a spark of defiance, of civil disobedience that has been the hallmark of the Civil Rights Movement. Today, we are all grateful that Ms. Parks had the courage and the faith to do what was right.

It is past time that Congress recognizes and honors this American legend. Rosa Parks has earned her place in history as a brave heroine for her lifelong dedication to civil rights.

It is with great honor and privilege that I support H.R. 573, awarding the Congressional Medal of Honor an American legend, Rosa Parks.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the chair.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), a young man who has done so much in terms of aiding me in getting this to where we are.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for yielding time to me, and salute her for her work and effort in bringing this matter before the United States House of Representatives. I also appreciate that she called me young. That was very nice; not true, but very nice.

Mr. Speaker, in the 105th Congress we honored Nelson Mandela, the father of the struggle for freedom and equality in South Africa, with Congress' highest honor, the Congressional Gold Medal. Now, in the 106th Congress, we have the opportunity to bestow a similar honor on Rosa Parks, the mother of the American struggle for freedom, our civil rights movement.

Through the simple act of keeping her seat on a Montgomery bus in 1955, Rosa Parks stood for the hopes of a people and a Nation. In a 1958 speech, Martin Luther King, Jr., said and I quote, ''You would never have heard of Martin Luther King if it had not been for Rosa Parks and the humble people of Montgomery, Alabama, who decided to walk in dignity, rather than ride in disgrace.''

Rosa Parks symbolizes the greatness in all of us and our ability to rise above our circumstances to achieve the extraordinary. One brave act of humble greatness triggered an avalanche of change which helped our country fulfill its commitment to equal rights for all Americans, regardless of race, regardless of anything.

For her leadership and her example, Rosa Parks deserves to be honored with this Congressional Gold Medal. I am very proud of all of the Members who cosponsored this resolution. I am very proud of all of the Members in both the Democratic and Republican Party who stood with their names for this resolution.

I want to salute my colleague, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. JULIA CARSON) for her efforts in bringing this matter to the Floor of the Congress. I want to thank the leadership on the Republican side for helping to bring this to the Congress.

This act today is in the highest tradition of this great body. We salute together, as one voice, the example, the life, the bravery, the courage, of Rosa Parks, who made this country and everybody in it better.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a lady, and I mean a lady in every sense of the word, Ms. Rosa Parks. Forty years ago Mrs. Parks, in her quiet, gentle way, said enough is enough. Forty years ago Mrs. Parks sat down so others could stand up for freedom, justice, and equality. Forty years ago this gentle lady gave birth to a movement that broke the chains of Jim Crowism and its ugly, cruel, and inhuman ways.

Her actions on that fateful day in December of 1955 set forth a chain of events for which every citizen, black, white, Latino and Asian, Jew and Gentile, everyone of this great country will be forever in her debt.

I cannot express how her act of heroism has impacted my life personally. Growing up in public housing in New York City, she inspired me as a young child to join the fight for freedom and to always stand up for dignity and justice. Her quiet, gentle actions commanded that every man, woman, and child has the right to be treated with dignity and respect, not how the Jim Crow regime perceived many or all African Americans to be, less than human.

I do not know where we would have been today without this great woman, for without Ms. Parks there would not have been a Montgomery bus boycott. Without the Montgomery bus boycott there might not have been a Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Without the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, we would not have known Dr. Martin Luther King in the manner that we have known him and the contributions he has made to this great Nation.

Back in 1955 there were only three Members, three African American Members of this body. Now we stand 39 strong, and in large part it is due to this woman. Mr. Speaker, I say that no one is more deserving to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor than Ms. Rosa Parks.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of this measure. I am certainly glad we are doing it in the bipartisan fashion that we are.

We often describe Rosa Parks as a civil rights hero, and as noble as civil rights heroes are, sometimes we forget that they are, in a larger sense, American heroes belonging to all of us. In fact, she is a true American hero, an American hero who has had an impact on all of us simply by one act of not leaving her seat. In doing so, she exploded into society a concept of full participation into the American institutions, so that not just people would be sitting next to each other on buses, but riding the same cabs, sitting in the same restaurants, and perhaps, most importantly, so children would be sitting next to children in schools.

I know. I entered the school system in Athens, Georgia, in 1962 in an all-white school system. We had white schools and we had black schools. Then when I was in fifth grade, Talmadge Vernell Wilson, the one black child, was in our class. There were four classes, four fifth grade classes, with a black child in each class. There were still white and black schools, but we were integrated. Yet by the time I graduated from high school in 1973, there were no more black schools and no more white schools.

That became ancient history because of the brave determination of people like Rosa Parks. She broke the barriers, and led the way for other boycotts and other icebreakers who would go in and bravely stand up, speak out, sit down, or whatever it took to bring the changes that needed to be made in the 1950s, 1960, and 1970s.

In ancient Rome the tradition of the Cincinnatus, the citizen hero soldier who stood up, who left his plow, fought the war, and then went back to being a citizen, that is what Rosa Parks was, a civilian, a citizen, a nonprofessional who happened to put what was right above her own needs.

As Robert Frost said in his poem, the Road Less Traveled, by not taking the road popular but taking the road less traveled, it made all the difference. By doing the brave thing, the uncomfortable thing, the thing that probably millions wanted to do but perhaps were scared or had reasons not to do, Rosa Parks did, and Mr. Speaker, that made all the difference.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN.)

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

□ 1515

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, to whom God has given much, much is expected. I rise today to say thank you, Mrs. Parks, on behalf of the residents of my district and the people of the State of Florida, for your unselfish commitment to civil rights.

This country is a better place because of her courage. Rosa Parks is a hero. I hope that we consider this Congressional Medal of Honor a first step in finally recognizing Mrs. Parks for her role in our Nation's history.

Mrs. Parks, wherever you are, we love you, we thank you, and we stand on your great shoulders.

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

I simply say that is it not ironic that Mrs. Parks, by remaining seated, stood up for all of us and for our right to fair treatment and to equality. For that, we are a better country and a better

people. This is a just and overdue honor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS).

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. CARSON) for her resolution, and I was honored to work with her to get this resolution to the floor.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the people's House celebrates and honors the courage of one woman, Mrs. Rosa Parks. On December 1, 1955, she refused to give up her seat on a bus in Montgomery, Alabama.

Her arrest ignited a chain of defiance throughout the South. Perhaps the most important lessen we can all learn of our triumph over segregation is that one person has the power to start a movement to right a wrong.

But today nearly 45 years later is an equally important day, because today marks a day of great reconciliation for our Nation. In 44 years we are transformed from a country bitterly and violently divided along color lines into a country that unites to honor the courage of one black woman.

I am honored to stand on the floor of the United States House of Representatives representing the great State of Oklahoma and introducing this resolution, which already has overwhelming bipartisan support, to honor Mrs. Parks. A woman who has been considered a heroine for African-Americans is today a heroine for all Americans.

The United States of America, the greatest democracy the world has ever known, is a country of laws, not of men. However, our laws have not always protected all of its citizens.

The South's ''Jim Crow'' laws oppressed its African-American citizens and undermined the very spirit of our democracy. Although segregation subverted the integrity of equal justice under law, it cannot diminish the most indelible element of democracy: that one man, one woman can stand in the face of injustice and change a Nation. This is the legacy of Mrs. Parks.

Often courage is not deliberate, but rather quiet, unexpected, and subtle. Frequently, maybe daily, we all face simple dilemmas that require us to decide to either follow the pack or forge our own path.

It would have been easy enough for Mrs. Parks to get up and take a back row seat. It would have been simple enough for her to comply with the status quo and relinquish her seat. After all, it was only a seat in a bus, a bus she took back and forth every day. It would have been easy enough.

However, I believe true courage and heroism does not necessarily emerge from the monumental challenges of life but rather from the simple ones. It is easy to let an insult go, easy to yield in an argument, easy to acquiesce, and it would have been easy to give up a seat on the bus in Alabama in 1955, but we are here today to honor a woman who chose not to make the easy choice.

It is the people who choose not to make the easy decisions who change hearts, who change minds, who change history. We should all have the courage not to make the easy choices, for true democracy depends on those who choose their own path.

Democracy is a fragile concept. It is one that rests equally on the shoulders of each individual. Therefore, if one person's liberty is threatened, then everyone's liberty is at risk.

People like Mrs. Parks ensure democracy for all of us, because without them we risk submitting to the simple challenges and slowly surrendering the freedoms we all hold so dear.

I am proud and grateful for Mrs. Parks' past achievement and tenacious disposition, but I am also proud and inspired by the task we undertake today. By supporting the commemoration of Mrs. Parks' accomplishments with a Gold Medal of Honor, we are not only honoring her past achievements, but we also celebrate our present gratitude.

Because when Mrs. Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat that evening on a bus in Alabama, she stood up not only for the civil rights of Southern blacks, but for the civil rights of every red, yellow, brown, black and white American. She did not bend under the formidable pressure democracy can sometimes place on one's shoulders. She stood tall and she stood firm so that we all might stand a little taller and a little prouder.

As the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) said, we all, red, yellow, brown, black, or white, are benefactors of Mrs. Parks' courage. For that, Mrs. Parks, we all say ''Thank you.''

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and for her great leadership in bringing this very, very important piece of legislation to the floor.

This is a great day for the House of Representatives. This is a day that brings honor to the work we do here as we honor Rosa Parks. Rosa Parks is the legitimate heir of the founders of our country. I hesitate to say Founding Fathers because in some ways she is a founding mother for all that our country stands for. She is in the tradition of freedom, equality, and of liberty.

How wonderful, how wonderful that this House of Representatives and thus then this Congress of this United States will award her the Gold Medal. Every American who has ever lived and who ever will live owes Rosa Parks a great debt of gratitude for her courage, for her leadership. It did not stop when she changed the course of history in our country. She continues to be a source of inspiration to all of us.

Again, we thank Rosa Parks for her courage and for allowing us the privilege of honoring her.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to myself the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I take this moment to thank the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) for her hard work, for her vision, and for the care that she has shown in bringing to us what we should have done a long time ago, the honoring of Rosa Parks in this very special way.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), my colleague, the chair of our committee. I would like to thank him for all of his cooperation, for his support, and for the work that he did to make sure that we got this measure up before this House. I thank him very much for all that he has done to ensure that Rosa Parks is honored.

We seek to honor Rosa Parks with the Congressional Gold Medal of Honor because of her love of justice and equality, because of her love of self and her people and all people, because she has helped to save America and pointed the Nation in the right direction after a favorable Supreme Court decision brought to an end the Montgomery bus boycott.

Mrs. Parks moved to Detroit, Michigan, where she worked for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), her good friend and our colleague. I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for seeing to it that Ms. Parks had food on her table. She stayed there until her retirement.

Now, as if she had not done enough, in February of 1987, along with Mrs. Elaine Eason Steele, Mrs. Rosa Parks co-founded the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self-Development. The institute, which focuses on social action and economic development among America's youth, is a realization of one of Mrs. Parks' long-awaited dreams.

When we honor Mrs. Rosa Parks, we honor the best in ourselves. If she had not sat down, where would we stand today?

Mr. Speaker, I hope the time the Members of the House have spent on the floor here today will serve as a history lesson to the young people of this Nation. We want them, like Rosa Parks, to be the absolute best human beings they can possibly be.

We would like them and all Americans to dedicate their lives to freedom, justice, and equality for all people. We would like all Americans who have focused today on this history lesson to live for justice, to work for justice, to sacrifice for justice, and if necessary to even die for justice.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, racial prejudice, as the American novelist Pearl Buck once said, ''is a shadow over all of us and the shadow is darkest over those who feel it least and allow its evil effects to go on.'' Fortunately for the United States, this statement does not describe Rosa Parks.

Her courageous, yet simple act, made clear that the evil of racial prejudice could not go on. In an era when words seemed to speak louder than deeds, her small act of defiance spoke volumes—and we are still hearing the reverberations today.

Rosa Parks not only deserves, but has more than earned the Congressional Gold Medal. When I met her recently over tea, it was an amazing—and humbling—event to meet a living legend. Like American heroes before her, she has created a lasting legacy as truly the first lady of civil rights and the mother of the freedom movement. I am honored to have met her and honored to recommend that she receive the Congressional Gold Medal. I am proud that this Congress has taken the initiative to honor this American legend.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep admiration for Ms. Rosa Parks that I support H.R. 573, authorizing the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to her. As most Americans know, on December 1, 1955, Rosa Parks refused to give-up her seat to a white man on a Montgomery, Alabama bus. It is hard to imagine that up until the 1960s, Americans in the south lived in legal segregation. It took the strength and courage of one seamstress who had a particularly rough day to bring the injuries and injustices that a whole race had felt for decades to the forefront of our national discourse.

Her whole-hearted contribution to the civil rights movement and to the doctrine of non-violent protest was an inspiration to those who had lost hope during such a dark and tense time in American history. By not yielding her seat on that bus, Ms. Parks ignited a fever for change that was not quenched until the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. That fever started with the Montgomery Improvement Association beginning a bus boycott that grew larger and spread to cities across the country. The nation soon became aware of the social injustices that were being placed on its own citizens. Great civil rights leaders took up Rosa Parks' torch and began fighting for legislation that would repel laws calling for discrimination and unequal treatment.

Rosa Parks' dedication to equality and individual rights strikes at the heart of America's founding principles. It was through her steadfast will and enduring faith in the human spirit that a nation torn by racism and hate was able to see the folly of its misguided actions. Her quiet courage taught us all how to follow our hearts and stand-up for the freedom all Americans deserve. To this day, Ms. Parks embodies freedom and is a living example of individual power. Her actions ultimately culminated in the greatest civil rights movement of the century. After years of social strife and protest, America recognized the need to ensure all citizens equal treatment under the law. At the end of the long, loud struggle that Ms. Parks quietly began, all Americans could legally enjoy the rights that our great Constitution entitles all of us to. For those reasons alone she is a monumental figure and worthy of our deepest praise and thanks.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, anybody can be great because anybody can serve. You don't have to have a college degree to serve. You don't have to make your subject and verb agree to serve. You don't have to know Einstein's theory of relativity to serve, or theory of thermodynamics to serve. You only need a heart full of grace and a soul generated by love.

In 1955 at the time of Mrs. Parks heroic act, I was six years old, a daughter of a sky cap and factory worker, a student of the Civil Rights Movement, and now thank God a Congresswoman able to vote to award Rosa Parks a Congressional Gold Medal. I only hope that more young people African American, Caucasian, Asian American, Hispanic, American Indian, brown, black, white, or yellow will continue to be inspired by her heroic acts.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 573, a bill to convey the Congressional Gold Medal to Rosa Parks. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this measure, and I want to also express my thanks to my Hoosier Colleague Julia Carson for authoring the bill.

I thoroughly agree that Rosa Parks is a living role model for all of us. Her grace and dignity are inspiring, and her simple refusal to accept injustice is deservedly a noted highlight of American history. Rosa Parks is one of the most important icons of the century, and today we honor her living contribution to history.

Rosa Parks committed an act of valor that did not just disturb a community—it sent a wake up call to the nation. The foundations of history are built of simple acts of heroism. Ms. Parks earns her rightful place among the notable for her bravery and commitment. For her accomplishments, bestowing this medal is the least that Congress can do.

Mr. Speaker, Rosa Parks' experience teaches us about endurance, about pride, and about self-respect. The lessons learned from her life should reach everyone, and bring us closer together.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Rosa Parks for her role in American History. It is long overdue that the Congress recognize her with the Congressional Gold Medal for her contribution to the Civil Rights Movement.

On December 1, 1955, Rosa Parks stood up for human rights when she refused to give up her seat on a bus in Montgomery, Alabama. Her simple yet enormous act of defiance led to the 382 day Montgomery Bus Boycott. Rosa Parks stared down racism and hatred by simply saying ''No.'' No to Jim Crow. Not to second-class citizenship. No to segregation. By doing so, she said yes to freedom and yes to the principle that ''all men are created equal.''

We should not think however, that this resistance was easy. Rosa Parks was thrown in jail, harassed, and humiliated. But, this did not stop her from pressing forward. She displayed exemplary courage at a time when it was unsafe for a black woman to do so. She wanted equality not only for African-Americans, but for all Americans.

During this tumultuous time America, Rosa Parks was a beacon of light for our country. Her defiance and the persistence of African-Americans led to the desegregation of public transportation in Montgomery. She has earned her place in history with other civil rights pioneers such as Harriet Tubman, Frederick Douglass, and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Prior to the Montgomery Bus Boycott, Rosa Parks served as the Secretary of the NAACP and later Adviser to the NAACP Youth Council. She tried to vote at a time when it was impossible for African Americans to do so. She was constantly turned away at the polls, but these obstacles did not hinder her pursuit of justice.

Segregation was evil, demeaning, and belittling to our Constitution. Today is our chance to reaffirm our faith in freedom.

This honor should not have taken so much time. We should remember Dr. Martin Luther King's words in his letter from A Birmingham Jail:

> Actually, time itself is neutral: it can be used either destructively or constructively. More and more I feel that the people of ill will have used time much more effectively than the people of good will. . . Human progress never rolls in on wheels of inevitability; it comes through the tireless efforts of men willing to be coworkers with God, and without this 'hard work,' time itself becomes an ally of the forces of social stagnation. We must use time creatively, in the knowledge that the time is always ripe to do right.

Rosa Parks lived these words.

Mr. Speaker, Americans have made great strides in equality, but we still have a long way to go. Awarding Rosa Parks a Congressional Gold Medal is the least we can do to recognize her achievements to the Civil Rights Movement. She truly inspired a nation.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of bill H.R. 573 to honor the eternal Mother of the Modern Civil Rights Movement, Rosa Parks. Ms. Parks' humble and courageous resistance on that great day in 1955 served as a catalyst for great change in our nation. Her refusal of ''second class citizenship'' served as a testimony to her pursuit of equality and justice for all Americans. Ms. Parks' is one of the great figures of modern times, and it is, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, ''altogether fitting and proper'' that we repay her dedication with the Congressional Gold Medal.

When they arrested and removed Ms. Parks from that bus in Montgomery, Alabama, she did not know the momentous impact of her actions. She didn't know that her quiet courage would spark the bus boycotts and the emergence of a young minister by the name of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Ultimately, the movement ignited by Ms. Parks led to the monumental civil rights legislation passed by this great body.

Ms. Parks has been recognized by virtually every national organization dedicated to equality and social justice in this nation, yet until today, the U.S. Congress had not extended such an honor. I urge each and every person in this House to vote ''yes'' to bill H.R. 573. Join me in honoring Rosa Parks, a champion of the Civil Rights Struggle, with the Congressional Gold Medal.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I rise today in strong support of this legislation to honor one of my heroes and a great American, the venerable Rosa Parks.

On a wintery afternoon in December 1955, Rosa Louise Parks could not have known she would soon become a national symbol and civil rights icon. But in standing her ground and demanding her fair and equal treatment on that bus in Montgomery, Alabama, Rosa Parks became the first lady of civil rights and the mother of the freedom movement.

Her simple action and committed resolve that day empowered a people, ignited a movement and changed the course of American history.

The events that followed Ms. Park's protest that day—her arrest, the Montgomery bus boycott, and the eventual integration of the bus system—set the stage for Dr. Martin Luther King and the Civil Rights Act.

As a young college student, I was inspired by the stories of Ms. Park's courageous action. I traveled to the south as a ''freedom rider'' in support of the blossoming civil rights movement, and I too was jailed for my actions.

Rosa Parks determination and tenacity that day continues to be an inspiration to all those committed to non-violent protest and change more than 40 years later. She continues to be a symbol and tireless advocate for justice and equality throughout America. She is a priceless lesson on the ''power of one.''

Mr. Speaker, Rosa Parks is a national treasure. Our debt to her is great, and awarding her the Congressional Gold Medal is an honor long overdue.

I am proud to co-sponsor this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to my hero, Rosa Louise Parks.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago this December, Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat on a bus to a white man who wanted it. Rosa Parks didn't know that she was making history. And she certainly had no idea that she would become a genuine American hero. What she knew was that she was tired after a long day's work and she wanted to rest her weary feet.

In the first half of this century, Montgomery, Alabama, represented the worst segregation had to offer. Daily life in Montgomery included such insulting facts of life as ''blacks only'' elevators, segregated lunch counters, and Jim Crow laws which relegated African-Americans to second-class status. And on public buses, the first four rows of seats were reserved for whites, and usually remained empty when there were not enough whites to fill them. The back section, of course, was always very crowded, was reserved for blacks.

One December evening after a long day at work, Rosa Parks stepped on a bus for the ride home to a restful night of sleep. Parks was sitting in the middle section of the bus when a white man boarded the bus and demanded that she move because the white section of the bus was full. Parks, very tired from a long day working as a seamstress, quietly refused to move. When told by the bus driver that the police were about to be called, Parks said, ''Go ahead and call them.'' The police came and they arrested this gentle, middle-aged women for refusing to move to the back of the bus.

It was this stand against racism and prejudice in Montgomery, Alabama, that has led many to refer to Rosa Parks as, ''The mother of the Civil Rights movement.'' Because of the courage of individuals like Rosa Parks, the ugly head of segregation was eventually severed and the violence and indignities that once faced African-Americans in the South are now grim reminders of a shameful part of American history.

Mr. Speaker, school children today read in their history books about the strength, dignity and heroism of Rosa Parks. She is a living treasure and her heroism serves as a constant reminder that freedom only works if freedom applies equally to all Americans, regardless of color or circumstances.

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to offer my support for H.R. 573, which would ''Authorize the President to Award a Gold Medal on Behalf of the Congress to Rosa Parks in Recognition of her Contributions to the Nation.''

Rare are the people who can be called ''living legacies.'' But today I am fortunate to have the opportunity to honor one of these rare people. Her name is Rosa Parks.

It is probably hard for any of us to understand the inner strength and fortitude that it took for Ms. Parks to take the simple, but momentous action she did on that fateful day of December 1, 1955. Yet, what we can understand is why she is most deserving of a Presidential Gold Medal.

We often hear the phrase ''one person can make a difference.'' No one more embodies that phrase than Rosa Parks. Not only did she make a difference to her generation—since it was her action that inspired the creation of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act—but she continues to inspire generations that have followed. Through the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self-Development, a non-profit organization she co-founded in 1987, she works with young people to help them achieve their full potential.

No words can better state the difference that one person can make than what Ms. Parks wrote herself in her book *Quite Strength* ''Our mistreatment was just not right, and I was tired of it. I kept thinking about my mother and my grandparents, and how strong they were. I knew there was a possibility of being mistreated, but an opportunity was being given to me to do what I had asked of others.''

When she refused to give up her seat on a bus to a white man she inspired 42,000 African Americans to boycott Montgomery buses for 381 days. Rosa Parks' fight against the barriers of racism could have easily ended there. The fact that it did not is what makes her so special.

Rosa Parks is a woman who lived her life with the strongest of convictions for what is right, what is good and what is just. I urge my colleagues to support this bill to honor one of our Nation's living legacies who has devoted her life to making a difference in this country.

Thank you, Rosa Parks for all that you have done.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 573 to authorize the President to award a gold medal honoring Mrs. Rosa Parks.

She has embodied the importance of individual responsibility and the significance of individual action. When she stood up for her rights as a human being, she truly made a difference.

In her autobiography *Quiet Strength,* Mrs. Parks explains that she did not change things alone. She writes, ''Four decades later I am still uncomfortable with the credit given to me for starting the bus boycott. I would like people to know I was not the only person involved. I was just one of many who fought for freedom.''

Her enduring modesty has also been an example for others, reminding us that standing up for principle is enough of a reward, whether it is in the limelight or in the shadows.

The reality is, of course, that Rosa Parks was the pebble that started an avalanche, and for that she is honored as the Mother of the Civil Rights Movement in America.

I have had the privilege of knowing Rosa Parks over the decades of the civil rights movement. As she has for millions of Americans, she has been for me a source of inspiration in the battle for good will among us all.

I urge support for this important resolution.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 573, legislation which will authorize a congressional gold medal to Rosa Parks. H.R. 573 will authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Rosa Parks. Rosa Parks is the Mother of America's civil rights movement. Her efforts opened new doors of opportunity and brought true equality for all Americans closer to reality.

In 1955, Rosa Parks touched off the bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama, when she was arrested for refusing to yield her seat at the front of the bus to a white man. Boneweary from a long day at work, Rosa Parks was on her way home. The only seat available on the bus was in the 'white' section. Outraged by her arrest, the black community in Montgomery launched a bus boycott demanding racial integration of the bus system.

The bus boycott introduced Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. to America as a civil rights leader. Led by Dr. King, African-Americans took car-pools to their destinations in Montgomery and pushed the bus system to the brink of financial ruin. After months of running nearly-empty buses, Montgomery relented and agreed to integrate the system. For the first time bus riders, no matter what their color, could sit anywhere they wanted.

The movement sparked in Montgomery culminated several years later in the Civil Rights Act, and other civil rights legislation, and a new affirmation of the equal rights promised all Americans by the Constitution. The quiet courage of Rosa Parks changed the course of American history and came to symbolize the power of non-violent protest.

In the 44 years since that day in Montgomery, the nation has derived immense benefit from the leadership Rosa Parks inspired, and she continues to dedicate her life to the cause of universal human rights.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Rosa Parks' contributions to the nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this unique woman and authorizing a congressional gold medal.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, today the U.S. House is honoring the contributions of a distinguished native Alabamian who helped change the social fabric of the nation. I'm speaking of Rosa Parks, known as the mother of the civil rights movement.

On Thursday, December 1, 1955, Rosa Parks, an African-American seamstress, boarded a city bus in Montgomery, Alabama on her way home from work. She took her seat on the crowded bus just behind the white section. A few stops later, as more passengers boarded, the driver ordered her to give up her seat to a white man. She refused and the bus driver called the police. Parks was arrested for violating the Montgomery segregation code, having to pay a $10 fine and $4 in court costs.

It was this single act of courage that served as the catalyst for the Montgomery bus boycott of 1955 and the U.S. Supreme Court's eventual declaration that bus segregation was unconstitutional. By her quiet defiance, Rosa Parks laid the foundation of the peaceful resistance movement for American civil rights.

Today, the House has honored Rosa Parks's place in the history of our nation by authorizing the minting of a Congressional Gold Medal to be presented to her. I am proud to support this tribute to a great American who continues her quiet struggle for racial and social harmony.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on December 1, 1955, Rosa Parks sat down for justice, sat down for righteousness, and then she would not get up when faced with tyranny and

oppression. In this immortal act, refusing to give her seat to a white man, she inspired the oppressed masses of minorities in America to reach for what America owed them. Ms. Parks also inspired a modern American myth that has allowed generations of children to aim higher, to reach for something better, and to believe that justice is possible for all people. This myth allows children and grown folk to believe that, maybe, all men are created equally. This woman inspired children from Soweto to Tibet, from Turkey to Columbia, and she still inspires children from Harlem to Watts, from Austin to Minneapolis, and from Chicago's west side to the south side and up to the north side.

Martin Luther King, Jr., while standing on the Mall of America in our Nation's Capitol said, ''We refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt . . . So we have come to cash this check, a check that will give us upon demand the riches of freedom and security of justice.'' Now we, as Members of Congress, we are voting to cash a check and give a poor black woman from Montgomery, Alabama, a Congressional Gold Medal. Because she helped America realize that injustice permeated the land, realize that African-Americans would no longer accept the repeated abuse and inequity that went with their supposed life. Because she helped a nation realize we can only be as great as our most oppressed citizens. Because she was a catalyst for the greatest civil rights change in this Nation's history.

In the later years, the struggle progressed and spread this great nation, those who followed her path of civil disobedience while fighting for justice looked to her for strength and for inspiration. If Rosa Parks could go to jail for justice then so could they, and the jails across the southern States filled to the bursting point with people demanding equality. By awarding this medal today we bestow a rightful honor owed, an honor required, and an honor that is overdue.

It is high time we added Rosa Parks to the Pantheon of American heroes along Robert Kennedy, George Washington, and Nelson Mandela and this medal does just that. By awarding this medal we let the world know the bank of justice and righteousness is no longer returning checks to African-Americans marked as ''insufficient funds,'' but we are on the road to distributing the dividends of justice and equality for all.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, today, led by a remarkable woman, Congresswoman JULIA CARSON, we honor the actions of another remarkable woman, Mrs. Rosa Parks. Congresswoman CARSON has worked tirelessly to insure that Mrs. Parks receives a Congressional Gold Medal, a distinction reserved for only the most heroic individuals who have affected change on a grand scale. It is particularly fitting that Mrs. Parks receive this award, since through her simple action, refusing to give up her seat on a crowded Montgomery bus, she affected the modern history of the most powerful nation in the world. However, Mrs. Parks is not only the Mother of the Civil Rights Movement, she is one of its current guardians, and I believe that in honoring her most well-known deeds, we must honor the other contributions she has made as well.

Another leader who refused to see people stripped of the dignity and self-respect they deserve, Mahatma Ganhi, once said that. ''Whatever you do, however small and insignificant it may seem, it is most important that you do it.'' Mrs. Parks' actions, and the enormous ramifications her small action has had, are a perfect example of the importance each individual must put in their own endeavors. Mrs. Parks' actions since that fateful day in Montgomery have helped many people reach their full potential. Although her leadership in the Montgomery bus boycott made her famous, her subsequent 33 years of work as a member of Congressman CONYERS' staff also made a real impact on the lives of others. In fact, Mrs. Parks has spent her whole life, not merely one day in 1955, providing an example for all of us of the difference one person can make.

In 1987, Mrs. Parks founded the nonprofit Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self-Development, which motivates youth to reach their potential through many programs, including bank training, substance-abuse prevention and goal setting. The institute she founded is not designed to organize a mass rebellion or spark a sense of outrage in the children it reached. Instead, Mrs. Park believes that spending time with children, giving them a good sense of their history and the pride they should have in it can affect real change. She spends a good deal of her time teaching the children she works with about the contributions of Africans in America, she sets the record straight about events during the civil rights movement with the expertise of someone who knows. The program she designed emphasizes pride, dignity, courage, leadership, and the importance of marketable skills. The institute's most well-known program, Pathway to Freedom, enables youth to research history around the country—by bus—tracing the underground railroad. Mrs. Parks teaches kids, ages 11–17, about the Underground Railroad that carried slaves through a secret route of wooded hideouts and safe houses to freedom in Canada. She given them the opportunity to participate in a month-long tour of those ''Pathways to Freedom.''

An example of personal responsibility who cleaned the bathrooms in her private school to pay for her own tuition, Mrs. Parks also passes this empowering sense of self on to the children with which she works. Awarding Mrs. Parks the Congressional gold Medal not only honors her stand, so to speak, in 1955, it also honors the many contributions she has made since then. Congresswoman CARSON'S tribute to Mrs. Parks reflects her understanding of the importance the leadership of African-American women has on the nation.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 573, a bill to award a Congressional gold medal to Ms. Rosa Parks.

As the 91st African-American Member of Congress, I stand on the shoulders of Ms. Rosa Parks and the other mothers, martyrs, and soldiers of the struggle to create a more perfect Union.

On December 1, 1955, a weary seamstress in Montgomery refused to give up her seat on the public bus to a white man for the long ride home. She was just too plain tired. By her simple yet significant act of defiance, Ms. Parks struck a mighty blow against the states' rights philosophy that justified Jim Crow American Apartheid, and helped set the nation back on the course of Reconstruction.

Ninety years after the end of the Civil War, her actions were the catalyst for the sweeping and revolutionary changes that culminated in some of the most significant legislation to ever pass the House of Representatives: The Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Fair Housing Act of 1968.

In fact, my election to Congress, and the elections of every African-American serving in Congress, can all be directly attributed to her courage on that fateful day.

But if we are to honor Ms. Rosa Parks for her courageous actions on that bus in Montgomery, surely we must also honor her for the life of activism that led up to that event. Ms. Parks was as a familiar participant in the civil rights struggle long before that bus ride.

Through the forties and fifties, she served as an active and vocal member of the NAACP. She joined the Montgomery Voters League, and was active in registering others to vote well before her 44 years of fame began.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as we add our names to the litany of those who have paid tribute to the legacy Ms. Parks has created, let us also recognize the larger significance of her acts.

The true legacy for all Americans in the beginning of the Montgomery bus boycott is the years of hard work, perseverance, preparation, and faith that preceded that moment.

Mr. Speaker, Honorable Members of the House, Rosa Parks did not make history by refusing to give up her seat on a bus in downtown Montgomery in 1955; she made history by preparing herself to stand and be counted long before the spotlight was cast on her weary feet.

She is a model citizen of this nation. And it is the entirety of her actions and the singularity of her purpose—a freer and more just nation—that we ought honor here today. Even more, we ought to continue to work in her legacy by striving to deliver on the constitutional promise of a more perfect Union, a Union in which no American is left behind.

Ms. Parks, on behalf of myself, my staff and the constituents of the Second District of Illinois, I thank you for all of the sacrifices you made for the United States of America.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Rosa Parks.

Occasionally in our nation's history there are pivotal moments and indispensable individuals that move America away from its divisive past and closer to its imagined promise. December 1, 1955, produced such a moment and such a person.

Rosa Parks grew up in segregation. Every day she was forced to deal with the violation of America's constitutional guarantees. On December 1, 1955, this American woman, exacted of this country the freedom and equality the Constitution promises.

Tired, like most citizens after a hard day's work, Rosa Parks refused to obey a shameful law that required her to sit at the back of a Montgomery, AL, bus. Her actions set the stage for the civil rights movement of a people who were unfairly and unjustly living under racist law.

Because of this brave American woman, segregation laws around the nation began to crumble and our nation began to respond to the call for African-American equality. Because of her invaluable contribution to our nation, every American lives better lives today. For that reason, it is quite appropriate that Mrs.

Rosa Parks receive the Congressional Gold Medal.

But I must add Mr. Speaker, that today, our nation continues to call for equality and freedom. There are still issues in our America that were issues in 1955. There are still Americans who do not enjoy the promises enumerated in the constitution. So, if we are to truly honor this great woman, we must do so, not only with a Gold Medal, but also with actions that further her purpose. We must all become individuals working to end the discrimination and inequalities that exist in our great nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and honor the mother of the civil rights movement, Mrs. Rosa Parks.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 573. At the same time, I rise in great respect for the courage and high ideals of Rosa Parks who stood steadfastly for the rights of individuals against unjust laws and oppressive governmental policies. However, I oppose the Congressional Gold Medal for Rosa Parks Act because authorizing $30,000 of taxpayer money is neither constitutional nor, in the spirit of Rosa Parks who is widely recognized and admired for standing up against an overbearing government infringing on individual rights.

Because of my continuing and uncompromising opposition to appropriations not authorized within the enumerated powers of the Constitution, I must remain consistent in my defense of a limited government whose powers are explicitly delimited under the enumerated powers of the Constitution—a Constitution, which only months ago, each Member of Congress, swore to uphold.

Perhaps we should begin a debate among us on more appropriate processes by which we spend other people's money. Honorary medals and commemorative coins, under the current process, come from allocated other people's money. We should look for another way.

It is, of course, easier to be generous with other people's money.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer my enthusiastic support to H.R. 573, a bill to authorize the President of the United States to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Rosa Parks in recognition of her contribution to the nation.

In recent years, the Congress has bestowed this important honor to Nelson Mandella, Mother Theresa and Frank Sinatra. In their own way, each of these individuals has made significant social contributions. Moving beyond their basic roles as a political figure, a nun, and a musician, these Congressional Medal recipients have, by deed and example, influenced history.

The life of Rosa Parks and her heroic act of defiance on a Montgomery, Alabama bus on December 1, 1955, have forever changed history for millions of Americans. Few Americans can be more deserving of the Congressional Gold Medal. Rosa Parks's contribution to our society goes far beyond what she did one day in Montgomery, Alabama. From that day on, Rosa Parks has spent her life fighting for equity and justice, including her roles as the founder of the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self-Development to offer guidance to young African-Americans in preparation for leadership careers.

Having recently celebrated her 86th birthday, Rosa Parks deserves the thanks of the American public for decades of dedication to the cause of racial equality. By her own admission, the ''mother of the civil rights movement'' is still uncomfortable with the accolades she has received over the years. In remains, however, our obligation as the elected representatives of our nation to single out those among us who deserve special recognition as role models for our society. Today, we have such an opportunity. By supporting the resolution before us we honor the principles that are the foundation of the American democracy.

I am pleased to cast an ''aye'' vote on the legislation before us and honor a most deserving recipients of the Congressional Gold Medal.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in honoring Mrs. Rosa Parks. As we approach the millennium, it is fitting that we bestow the Congressional gold medal on a woman whose simple, but profound response to unfairness marked a defining moment in our American century.

I offer the words of another of this century's courageous Americans as a tribute to Rosa Parks. As he accepted the Nobel Peace Prize, Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. had this to say:

''I [have] an abiding faith in America and an audacious faith in the future of mankind. I refuse to accept despair as the final response to the ambiguities of history. I refuse to accept the idea that the 'isness' of man's present nature makes him morally incapable of reaching up for the eternal 'oughtness' that forever confronts him. I refuse to accept the idea that man is mere flotsam and jetsam in the river of life, unable to influence the unfolding events which surround him.''

Mrs. Parks' courage to reach up for the ''oughtness'' before her continues half a century later to inspire others who refuse to accept the ''ambiguities of history.'' Mrs. Parks, we thank you for your profound contribution to our nation.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in recognizing Rosa Parks, whom by her brave action became a catalyst in the Civil Rights Movement. When Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat on a Montgomery bus on December 1, 1995, no one realized the national impact her actions would have. Rosa Parks was simply one courageous woman who did what she believed was fair and right. She is a testament to the power of one individual willing to fight for her beliefs.

''Ms. Parks' actions set the Civil Rights Movement in motion and set a precedence for protest without violence. I would like to thank Rosa Parks for her contribution to freedom and justice for all men and women in this country. Her actions changed the course of history. Today Rosa Parks will take her rightful place among the legends of history when Congress presents her with the Congressional Medal of Honor.''

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to Rosa Parks and in support of a bill introduced by Congresswoman JULIA CARSON of Indiana to authorize President Clinton to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Rosa Parks.

Rosa Parks was the spark that lit the fire in the civil rights rights movement. In 1955, in Montgomery, Alabama Ms. Parks refused to give up her bus seat to a white man. She was arrested and ordered to pay $14. Her actions led other civil rights leaders to protest bus desegregation creating a city-wide boycott. Martin Luther King, Jr. became a household name when he became involved in the boycott by preaching to others about the injustice of the bus segregation policy.

Ms. Parks continued to be a national civil rights leader even after the success of the bus boycott. She lectured about the civil rights movement and attended demonstrations. She worked for Congressman JOHN CONYERS of Detroit, Michigan until 1988.

Congress should recognize Ms. Parks for her actions that defied the policies of separation and humilitation. Through this legislation, Congress should salute Ms. Parks for her current work in combating racism at the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute of Self Development which teaches young people about the legacy of the civil rights movement.

Because of Rosa Parks' courage, I stand before you here today. Because of her courage, America is a stronger nation.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation. I am proud to serve in a Congress that recognizes the importance of the civil rights movement and is willing to honor a woman who ushered in the movement. Our past should not be forgotten and our heroines should be honored.

I hope that this legislation will serve to bring America together. That is Ms. Parks' legacy.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 573, as amended.

The question was taken.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 573.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

ALLOWING FOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF CERTAIN ROLLOVER DISTRIBUTIONS TO ACCOUNTS AND ELIMINATING CERTAIN WAITING-PERIOD REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTICIPATING IN THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 208) to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow for the contribution of certain rollover distributions to accounts in the Thrift Savings Plan, to eliminate certain waiting-period requirements for participating in the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 208

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

SECTION 1. ELIGIBLE ROLLOVER DISTRIBUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8432 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j)(1) For the purpose of this subsection—

''(A) the term 'eligible rollover distribution' has the meaning given such term by section 402(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

''(B) the term 'qualified trust' has the meaning given such term by section 402(c)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(2) An employee or Member may contribute to the Thrift Savings Fund an eligible rollover distribution from a qualified trust. A contribution made under this subsection shall be made in the form described in section 401(a)(31) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. In the case of an eligible rollover distribution, the maximum amount transferred to the Thrift Savings Fund shall not exceed the amount which would otherwise have been included in the employee's or Member's gross income for Federal income tax purposes.

''(3) The Executive Director shall prescribe regulations to carry out this subsection.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2000, or such earlier date as the Executive Director (as defined by section 8401 of title 5, United States Code) may by regulation prescribe, but not before September 1, 2000.

SEC. 2. IMMEDIATE PARTICIPATION IN THE THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN.

(a) ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN WAITING PERIODS FOR PURPOSES OF EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTIONS.—Paragraph (4) of section 8432(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(4) The Executive Director shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the following:

''(A) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2), an employee or Member described in such subparagraph shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity to first make an election under this subsection beginning on the date of commencing service or, if that is not administratively feasible, beginning on the earliest date thereafter that such an election becomes administratively feasible, as determined by the Executive Director.

''(B) An employee or Member described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity to first make an election under this subsection (based on the appointment or election described in such subparagraph) beginning on the date of commencing service pursuant to such appointment or election or, if that is not administratively feasible, beginning on the earliest date thereafter that such an election becomes administratively feasible, as determined by the Executive Director.

''(C) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this paragraph, contributions under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (c) shall not be payable with respect to any pay period before the earliest pay period for which such contributions would otherwise be allowable under this subsection if this paragraph had not been enacted.

''(D) Sections 8351(a)(2), 8440a(a)(2), 8440b(a)(2), 8440c(a)(2), and 8440d(a)(2) shall be applied in a manner consistent with the purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B), to the extent those subparagraphs can be applied with respect thereto.

''(E) Nothing in this paragraph shall affect paragraph (3).''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 8432(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the first sentence by striking ''(b)(1)'' and inserting ''(b)''; and

(B) by amending the second sentence to read as follows: ''Contributions under this subsection pursuant to such an election shall, with respect to each pay period for which such election remains in effect, be made in accordance with a program of regular contributions provided in regulations prescribed by the Executive Director.''.

(2) Section 8432(b)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''(or any election allowable by virtue of paragraph (4))'' after ''subparagraph (A)''.

(3) Section 8432(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Notwithstanding paragraph (2)(A), an'' and inserting ''An''.

(4) Section 8439(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''who makes contributions or'' after ''for each individual'' and by striking ''section 8432(c)(1)'' and inserting ''section 8432''.

(5) Section 8439(c)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Nothing in this paragraph shall be considered to limit the dissemination of information only to the times required under the preceding sentence.''.

(6) Sections 8440a(a)(2) and 8440d(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, are amended by striking all after ''subject to'' and inserting ''this chapter.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2000, or such earlier date as the Executive Director (as defined by section 8401 of title 5, United States Code) may by regulation prescribe, but not before September 1, 2000.

(2) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, until the amendments made by this section take effect, title 5, United States Code, shall be applied as if this section had not been enacted.

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS FOR RETIREMENT.

(a) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—Section 8423(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, effective with respect to contributions for pay periods beginning on or after October 1, 2000, the normal-cost percentage used for purposes of any computation under this subsection shall be equal to—

''(A) the percentage that would otherwise apply if this paragraph had not been enacted, plus

''(B) .01 of 1 percentage point.''.

(b) SUPPLEMENTAL LIABILITY.—For purposes of applying section 8423(b) of title 5, United States Code, and section 857(b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4071f(b)), all amounts shall be determined as if this section had never been enacted.

(c) LIMITATION ON SOURCE OF ADDITIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—Notwithstanding section 8423(a)(3) of title 5, United States Code, or any other provision of law, the additional Government contributions required to be made by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a) shall be made out of any amounts available to the employing agency involved, other than any appropriation, fund, or other amounts available for the payment of employee salaries or benefits.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 307 of the Federal Employees' Retirement System Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–335; 5 U.S.C. 8401 note) is amended by inserting '', including the additional amount required under section 8423(a)(5)(B) of such title 5,'' after ''Federal Employees' Retirement System''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 208.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 208. H.R. 208 would achieve two worthwhile objectives. First, it would allow newly hired Federal employees to begin contributing their own money to the Thrift Savings Plan, the Federal Government's 401(k) plan, almost immediately. Second, Federal employees would be able to consolidate their retirement funds in the Thrift Savings Plan.

I believe the policy underlying H.R. 208 is sound. I commend the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) for introducing this legislation and for all of her hard work to advance this bill.

I also would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, for his strong support for this legislation. I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) for expediting this very important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in light of all the uncertainty surrounding Social Security, Congress should encourage everyone, including Federal employees, to assume more responsibility for their own retirement. H.R. 208 does exactly that.

According to the Congressional Research Service, each $1,000 employees contribute their first year will increase their Thrift Savings Plan balances after a 30-year career by almost $19,000. That is assuming a 10 percent rate of return, which is very good. It is a very good incentive to save.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and I have been working closely together to help offset and pay for this benefit, and I greatly appreciate her cooperation in this process. As a result of this work, H.R. 208 fully offsets the cost of this benefit without raising taxes on the American people.

I encourage all Members to support this very important bill.

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

□ 1530

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

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), for sponsoring H.R. 208. I also want to thank our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the full committee chairman, and certainly our ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), for bringing this bill up so quickly.

H.R. 208 makes significant reforms in the Thrift Savings Plan. This bill contains proposals that are contained in President Clinton's fiscal year 2000 budget. It would permit new Federal employees to begin contributing to their TSP immediately rather than waiting a year, as required under current law, and would let Federal employees transfer balances from other tax deferred savings plans, including private sector 401(k) accounts, to their TSP accounts.

Early participation in the Federal Employees Retirement System, particularly in the Thrift Savings Plan, is critical if an employee is going to maximize the amount of savings earned for his retirement.

The importance of saving for one's retirement is more evident to me as the Subcommittee on Civil Service of the Committee on Government Reform considers legislation to offer long-term care insurance as a benefit option to Federal and postal employees and military personnel and retirees. A study released at the beginning of this month shows that baby boomers are concerned about their retirement security, but are not saving adequately for their long-term care needs. H.R. 208 is one initiative that will help the Federal work force save money for their golden years.

At the full committee markup of this bill, the Republicans offered an amendment to pay for the cost of the legislation by requiring agencies to divert money from their already hard-pressed salaries and expense accounts into the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Trust Fund. The Democrats strongly opposed this provision and worked in a swift and bipartisan manner to formulate an acceptable alternative that would require agencies to pay for the cost, but prohibit them from using salaries and benefit accounts for this purpose.

I support this prohibition, Mr. Speaker, because Federal employees have been squeezed enough. Inadequate pay raises, increasing costs in health insurance premiums, and the constant threat of layoffs and contracting out have caused serious problems in Federal agencies. Enough is enough.

I am pleased now to be able to support this legislation because it helps Federal employees save for their retirement and removes the possibility that any of them would have to lose their jobs to pay for it.

Again, I congratulate the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), my colleague, and I urge all Members to join me in supporting this legislation.

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), who is, of course, a great champion of Federal employees and who is the architect of this bill.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding me this time, and I am really delighted this important legislation is coming before the House today.

I certainly want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), as well as the committee's ranking minority member, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), and of course we have just heard from the subcommittee's ranking minority member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), my colleague, for all their strong support throughout.

Mr. Speaker, when I thank my colleagues I know that I also speak for the thousands of Federal employees with whom I have met and who have written and called my office and the offices of others in support of this legislation.

This legislation would bolster two critical components of Federal employees' retirement benefits, the Thrift Savings Plan. The Thrift Savings Plan is critical for all Federal employees but is particularly important for those employees hired in the last decade who, under the Federal Employees Retirement System, receive smaller civil service benefits and need to invest more to enhance their retirement income.

Currently, employees can elect to begin contributing to the TSP only during two semiannual election periods that are established by law. Newly hired employees are first eligible to participate during the second election period after being hired. Now, what that means is that these employees must wait from 6 to 12 months, depending upon their dates of hire, before they may contribute their own funds.

Allowing employees to begin contributing to the Thrift Savings Plan immediately makes it more likely that employees will get into or continue the habit of saving for retirement through payroll deduction. Early saving is especially important in order to maximize the effect of compound earnings and to take full advantage of the benefit of pretax savings accorded to tax deferred retirement plans.

This bill would eliminate all waiting periods for employee contributions to the TSP for new hires and rehires. Employees who are hired or rehired would be eligible to contribute their own funds immediately.

Further, ensuring the portability of retirement savings is important because portable retirement savings can follow employees as they change jobs. It also would preserve the special tax status accorded to these funds. So while the Internal Revenue Code currently allows transfers of retirement savings between 401(k) plans, such transfers are not authorized for the Thrift Savings Plan. There is no justification for this limitation.

H.R. 208 would authorize employees to transfer funds from certain tax deferred savings plans from a previous job to their TSP accounts. The funds so transferred would be subject to the rules governing the plan which accepts the transfer.

Mr. Speaker, during the committee markup of H.R. 208, I offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute to this bill to provide offsets to the anticipated decrease in Federal Government general tax revenues that would result from employees taking advantage of the benefits offered by H.R. 208. Because H.R. 208 would eliminate all waiting periods for employee contributions to the TSP for new hires and rehires, it is estimated that about 400,000 employees hired over the 1999–2003 period would participate in the TSP. As a result, the Federal Government would forgo tax revenues over that period, 1999–2003.

The amendment I offered will provide funding to compensate the Federal Government for these lost revenues. And I want to make it clear, this amendment does not require agencies to use any of their salary and expense account funding to accomplish these goals. In fact, it makes clear that they may not use funding intended for employees' salary and expense accounts for those expenses. The amendment assures Federal employees that the legislation is designed to improve benefits for Federal employees, and it will not unintentionally result in furloughs or reductions in force at Federal agencies.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to stress that H.R. 208 is a sensible way to encourage Federal employees to take personal responsibility and increase their savings for retirement, something we want all Americans to do. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important measure, and again I thank the committee chair, the ranking member, the subcommittee chair, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), for their support throughout the way.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my distinguished colleague who has constantly been at the forefront of protecting the rights of Federal employees, and who has been constantly sensitive to their needs and their concerns.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member, my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), for his kind comments and for his leadership on this bill, and in particular for his leadership on ensuring the fact that we did not rob from Peter to pay Paul as it related to employee pay and benefits.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, for his leadership in facilitating this bill to the floor. He is motioning that Mr. Nesterczuk made him do it, but for whatever reasons, he did it. We are pleased; I want him to know that.

I also want to take the opportunity to congratulate my colleague, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. CONNIE MORELLA), who, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) said, is always in the forefront of advocating on behalf of our Federal employee work force.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply add this. The bill has been explained by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) herself, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), and many Members on this floor talking about the necessity to recruit and retain good people. This will be a major recruitment tool, in my opinion, for the Federal Government because it will give the ability to Federal employers to say that first of all its employees can transfer whatever savings they now have in a 401(k) or similarly situated program from a tax standpoint and switch that into the Thrift Savings Plan.

The Thrift Savings Plan, which, by the way, was the creation of Senator TED STEVENS from Alaska and Congressman Bill Ford from Michigan, has been an extraordinarily good program for Federal employees. It was created in 1984 and took effect in 1987 as the integrated retirement system that we now have dealing with retirement and Social Security and the Thrift Savings Plan. Those three components now make up a Federal employees retirement benefit package.

So not only will we allow them to put their money in from previous programs, but in addition to that, we will let them do so from the very beginning of their employment. I think that is a critical aspect of this legislation. I think it will be an incentive for employees to come on board; and I congratulate the committee for bringing this legislation to the floor and will certainly support it enthusiastically.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON).

We are very pleased, Mr. Speaker, at this point to recognize my distinguished colleague from the District of Columbia, and a member of our subcommittee who, too, has been at the forefront of protecting the rights of Federal employees, and one who has put forth her own legislation from time to time to make sure that those rights are protected. I am just so glad that she is on our subcommittee because she makes sure that we keep an institutional memory of the things that we should have been doing for Federal employees and the things that we must do.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his very kind remarks and for yielding me this time, and I congratulate him for his consistent hard work and vigilance on behalf of Federal employees, especially for his particular contribution to this bill and seeing how it was paid for.

I congratulate the gentlewoman from Maryland for writing this bill, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) for his hard work in making sure that the bill was shaped in a bipartisan manner and reached the floor here today.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is, first and foremost, a richly deserved benefit for Federal employees who have fallen way behind the private sector in state-of-the-art benefits, but it has a more important implication for the Federal Government itself.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government seems not to have heard that there is a labor shortage out there, and it is a shortage that goes from the top to the bottom of the work force.

There is a fierce competition for labor at all levels. The Federal Government has literally not joined this competition. It is as if this were 1960, when college graduates and skilled workers automatically gravitated to Federal employment. That has not been the case now for a long time, and it is going to show in our Federal work force. Therefore, the implications of this bill are larger than the modest benefit it provides to our employees in eliminating the waiting period for when an employee can make a contribution to the Thrift Savings Plan and in allowing transfers from a 401(k) savings account.

A way to understand the importance of this bill, if we mean to attract good people to work for the Federal Government, is to imagine an employee looking around among her options and seeing that she could not transfer her 401(k), and seeing that she would have a 6-to-12-month break in engaging in tax-exempt savings herself. It seems to me she might well move on to almost any large employer today where we will find such benefits to be state-of-the-art. There are plenty of alternatives. No large, smart employer would fail to have comparable benefits to those which this bill modestly affords.

□ 1545

Social Security is the most important issue facing the 106th Congress. The President and the Republican majority together are encouraging private savings and investment. If we are serious about encouraging Americans to engage in private saving and our savings are at a low point, then it is time we took care of home first, and the Thrift Savings Account is the place to begin.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) has 10½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. We have no additional speakers.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I am very, very pleased that this legislation is before us. I think it sends a very strong statement to our Federal employees and those who are considering possibly coming into the Federal Government, and that is that the Congress of the United States of America cares about them and cares about their security in retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I just urge all of my colleagues to vote for this very, very important legislation.

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

H.R. 208 is a sound bill, and it is fully paid for. Once again, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) for her hard work on this bill, as well as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the ranking member, and I urge all Members to support it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 208, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING MURDER OF ROSEMARY NELSON AND CALLING FOR PROTECTION OF DEFENSE ATTORNEYS IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 128) condemning the murder of human rights lawyer Rosemary Nelson and calling for the protection of defense attorneys in Northern Ireland, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 128

Whereas on September 29, 1998, Rosemary Nelson, a prominent defense attorney in Northern Ireland, who testified before the

Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights of the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives, stated that she had been harassed and intimidated by the Northern Ireland police force, the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC) in her capacity as a defense attorney, and that she had been ''physically assaulted by a number of RUC officers'' and that the difficulties with the RUC included ''at their most serious, making threats against my personal safety including death threats'';

Whereas Param Cumarswamy, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers, also testified before the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights citing the grave dangers faced by defense attorneys in Northern Ireland and stated that ''there have been harassment and intimidation of defense lawyers by RUC officers'' and that ''these harassments and intimidation were consistent and systematic'';

Whereas the United Nations Special Rapporteur recommended that authorities other than the RUC conduct ''an independent and impartial investigation of all threats to legal counsel in Northern Ireland'' and ''where there is a threat to physical integrity of a solicitor'' the ''Government should provide necessary protection'';

Whereas Northern Ireland's Independent Commission for Police Complaints (ICPC) reported ''serious concerns'' about the RUC's handling of the inquiry into the death threats Rosemary Nelson received and described the RUC officers investigating the death threats as ''hostile, evasive and disinterested'' and also noted an ''ill-disguised hostility to Mrs. Nelson on the part of some police officers'';

Whereas the government, which provided protection for Northern Ireland judges after paramilitary violence resulted in the death of four judges and some family members, should also provide appropriate protection for defense attorneys;

Whereas despite the threats and the intimidation, Rosemary Nelson courageously continued to represent the rights of Catholic clients in high profile cases, including the residents of Garvaghy road in their bid to stop controversial marches in their neighborhood and the family of Robert Hamill who was beaten to death by a sectarian mob in 1997;

Whereas, because of her human rights work, Northern Ireland solicitor Rosemary Nelson, the mother of three young children, suffered the ultimate harassment and intimidation and was brutally murdered on March 15th, 1999, by a bomb placed on her car;

Whereas all those involved in the targeting and killing of defense attorney Rosemary Nelson, including the Red Hand Defenders, a militant loyalist paramilitary group that is opposed to the peace process and that has claimed responsibility for the murder, must be brought to justice;

Whereas the success of the peace process is predicated on the ability of the people of Northern Ireland to believe that injustices such as the murder of Rosemary Nelson will be investigated thoroughly, fairly, and transparently;

Whereas the murder of Rosemary Nelson is reminiscent of the 1989 murder of human rights attorney Patrick Finucane, who, according to the United Nations report, had also received numerous death threats from RUC officers;

Whereas the United Nations Special Rapporteur reported that since the Patrick Finucane murder, further information that seriously calls into question whether there was official collusion has come to light; and

Whereas Rosemary Nelson's stated fear of the RUC, the recent release of Northern Ireland's Independent Commission for Police Complaints (ICPC) report, and the United Nations report, all necessitate the establishment of an independent inquiry into Rosemary Nelson's murder in order to foster confidence and credibility in this investigation as well as the peace process: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the historic significance of the 1998 Good Friday Peace Accords and commends the people of Northern Ireland for their commitment to work together in peace;

(2) condemns all violence committed in violation of the Northern Ireland cease-fire agreement, an agreement that has been largely successful; and

(3) calls on the Government of the United Kingdom—

(A) to launch an independent public inquiry for the investigation of the murder of defense attorney Rosemary Nelson so that evidence gathering, witness interviews, and the issuance of a detailed, public report can be based on the work of law enforcement experts not connected to or reliant upon the efforts of the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC);

(B) to institute an independent judicial inquiry into allegations that defense attorneys are systematically harassed and intimidated by security forces; and

(C) to implement the United Nations Special Rapporteur's recommendation for an independent inquiry into the possibility of collusion in the killing of defense attorney Patrick Finucane.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 128.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), and all those on both sides of the aisle for working together on this bipartisan resolution on the murder of Rosemary Nelson in Northern Ireland that is now before us. It passed without objection last week in our committee because we all know what is at stake here, the very integrity of the Northern Ireland peace process.

On March 15, in Lurgan, Northern Ireland, Rosemary Nelson, prominent Northern Ireland solicitor who had long defended nationalists, Catholics, as well as having represented the nearby Drumcree nationalist community in the controversy over forced Orange Order triumphant marches through their neighborhoods, was murdered. In a brutal, cowardly, and professionally done car bomb near her home, this mother of three lost both her legs from the bomb and died shortly thereafter in the hospital.

A loyalist group, the Protestant Red Hand Defenders, claimed credit for this cowardly terrorist act. Mrs. Nelson was killed solely because she was engaged in advocacy and providing vital legal counsel to many of those who have little faith in a unionist dominated society, and especially the police service, RUC, many fear and want disbanded.

Just late last September, Mrs. Nelson, who had faced numerous threats on her life because of her advocacy and feared the local police as much as the loyalist killers, testified before our House Committee on International Relations.

Mrs. Nelson told our committee of her hope in our committee room that, as a solicitor engaged in representing her clients, many of whom were nationalists, and I quote, ''The test of a new society in Northern Ireland will be to the extent to which it can recognize and can respect our role and enable me to discharge it without proper interference. I look forward to that day,'' said Mrs. Nelson.

The day, sadly, is not yet here. And the resolution before us is intended to help hasten that day. The British Government must establish a completely independent inquiry into Mrs. Nelson's tragic murder and publicly report its findings. The trust and support of all of the people of Northern Ireland in any inquiry into Mrs. Nelson's death is essential.

It is now more important than ever that change must come, and the old ''business as usual'' is not what the nationalist community needs to see in the new north of Ireland. Covering up possible police abuse and negligence is not the way to build lasting peace and justice in Northern Ireland.

What we need to see is an overall independent inquiry into the intimidation of defense lawyers in Northern Ireland, as the U.N. Special Rapporteur called for last year, and told our committee was needed the very same day Mrs. Nelson was before us. We have heard all sorts of stories so far on what is being done in the Nelson inquiry, but none of them are satisfactory.

First, we heard the FBI would be helping the inquiry, and then the Chief Constable of Kent in England would be running the show. Now we have another deputy constable brought in from England to run the investigation.

All the time the local RUC in the Portadown region has been involved from where some of the threats on Mrs. Nelson's life in fact originated. One RUC officer reportedly told another

client of Mrs. Nelson when he was arrested that, ''Nelson won't help you this time. She won't be here that long. She will be dead.''

Now no objective and fair person would want that police service investigating this courageous solicitor's murder. This is one of the factors why the original investigation of these RUC threats against Mrs. Nelson were referred to the London Metropolitan Police for investigation, not the RUC, by the Northern Ireland Independent Commission on Police Complaints.

Yes, a lot rides in how this inquiry is fairly and independently handled by the British Government, as well as the future for the north of Ireland. There is a point in time when the peace process is stalled.

Accordingly, I urge the adoption of this important and timely bipartisan resolution before us and urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the resolution.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support, strong support, of House Resolution 128 and the work of the gentlemen from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and (Mr. PAYNE) and the work that they have done to honor the memory of Rosemary Nelson.

It is amazingly fitting that we celebrated in the previous resolution with the Congressional Gold Medal being given to Rosa Parks, and deservedly so. The fact is that Rosemary Nelson was a Rosa Parks in Northern Ireland. But she, unlike Rosa Parks, will never see the day where she will be so honored in her homeland.

Mr. Speaker, Rosemary Nelson's death should not have happened. Mrs. Nelson dedicated her life to improving human rights in Northern Ireland as a defense attorney for the Catholic minority community. Her work earned her much respect, as well as enemies.

In 1998, Congress heard Mrs. Nelson's fear when she testified before the subcommittee of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the Subcommittee on Human Rights, about her defense work in the north of Ireland. She feared for her life because of the lack of police protection she and other Catholic defense attorneys received or did not receive from the Royal Ulster Constabulary.

In addition to her own fears, the Independent Commission for Police Complaints has reported that the RUC disregarded previous death threats against Mrs. Nelson and that RUC officers repeatedly threatened her during her course of work.

Frankly, I believe the RUC itself is partly responsible for the death of Rosemary Nelson because of their lack of protection of her and its prior history of collusion with loyalist militias.

This resolution brings justice to Rosemary Nelson and her legacy. This resolution calls upon the United Kingdom to carry out an investigation, not connected with the RUC, into the death of Rosemary Nelson.

In the past, quasi-independent investigations have not borne any fruit and typically have been disregarded, unpublished, and swept under the carpet. Reputations have been destroyed and justice has never been served.

In addition, this resolution calls upon investigators to issue a detailed report on police harassment of defense attorneys by RUC forces and forces it to implement the United Nations Special Rapporteur's recommendation for an independent inquiry into the death of defense attorney Patrick Finucane.

This Thursday, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), two great friends of human rights and the peace process in the north of Ireland, are holding hearings in the Committee on International Relations, which I have the pleasure of sitting on, about the reconstitution of the RUC and police reform in Northern Ireland.

The RUC is made up of a force which is over 92 percent Protestant and 100 percent loyalist to the British Government. They have systematically denied basic judicial and human rights to the Catholic minority in Northern Ireland, and have no respect in the Catholic community or in the world community at large. In fact, due to their abysmal human rights record, there is a ban on weapons sales to the Royal Ulster Constabulary by the Government of the United States.

I look forward to working with all my colleagues on both the Committee on International Relations and in the House to work with the international community in creating a police force which more accurately reflects the religious makeup of Northern Ireland, a force which all Irish can be proud of.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues in Congress to stand up for human rights in the north of Ireland and to honor the legacy of Rosemary Nelson.

Again, I want to thank my co-chairs of the Congressional Ad Hoc Committee for Irish Affairs, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), along with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), for their work in bringing attention to and making a difference on Irish issues and human rights in the north of Ireland.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for his fine work on this resolution and for helping us when we got to the full committee, and also the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), as was mentioned, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), one of the cosponsors. We have worked as a team, and I think this is a very important resolution for House consideration today.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today condemns the brutal murder of Northern Ireland defense attorney Rosemary Nelson and calls for the British Government to launch an independent inquiry into Rosemary's killing.

The resolution also calls for judicial inquiry into the allegations of official collusion in the 1989 murder of defense attorney Patrick Finucane and an independent investigation into broader allegations of harassment of defense attorneys by Northern Ireland's police force, known as the Royal Ulster Constabulary or the RUC.

Rosemary Nelson was a champion of due process rights and a conscientious and courageous attorney in Northern Ireland. She was the wife of Paul Nelson and the mother of three young children: Sara, Gavin, and Christopher.

Her murder, Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1999, was a cowardly act by those who are the enemies of peace and enemies of justice in Northern Ireland. Her death is a loss felt not just by her family and friends but by all who advocate fundamental human rights.

Consideration of this resolution today is particularly timely, as officials in Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland, and the U.K. continue to question the ability of the RUC to properly conduct this murder investigation.

In fact, last week the European Parliament passed its own resolution, offered by Dublin's representative Bernie Malone, which calls for ''a fully independent team of investigators to conduct the inquiry as a means of securing confidence and objectivity.''

Anyone who knows anything about human rights in Northern Ireland would have little confidence that the RUC could produce a credible or a transparent or thorough investigation of the murder of a Catholic defense attorney. The history of intimidation of defense attorneys by the RUC has been documented by my subcommittee as well as by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

□ 1600

Thus, Mr. Speaker, there is little reason to believe that Rosemary Nelson, who was mistreated by members of the RUC throughout her professional life as an attorney, would now be treated respectfully and justly in death.

I first met Rosemary Nelson in Belfast a few years ago when she shared with me her genuine concern for the administration of justice in the Northern Ireland. She explained how, as an

attorney, she had been physically and verbally assaulted by RUC members and how they sent death threats to her through her clients. Many of her clients were harassed as well.

Notwithstanding these threats, Rosemary still carried an exhaustive docket which included several high-profile political cases, such as representing the family of Robert Hamill, who was beaten to death by a sectarian mob and representing the residents of Garvaghy Road in their bid to stop controversial marches through the neighborhood. Through her work, she became an international advocate for the rule of law and the right of the accused to a comprehensive defense and an impartial hearing of their case.

For this, however, Rosemary was often the subject of harassment and intimidation. For her service to her clients, Rosemary Nelson paid the ultimate price with her life, the victim of a car bomb.

Mr. Speaker, in September of last year, just 7 months ago, Rosemary testified before my subcommittee. She told us how she feared, she feared the RUC. She reported that she had been, quote, and I quote from her testimony, ''physically assaulted by a number of RUC officers'' and that the harassment included ''threats against my personal safety, including death threats.'' She said she had no confidence in receiving help from her government, because in the end her complaints about the RUC would be investigated by the RUC.

Testifying along with Rosemary Nelson was a man by the name of Mr. Cumaraswamy, a U.N. Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers, who led an extensive human rights investigative team to the UK and published a report in 1998. Mr. Cumaraswamy stated that he found evidence, and I quote him, of ''consistent and systematic,'' close quote, RUC harassment and intimidation of defense lawyers in Northern Ireland. His report was quite critical of the excessive authority granted to the RUC by the so-called ''emergency laws,'' and he expressed dismay that the government had not moved decisively to protect lawyers that were under threat.

Mr. Cumaraswamy recommended a judicial inquiry into the threats and the intimidation of Rosemary Nelson and other defense attorneys. Last week at the UN Commission on Human Rights at their annual summit in Geneva, Mr. Cumaraswamy reported that in the years since the release of his report about the great dangers facing Northern Ireland's defense attorneys that the RUC had shown, and these are his words, ''complete indifference.'' He accused the RUC chief, Constable Ronnie Flanagan, and I quote him again, of ''allowing the situation to deteriorate,'' and like the rest of us, the Special Rapporteur says he has, and these are his words again, ''a nagging feeling that the RUC involvement in what is now a murder investigation could affect and taint the impartiality and the credibility of that investigation.''

And yet, our friends in the Blair government seem unmoved.

Despite Rosemary Nelson's testimony, her concerns and the concerns now raised by human rights experts around the world, the British Government has forfeited the investigation of Rosemary Nelson's murder to the very agency she feared and mistrusted the most. It does not seem to phase them that a report just released by Northern Ireland's police watchdog, the government's Independent Commission for Police Complaints, the ICPC, said that RUC investigators investigating the death threats against Rosemary Nelson were themselves evasive and disinterested. It also found an ill-disguised hostility to Mrs. Nelson on the part of some police officers.

Astonishingly, even the police from the bereaved family, even the pleas from the father himself, the husband and father of the three children, Paul Nelson; he went to Geneva just the other day, and his quote:

''If the ICPC had no confidence in the ability of the RUC to investigate the death threats against Rosemary, how can my family,'' he says, ''be expected to have confidence in their ability, indeed their willingness, to effectively investigate her murder?''

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, the resolution before us today, truly captures Mr. Nelson's sense of despair and reflects the growing international consensus that the British Government needs to act decisively and remove any and all doubts about the investigation into Rosemary Nelson's murder. RUC Ronnie Flanagan has rejected the call for an RUC-free investigation and has instead been spinning his wheels trying to create the image of impartiality and external influence on his investigation.

It does not cut, nobody is buying it, and we need now an RUC-free investigation.

Let me just conclude, Mr. Speaker, by noting that the major international human rights organizations, including Amnesty International, the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, British/Irish Human Rights Watch, the Committee for the Administration of Justice, Human Rights Watch and the Geneva-based Commission of Jurists all support the call for an independent inquiry. That is what we tried to do in this resolution. The time is long past for this to happen, and I hope we get the full support of this body in support of this resolution.

The resolution before us today condemns the brutal murder of Northern Ireland defense attorney Rosemary Nelson and calls on the British Government to launch an independent inquiry into Rosemary's killing.

The resolution also calls for a judicial inquiry into allegations of official collusion in the 1989 murder of defense attorney Patrick Finucane and an independent investigation into broader allegations of harassment of defense attorneys by Northern Ireland's police force, the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC).

Rosemary Nelson was a champion of due process rights and a conscientious and courageous attorney in Northern Ireland. She was the wife of Paul Nelson and the mother of three young children: Sarah (8), Gavin (11), and Christopher (13). Her murder on March 15, 1999, was a cowardly act by those who are the enemies of peace and justice in Northern Ireland. Her death is a loss felt not just by her family and friends, but by all who advocate fundamental human rights.

Consideration of this resolution today is particularly timely as officials in Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland, and the United Kingdom continue to question the ability of the RUC to properly conduct this murder investigation. In fact, last week, the European Parliament passed its own resolution—offered by Dublin's representative, Bernie Malone (MEP)—which calls for ''a fully independent team of investigators'' to conduct the inquiry as a means of securing confidence and objectivity.

Anyone who knows anything about human rights in Northern Ireland would have little confidence that the RUC could produce a credible, transparent, thorough investigation of the murder of a Catholic defense attorney. The history of intimidation of defense attorneys by RUC members has been documented by my subcommittee, as well as by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. Thus, there is little reason to believe that Rosemary Nelson, who was mistreated by members of the RUC throughout her professional life as an attorney, would now be treated respectfully and justly in death.

I first met Rosemary Nelson in Belfast a few years ago, when she shared with me her genuine concern for the administration of justice in Northern Ireland. She explained how, as an attorney, she had been physically and verbally assaulted by RUC members and how they sent death threats to her through her clients. Many of her clients were harassed as well.

Notwithstanding these threats, Rosemary Nelson still carried an exhaustive docket which included several high profile political cases, such as representing the family of Robert Hamill, who was beaten to death by a sectarian mob, and representing the residents of Garvaghy Road in their bid to stop controversial marches in their neighborhood. Through her work, she became an international advocate for the rule of law and the right of the accused to a comprehensive defense and an impartial hearing.

For this, however, Rosemary Nelson was often the subject of harassment and intimidation. For her service to her clients, Rosemary Nelson paid the ultimate price with her life—the victim of a car bomb.

In September 1998—just 7 months ago—Rosemary testified before our subcommittee. She told us she feared the RUC. She reported that she had been ''physically assaulted by a number of RUC officers'' and that the harassment included, ''threats against my personal safety including death threats.'' She said she had no confidence in receiving help from her government because, she said, in the end her complaints about the RUC were investigated by the RUC.

Testifying along with Rosemary Nelson was Mr. Param Cumaraswamy, the U.N. Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers, who led an extensive human rights investigative mission to the United Kingdom and published a report in 1998. Mr.

Cumaraswamy stated that he found evidence of ''consistent and systematic'' RUC harassment and intimidation of defense lawyers in Northern Ireland. His report was quite critical of the excessive authority granted to the RUC through the so-called ''emergency laws'' and he expressed dismay that the government had not moved decisively to protect lawyers under threat.

Mr. Cumaraswamy recommended a judicial inquiry into the threats and intimidation Rosemary Nelson and other defense attorneys had received. He endorsed the establishment of a police ombudsman and he called on the British government to provide protection for defense attorneys who had been harassed. Today, it is hard not to wonder: if only the British Government had taken the Special Rapporteur's recommendations more seriously, Rosemary Nelson might have been better protected and still with us today.

But last week, at the U.N. Commission on Human Rights annual summit in Geneva, Mr. Cumaraswamy reported that in the year since the release of the UN report about the grave dangers facing Northern Ireland's defense attorneys, the RUC has shown ''complete indifference.'' He accused RUC Chief Constable Ronnie Flanagan of ''allowing the situation to deteriorate.'' And like the rest of us, The Special Rapporteur says he has a ''nagging feeling'' that RUC involvement in what is now a murder investigation ''could affect and taint the impartiality and credibility of the investigation.''

And yet, the our friends in the Blair government seem unmoved.

Despite Rosemary Nelson's testimony, her concerns, and the concerns now raised by human rights experts the world over, the British government has forfeited the investigation of Rosemary Nelson' murder to the very agency she feared and mistrusted most, the RUC. It doesn't seem to faze them that a report just released by Northern Ireland's police watchdog, the government's Independent Commission for Police Complaints (ICPC), said that RUC officers investigating the death threats against Rosemary Nelson were themselves ''evasive and disinterested.'' It also found an ''ill-disguised hostility to Mrs. Nelson on the part of some police officers.''

Astonishingly, even the pleas of the bereaved family have fallen on deaf ears at Stormont Castle. As a result, Rosemary Nelson's husband, Paul, went to Geneva last week to gain outside help in his push for an independent investigation into the murder of his wife. He has said very simply, ''if the ICPC had no confidence in the ability of the RUC to investigate the death threats against Rosemary, how can my family be expected to have confidence in their ability—indeed their willingness to effectively investigate her murder?''

The bill before us today captures Mr. Nelson's sense of despair and reflects the growing international consensus that the British Government needs to act decisively to remove any and all doubts about the investigation into Rosemary Nelson's murder. RUC Chief Ronnie Flanagan has rejected the call for an RUC-free investigation and has instead been spinning his wheels trying to create an image of impartiality and external influence in his investigation.

But, it's all an illusion.

While the Chief Constable's diversionary tactics have flattered some—even one or two in our own FBI—the people in the affected community have not been fooled. This week, both the Irish News and the Irish Times reported that despite Mr. Flanagan's posturing about external influences on the investigation, community witnesses ''have been reluctant to talk to the police.''

And who can blame them?

Local residents remain skeptical of the RUC's window dressing and have no confidence in an investigation that has already swapped one non-RUC lead investigator for another.

They don't buy an investigation that advertises itself as a 50-member ''outside'' investigate force even though 40 members of the team are RUC and only 10 are not.

They have low expectations and little trust in an ''investigative team'' that tells people its working hard on the crime but can't get the date of the murder right and issues a telephone hotline number that's already been disconnected or never put in service.

The camouflage on Mr. Flanagan's so-called independent, outside inquiry has already worn thin. Because of the documented, open hostility that RUC officers displayed towards Rosemary Nelson, the RUC simply does not have the credibility to answer the burdensome questions: Who killed Rosemary Nelson? Who ordered her murder? And did the RUC officers who threatened her life in the past either instigate, condone, or cover-up her killing?

In order for this investigation to be beyond reproach, and to have the confidence and cooperation of the Catholic community that Rosemary Nelson adeptly represented, it must be organized, managed, directed and run by someone other than the RUC. Anything short of that may have surface appeal, but it still leaves too much of the grueling investigation under the charge of an organization of which the murder victim herself was extremely suspect, and to whom the local people are afraid to talk.

The major international human rights groups, including Amnesty International, Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, British/Irish Human Rights Watch, the Committee for the Administration of Justice, Human Rights Watch and the Geneva-based International Commission of Jurist support the call for an independent inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, one of the major tenets of the 1998 ''Good Friday Agreement'' is its promise of an acceptable police force that will secure due process rights—rather than thwart them—for members of both communities in Northern Ireland. The success of the peace process is predicated on the government's ability to deliver on a police force that will protect fundamental human rights and to demonstrate to the people of Northern Ireland that injustices such as harassment of defense attorneys and the murders of Patrick Finucane and Rosemary Nelson will be investigated by top-notch, dedicated and impartial personnel.

For these reasons, I urge final passage of this bill.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO).

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support and join my colleagues in lamenting the assassination of Rosemary Nelson. With the prospect of the Good Friday Accords in Northern Ireland and the fact that they are still being pursued, and we are hopeful that they will be brought to resolution, clearly this action against such a high-profile defense lawyer and defense representative in Northern Ireland was calculated to, in fact, stop those peace accords from going through, as other actions that have taken place have also been aimed at that; and I think all of us are hopeful that the Northern Ireland Government, the Government in the UK will recognize that the objectivity of the Royal Ulster Constabulary to in fact do this investigation has been forfeited because of the events that have occurred in the recent past and certainly with regards to Rosemary Nelson obviously, the testimony here, the fact that she feared them and so forth, I think is a statement that demonstrates that they have, in fact, compromised their neutrality in terms of being able to go forward with such investigation.

I think that the government structure clearly want to and hope that they would like to get to the bottom of this, and so I think we must find an objective investigation that is independent to get to the bottom of it; and I think we should get to the bottom of it and prosecute those that are guilty of this assassination and proceed with the business at hand.

I think that events in Northern Ireland are pretty clear. Recently I had the privilege to travel and participate in Northern Ireland with Habitat for Humanity, the Belfast celebration providing homes to both Catholics and Protestants. The economy of all of Ireland is on the upswing, employment and opportunities are growing, and hopefully the discrimination that has persisted in the past can now finally be laid to rest. It has taken hundreds of years to get to where we are, but these are, this type of behavior is learned behavior, and I think that the human spirit certainly can rise above it, and we have seen some pretty good examples of that in the past year.

The electoral process has been successful, and while outstanding issues exist, I am optimistic that the Clinton administration, the former Senator, George Mitchell-led Good Friday Peace Accord Agreement of 1998 will be implemented, and that the IRA decommissioning and reform at the RUC will be achieved.

I commend the leadership of the republic's Prime Minister Ahern, Mr. Trimble and Jerry Adams, who are attempting to bring to conclusion and completion the goals of peace and reconciliation in Northern Ireland.

This horrific murder of the attorney, Rosemary Nelson, represents a sad day in the long peace process in Northern Ireland, but hopefully it will not be the last chapter. Hopefully, the last chapter will be one with this type of symbolic action of this outstanding personality and person, that this will be one in which this loss of life will help to

push us and push these governments to a point of reconciliation and building the type of community and the type of understanding that will settle this matter for decades into the future.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in lamenting the plight of Rosemary Nelson. Sadly, Rosemary, a leading Catholic human rights attorney and campaigner, was murdered by a car bomb in Lurgen, Northern Ireland on March 15, 1999. This cowardly act is believed to have been orchestrated by an outlaw band of extreme Protestant Red Hand Defenders who claimed responsibility for the killing.

Rosemary's commitment to social justice and defense of nationalist activities in high-profile cases throughout Northern Ireland led to intimidation tactics by the Protestant-dominated police force, the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC) and several death threats by unionist para-militaries. Nelson, who was married and the mother of three children aged 8 to 13, represented the Catholic residents of Carvaghy Road, who refused to allow a Protestant fraternal organization to parade past their homes in annual sectarian commemorations that prompted province-wide violence. She also defended the family of Robert Hamill, who was the victim of the ''Portadown kicking'' incident, while RUC police officers did not address this atrocity. Unfortunately, due to Rosemary's death, this case is still pending.

Rosemary made a very impressive and powerful impact when she testified before the House Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, on September 29, 1998. Her testimony exposed the harassment and intimidation of defense lawyers representing nationalists in political cases in Northern Ireland. She accused the RUC of making death threats against her and her family through clients as well as sending threatening telephone calls and letters directly to her. In addition, it is also alleged that the RUC made similar threats against the safety of other defense attorneys in Northern Ireland. I would point out that 10 years ago, prominent Catholic defense attorney Patrick Funucane was murdered by an alleged loyalist death squad. To this day, no one has every been charged with that crime. Further allegations suggests that the RUC has conducted searchers without warrants, arrested and detained suspects without providing access to legal council. These allegations clearly violate international civil rights laws and compromise the neutrality of the RUC to enforce the law.

The murder of Rosemary Nelson has the potential to uproot and undermine last year's historic Good Friday peace agreement. Further retaliation from nationalist paramilitary forces could take the British province back toward a state of sectarian warfare that has regrettably prevailed for 30 years.

In response to Rosemary's murder and the past and current intimidation tactics, I rise in strong support of H. Res 128, which condemns all violence committed in violation of the largely successful Northern Ireland cease-fire agreement. Specifically, this measure condemns the murder of Rosemary and calls on the British government to overturn its decision to allow the RUC to investigate Rosemary's death. While the objectivity of the RUC is under question, the investigation will not be accepted. H. Res 128 rightly urges the British government to conduct an independent inquiry and issue a detailed public report on the car bombing which killed Rosemary Nelson. Furthermore, this important measure requests the British government to conduct a judicial investigation of the treatment of defense attorneys by the RUC and continue to investigate the death of Patrick Finucane.

Recently, I had the privilege to travel and participate with Habitat for Humanity in a Belfast celebration of providing homes for both Catholics and Protestants. The economy of all Ireland is on the upswing, employment opportunities are growing and hopefully the discrimination that has persisted in the past can now finally be laid to rest. The electoral process has been successful and while outstanding issues exist, I am optimistic that the Clinton administration and the former Senator George Mitchell-led Good Friday peace agreement of 1998 will fully be implemented and IRA decommissioning and reform of the RUC achieved. I commend the leadership of the Republic's Prime Minister Ahern, Mr. Trimble and Jerry Adams, who are attempting to bring to conclusion and completion the goals of peace and reconciliation in Northern Ireland.

The horrific murder of attorney Rosemary Nelson represents a sad day in the long peace process in Northern Ireland. The role of defense attorneys in any democracy and in Northern Ireland is vital. The test of a new society in Northern Ireland will be to recognize and respect such roles without any intimidation or improper interference. We must all look forward to that day by building a truly democratic society, brick by brick, and building a community which respects one another.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation before us in honor of Rosemary Nelson who gave her life on Monday, March 15. It is so ironic that today we also honor Rosa Parks. Rosa Parks and Rosemary Nelson have a lot in common. They both stood up for injustices in the world. Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat at the front of a bus in Selma, Alabama, and did not give in to intimidation of police.

Like Mrs. Rosa Parks, continents away, Rosemary Nelson continued to receive death threats from those who continue to see Catholics as second-class citizens.

In the shadow of peace talks, I know that Prime Minister Tony Blair and Irish Premier Bertie Ahern met yesterday for 5 hours at Downing Street. Although the parties showed little outward signs of progress, I do believe that they must continue.

But let me say this. The peace process is in serious trouble if perpetrators of Mrs. Nelson's death do not come forward. To date, the RUC has yet to bring anyone accused of any crime associated with the killings of the minority Catholic community. How do they have no indictments or imprisonments over several years of sustained and continued intimidation and abuse?

There is something wrong with this picture. The investigation into the assassination of not only Rosemary Nelson is disturbing, but the death of Pat Finucane as well. I have asked for an independent investigation, one that is totally independent of RUC involvement. Since there is well-founded evidence that there was collusion by the RUC in both these murders, it is imperative that the investigation be totally delinked.

Last year, the United Nations Rapporteur called for an independent investigation and pointed specially to look at the harassment of civil rights attorneys in the north of Ireland. Many lawyers on behalf of residents in Ireland are routinely excluded from interviews with their clients and are detained in holding centers.

The troubles in the north of Ireland did not begin with this one courageous woman's death. We must also investigate Bloody Sunday which began on Easter Sunday in 1972. Two years ago I went to the Pat Finucane Center in West Belfast and met with Miss Ruth Taillon of the West Belfast Economic Forum. While there, I also met with the wife of imprisoned lawyer, Colin Duffy, and Oliver Kearney, Chairman of the Fair Employment Group of Equity and relatives of the Justice Committee. The Justice Committee sent me a letter, and I quote: ''It would be untenable for RUC to have the inquiry.''

Moved by what I saw, I came back to the States committed to seeing that justice is done. I introduced legislation that will call for full disclosure of the inquiry reports of both Pat Finucane and the Nelson case, and it also calls on the United Nations to form an independent inquiry into the long-term harassment of these individuals. I have worked with the sponsors of this bill, and I believe my concerns have been incorporated in the bill.

It is public knowledge that Mrs. Nelson's life was threatened on several occasions by the RUC Special Branch. Mrs. Nelson testified before the Committee on International Relations' Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights on September 29 of last year that she had been threatened by the RUC officials. Rosemary Nelson lost both of her legs and suffered extensive abdominal injuries in the blast and died despite intensive medical efforts to save her life. Ms. Nelson was a prominent Armagh County human rights attorney and was a defender of the basic principles that this country has fought for during the height of the civil rights movement and continues to fight for today, the equality of mankind.

She died to enable our world to live more amply with greater vision and finer spirit of hope and achievement. We impoverish her memory if we forget the task at hand.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House and ask for passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for all his work for all concerned not only in Northern Ireland and around the world, but particularly for his work and his effort in the north of Ireland. We thank him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1615

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by commending the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and certainly the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and people who have been so faithful to this cause for so long.

For the better part of two decades I have been immersed in the details of what life is like in Northern Ireland, particularly for the nationalist community, and we are reminded today that this conflict represents the longest standing political dispute in the history of the Western world.

Once again, on occasions like this we are also reminded that it is the United States that lights the way for hope in terms of man and womankind. It is the United States, and its ability to shed light on inequities and injustices in other parts of the globe, that calls attention to events like the murder of Rosemary Nelson.

I had the opportunity to meet Rosemary Nelson, and I can say that in an unbridled manner she was the champion of the rights of the nationalist community to stand in front of a court system that they do not always trust, but nonetheless to be treated in a manner that was fair and equitable.

The killing of Rosemary Nelson reinforces my belief and the belief of millions of Americans that the criminal justice system in the north of Ireland, including policing, is in need of dramatic change and indeed reform and perhaps even abolition.

Just last week, the United Nations' special investigator released a report that raises serious questions about the professional integrity and independence of the Royal Ulster Constabulary. The report documents cases of collusion between the RUC and the paramilitary groups.

Let me picture this for the American people: The policing organization tips off members of the paramilitary loyalist groups who then, once the individual is fingered as a suspect, is not only subject to verbal intimidation and harassment, but as is the case of Rosemary Nelson, one may well be murdered for their beliefs.

It draws attention to the fact that solicitors who choose to represent individuals in the nationalist community, like Rosemary Nelson and another friend of mine through his family, Pat Finucane, were always the targets of harassment and intimidation by the Royal Ulster Constabulary.

Following the recommendations of organizations such as the British-Irish Watch, Amnesty International, and the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, the U.N. Special Investigator demanded independent judicial inquiries into the deaths of Rosemary Nelson and Patrick Finucane.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not say something in this Chamber, if we do not say something in the halls of this Congress, then typically these events are brushed under the carpet. It is only the United States, in its ability to call attention to these inequities, that in the end causes us to travel down the path of what might be a satisfactory system of justice.

Ireland is closer today than it has been at any time in this century to the settlement of peace; as John Hume and Jerry Adams frequently say, an agreed upon Ireland. That should be the goal of all of us. We cannot have one part of the community, the policing organization, being seen as being part of the occupying force, and expect the minority or the nationalist community to accept that judgment.

It is people like John Hume and Jerry Adams who for the better part of 30 years have stood for the rights of people in the nationalist community, to ensure that when someone stands in front of a judge, that they are not found guilty because of their religious beliefs or because of their ethnicity. That is what Jefferson and Madison gave us in America and that is what we ought to attempt, wherever we can, to export to the rest of the world.

I must say that it will be the United States in the end that calls attention to these injustices, that could lead to a conclusion of swift justice to bring the perpetrators of the murderer of Rosemary Nelson and Patrick Finucane to the bar of justice.

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

Mr. Speaker, without question, we must all condemn the murder of Rosemary Nelson in the strongest terms. She was a remarkable woman who fought for justice, human rights and respect for the law in the north of Ireland.

I once again commend my colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), and all the sponsors of this resolution. The facts surrounding the Nelson murder and investigation demonstrate the need for overall police reform in Northern Ireland. Northern Ireland must have a police force that all of its citizens, all of its citizens, can have confidence in.

The reason the RUC had to call in an independent investigator was because they lacked credibility to conduct this investigation. The degree to which lower level RUC officers were involved in the murder of Ms. Nelson must be explored. We must have an independent entity direct this investigation, which produces a public and transparent report, finding out all the facts, all of the facts, behind the Rosemary Nelson murder. It must be a prelude to radical and thorough police reform in Northern Ireland and cannot have any substitute. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) will control the time allocated to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for his good, strong statement and for his work on this resolution.

Let me close very briefly. British justifications for not having an independent inquiry were further undercut by the Northern Ireland Independent Commission on Police Complaints, which expressed doubts that the RUC could objectively address Mrs. Nelson's earlier allegations of police harassment and threats.

The commission, after initially watching the RUC's investigation of itself, concluded that the RUC did not inspire confidence. The commission noted the need for independence and referred the matter to the metropolitan police in London for investigation even before Mrs. Nelson's tragic murder.

That referral report has leaked out since Mrs. Nelson's murder, and it is a scathing indictment of the RUC and its indifference to her safety. For example, the report says that of the RUC officers involved in the investigation, that there was, ''observable hostility, evasiveness and disinterest. One officer attended the interview 45 minutes late without explanation and smelled of alcohol.''

It is time now to act independently, to encourage real independence in this investigation and Pat Finucane and for protection of all the defense attorneys in Northern Ireland. That is why this resolution sends that clear message to the British.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), and others who have been working on this for some time.

For those in this country that have come to expect a judicial system that is fair, that is honest, police investigations that we can put our faith in, sometimes it is hard to understand when a country's entire respect for law is adversely affected by concerns about

the honesty of investigations and police activities.

This Congress time and time again has led the fight for fair justice for all citizens of every country. That is what we are doing here today. Again, I commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), and in particular my good friend, the gentleman from Springfield, Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), for the efforts they have made fighting for justice here again.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week, during consideration of the State Department reauthorization bill in the House International Relations Committee, I rose with Congressman MENENDEZ to present an amendment to that bill. Its purpose was to ban the further training of members of the Royal Ulster Constabulary by the FBI at their National Academy in Quantico, Virginia. There were many reasons why we introduced that amendment, but one of the most compelling was the suspicion of RUC complicity in the assassination of Rosemary Nelson.

Accusations of RUC support for the murder of Catholic leaders abounds. Rosemary Nelson appeared before the International Relations Committee and testified that she had received death threats from members of the RUC.

The U.N. Special Rapporteur on the Independence of Judges and Lawyers has found that the RUC is engaged ''in activities which constitute intimidation, harassment, [and] hindrance'' of defense lawyers [in Northern Ireland] in the course of their professional duties. He also labeled the RUC's intimidation of defense lawyers in Northern Ireland as, and I quote, ''consistent and systematic.''

This is not acceptable. There must be an independent investigation into the murder of Rosemary Nelson to determine who is responsible. Those who are responsible must be brought to justice. If members of the RUC are confirmed to have been involved, the RUC should be disbanded and a new police force created.

Mr. Speakers, Northern Ireland needs a police force for all the people. Defense attorneys in Northern Ireland must be protected so that they can do their jobs. I support H. Res. 128 and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 128, a resolution which condemns the brutal murder of Northern Ireland human rights lawyer Rosemary Nelson and calls for an independent inquiry into her death.

Ms. Nelson's murder was truly a tragedy—a cowardly act by those who are enemies of peace and justice in Northern Ireland.

Rosemary Nelson spent her life trying to help others. She was a champion of human rights worked tirelessly to protect ensure these basic rights for her fellow countrymen. Ultimately, she was killed because of her work.

We must not allow her death to be in vain—we must not allow the enemies of peace to win. We have all worked too long and hard to achieve peace and the people of Ireland deserve no less.

Today, I join with my colleagues and call for an independent investigation into the death of Rosemary and all human rights attorneys in Northern Ireland who have lost their lives in the pursuit of helping others.

We owe it to the memory of these courageous individuals—and we owe it to the cause of peace and justice, both in Ireland and throughout the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and urge a ''yes'' vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 128, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECOGNIZING HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OF FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF GOOD FRIDAY PEACE AGREEMENT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 54) recognizing the historic significance of the first anniversary of the Good Friday Peace Agreement, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 54

Whereas Ireland has a long and tragic history of civil conflict that has left a deep and profound legacy of suffering;

Whereas since 1969 more than 3,200 people have died and thousands more have been injured as a result of political violence in Northern Ireland;

Whereas a series of efforts by the Governments of the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom to facilitate peace and an announced cessation of hostilities created an historic opportunity for a negotiated peace;

Whereas in June 1996, for the first time since the partition of Ireland in 1922, representatives elected from political parties in Northern Ireland pledged to adhere to the principles of nonviolence and commenced talks regarding the future of Northern Ireland;

Whereas the talks greatly intensified in the spring of 1998 under the chairmanship of former United States Senator George Mitchell;

Whereas the active participation of British Prime Minister Tony Blair and Irish Taoiseach Bertie Ahern was critical to the success of the talks;

Whereas on Good Friday, April 10, 1998, the parties to the negotiations each made honorable compromises to conclude a peace agreement for Northern Ireland, which has become known as the Good Friday Peace Agreement;

Whereas on Friday, May 22, 1998, an overwhelming majority of voters in both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland approved by referendum the Good Friday Peace Agreement;

Whereas the United States must remain involved politically and economically to ensure the long-term success of the peace agreement; and

Whereas on Good Friday, April 2, 1999, a one-year deadline passed without agreement among all major parties, putting the entire peace process in jeopardy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) recognizes the historic significance of the first anniversary of the Good Friday Peace Agreement;

(2) salutes British Prime Minister Tony Blair and Irish Taoiseach Bertie Ahern and the elected representatives of the political parties in Northern Ireland for creating the opportunity for a negotiated peace;

(3) commends Senator George Mitchell for his leadership on behalf of the United States in guiding the parties toward peace;

(4) congratulates the people of the Republic of Ireland and of Northern Ireland for their courageous commitment to work together in peace;

(5) encourages the Governments of the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland with the active involvement of the United States to continue to work together to ensure the forward movement of the peace process; and

(6) reaffirms the bonds of friendship and cooperation that exist between the United States and the Governments of the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom, which ensure that the United States and those Governments will continue as partners in peace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the measure now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, next week the British and Irish governments will resume talks with the major political parties of Northern Ireland in an attempt to move the promises held in the 1998 Good Friday Agreement, to try to move them from good rhetoric to actual implementation.

This resolution that is being offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) is really a message of encouragement and hope. It urges all those who have worked so hard to achieve the Good Friday Agreement on paper to now rededicate themselves to the actual implementation of its provisions so that peace and justice will take root in the north of Ireland.

Last year, by overwhelming majorities, the people of Ireland, both north and south, embraced the ideals put forth by this peace agreement. Only

those who are enemies of peace and justice in Northern Ireland could be content with the prospect that the agreement may be stalled or parked as a result of new time lines and deadlines injected into the process.

Instead, as friends of Northern Ireland and sponsors of this resolution, we call on the leaders of all parties to move beyond the current impasse, to stick to the agreement as approved, resist renegotiating or clarifying the promises it holds, and do whatever can be done to ensure that the guarantee of fundamental human rights for both communities of Northern Ireland remains the driving force behind all that is done and worked for.

When the guarantee of fundamental human rights supersedes all other negotiation considerations, then we will see a just and lasting peace take hold in the north of Ireland.

This resolution puts us on record as saying go forward, and I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for his sponsorship of this very timely and important resolution.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to also thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and say that in the short period of time that he has been here he has been able to raise the profile of these kinds of issues. I think it is a testament to how successful and effective he has been in this short period of time.

I certainly want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) as well for the Rosemary Nelson, I think, opportunity where we could shed some light on that issue for the world to indeed see.

While we celebrate the first anniversary of the Good Friday Agreement in the north of Ireland, an agreement which people in the north of Ireland and the Republic of Ireland have now offered their support for, we nonetheless, I think, have to call attention to the 1-year anniversary in this sense: The people voted for an agreement which is historic in nature. This problem, again the longest standing political dispute in the history of the Western world, begins in geography eight centuries ago, certainly was reinforced during the Reformation, but during the last 30 years it has been a battle about civil rights.

What I think is significant about the Good Friday Agreement is that again both communities in the north of Ireland, both traditions, voted for the agreement. So we ask ourselves today, why has it not been implemented as the people voted?

The answer is this: Because once again the unionist community has said the famous word ''no''. They are now suggesting that because decommissioning has not taken place from the Irish Republican Army, that in fact that is the reason not to proceed with the agreement.

Now, let me say this. After both traditions voted for this agreement, decommissioning was supposed to take place simultaneously to, not in advance of, the institutions of governance being put in place.

What is striking about this current disagreement is this: All parties agreed to decommission in the month of May in the year 2000.

So now what we are seeing is, all parties have gotten to the goal line, and at the goal line David Trimble and the unionist community have essentially said, no, there was no touchdown scored; we are going to move the goalpost back.

The signal that that sends to the nationalist community is the historic reinforcement that no matter what is done, it is not good enough; that if we are not arguing today about decommissioning we will be arguing tomorrow about how to fly which flag. We will be arguing again about what the schools are to be like, and just wait until we get to that issue of the role that Dublin is going to play in the day-to-day affairs of the north.

□ 1630

If we think that we are now at impasse, believe me, that is the next unionist position that they will reinforce.

David Trimble typically contributes to his own political problems by reminding everybody how difficult it is. If one wants to be the prime minister of the north of Ireland, one has to be the leader of all of the people. Forty-one percent of the people in America voted against Bill Clinton. He is still President of the United States. That is the notion of democracy. The greater number decide. That is precisely what we subscribe to here in our democratic ideals.

So why is it after there has been an agreement and the public has ratified the agreement, bringing that island closer to peace than they have been at any time in the last 30 years, does one party once again have the ability to veto what people have voted for?

I would call upon Prime Minister Blair, who by the way I think deserves some credit, the Taoiseach Bertie Ahern, and certainly Bill Clinton who deserves credit as well, to say to the unionist community, ''We are going to proceed with the implementation of this agreement. On a prescribed date, we hope you are on board, because this is what the people voted for.'' That is the path that we should be traveling down; not once again to say, ''Here is an agreement ratified by the public,'' only have to a small number of people say, ''That cannot be,'' after it has been duly ratified by the voting public.

As those old visions and bad feelings sunset on that tiny island, I think we have an opportunity here to set an agenda where both traditions can live in accord. But we cannot do it if one party always says no. We cannot do it if one party simply says, yes, but. We cannot do it if one party says that our tradition somehow allows us to lord over the other tradition. In the end, that only generates bad feeling and it generates lasting feelings that cannot be overcome.

Let me close on this simple note. John Hume said it best, the Nobel Prize winning John Hume. He said, at the end of the day, what we all ought to be able to come to accord on is an agreed upon Ireland, and that should be the goal of all of us.

I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), who have traveled therewith, for their visionary leadership on this issue. Indeed, there is an opportunity to make the implementation of this historic accord stick.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me compliment the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for taking this time and handling this very important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise today in support of the continuation of the peace process in the north of Ireland. I must begin by complimenting President Clinton, because it was his decision to allow Jerry Adams and the Sinn Fein organization to visit the United States after many years of being refused a visa, and that began to get the other side and the story of the work that was being done by the political wing of the movement in the north of Ireland.

Also, I have to compliment the skills and the patience and the deliberation of Senator George Mitchell for his work of for years forging an agreement between the parties. People who said they would never sit down together sat down and worked together, and I must compliment the people of the north of Ireland and Ireland for overwhelmingly approving the referendum that came to the agreement of the Good Friday Accords.

The Good Friday Accords were promulgated nearly a year ago this April with the best intent in mind: To end the authoritative rule and domination of the Protestant party over minority Catholics. It gave Catholics a real voice, for once, by ending three decades of conflict in the north of Ireland.

I became very interested and involved because as a youngster I was involved in the civil rights movement in this country, and I emulated and felt very close to the movement in the north of Ireland because of the same obstacles and the same freedom songs

that they sang about ''We Shall Overcome.'' So I became very involved as a young person in the struggle there.

But it will be two years this July since I went and spent time in the north of Ireland and had the opportunity to see for myself the violence and the killings associated with the Orange Order march in the village of Drumcree where I stayed, right there in the center of town. I also had the opportunity to visit the north of Ireland and Ireland with President Clinton on his historic trip back to that region.

The celebration of the victory of William of Orange, in which Irish land was seized and confiscated, is an assault to Catholics everywhere. Sadly, this parade glorifies a part of history and is provocative in its nature, and I have seen the walls that they marched down and threw pennies on both sides of the area, which just provokes people.

I believe that the political prisoner release of paramilitary groups on both sides was a good issue. I know that Tony Blair is receiving pressure to overturn this rule. I think it would be a very bad precedent for all involved if it was overturned.

In the same light, I know that the decommissioning issue was one of the last things discussed before all parties made the last push toward peace. We cannot allow decommissioning to be used as a wedge to keep Jerry Adams and Sinn Fein out of the government. Decommissioning of paramilitary weapons will take place, but I think we know that disarming the paramilitaries is going to be a very difficult task. This was never a precondition of power-sharing.

But let me say this: The peace agreement does not explicitly require a start on disarmament, but the politics of the accord compel it. I will hope that this could be worked out soon because we must have decommissioning, but it should not be a precondition.

If it is not, we are faced with confronting Bloody Sunday all over again in the future. We have gone too far, we have worked too hard, we have pushed too long to allow this. So this is the stakes that we all must make to ensure that peace in the north of Ireland becomes a reality and irreversible.

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

Mr. Speaker, I introduced H. Con. Res. 54 with the intent to honor and celebrate as a Congress the one-year anniversary of the Good Friday Peace Accord and the involvement of the United States Senate majority leader, George Mitchell; our President, Bill Clinton; Irish Taoiseach Bertie Ahern; and British Prime Minister Tony Blair for their work in securing this important and historic agreement.

In particular, recognition has to be given to Senator George Mitchell. This peace agreement would not have been possible without his involvement, and also without the support of our President, Bill Clinton.

On May 22, 1998, an overwhelming majority of voters in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland approved the referendum to support the Good Friday peace agreement and establish a Northern Ireland Assembly. Unfortunately, though, the peace process has been dealt some recent setbacks.

The demand by unionist forces that Sinn Fein unilaterally decommission one year ahead of schedule before taking seats in the Northern Ireland Assembly has stalled the peace process. On Good Friday of this year, peace talks were suspended. The same happened again when talks in London were suspended. The outlook is not very optimistic. Today's Washington Post quotes Sinn Fein leader Jerry Adams as saying, ''The Good Friday Peace Agreement is in free fall.''

Mr. Speaker, the United States and the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom have invested too much to let this delicate peace agreement fall apart. Without a resolution between all parties, the peace process will come to a halt and the Northern Ireland Executive will not be established.

There is talk of closing down the Northern Ireland Assembly of 108 elected members until all parties can come to an agreement. This latest setback comes at a very terrible time. Weighing heavily is the fact that we are fast approaching the start of the Protestant Orange Order marching season, which acts as a catalyst for sectarian violence in the north of Ireland.

Now, let me say that my resolution does not attempt to take sides in the dispute over decommissioning and the seating of the Northern Ireland Executive, but rather commemorates the one-year anniversary of the Good Friday Peace Accord. I personally believe that Sinn Fein and Jerry Adams have been honest peace brokers in the peace process, and I find it troubling that David Trimble and the Ulster unionists have added preconditions to this agreement. They are holding hostage the people of Northern Ireland's right to determine their own local government and establishment of the Northern Ireland Assembly's Executive.

Again, Mr. Speaker, my resolution does not attempt to speak on the subject of who is or is not to blame for the recent stall in progress. My resolution does attempt to speak loudly as a Congress and as a country that the United States is committed to working with both the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom to ensure the success of the peace process in Northern Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot sit idly by while the peace process in Northern Ireland comes to a halt. I am disheartened that instead of celebrating, we are admonishing the parties to come back to the bargaining table, to understand that peace will bring prosperity to their children and to their children's children.

Making peace is difficult. It involves sacrifice, it involves hard work, and it involves dedication. As someone who has worked in a former career in the State Assembly of New York and has been involved all my life in Irish affairs, and whose mother is from Northern Ireland, I personally know how important the Good Friday Peace Accord was and still is to those who live in Northern Ireland, as well as to Irish throughout the world.

As conflicts rage around the world, especially in Kosovo, we must not forget about Northern Ireland and the work that had been done and the work that will continue to be done to bring peace to this troubled region. This resolution, which has 107 cosponsors, intends to move the peace process forward beyond this temporary hurdle and reaffirms the support of the Congress to the peace process as well as the work of all parties in establishing and securing a long-lasting peace in Northern Ireland.

In closing, I want to thank my colleagues and my cochair of the congressional ad hoc committee again, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN); the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the ranking member; the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL); the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING); the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), and all who have worked on bringing peace to Northern Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time and for the leadership that he has provided on this most important of issues in our international relations. I would also like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), new to this Congress certainly, but not new to the issues regarding Ireland and the civil rights issues that we have seen come so clear in these past few weeks and months.

The Good Friday Agreement, which is what we have been talking about for the better part of the afternoon, seemingly died this Good Friday on its first anniversary. The discussions surrounding bringing the government together, as Jerry Adams, the leader of Sinn Fein said just yesterday, are in free fall.

This agreement is a good agreement. It has brought all sides and factions together to form a government. It has been supported by the Republic of Ireland government, it has been supported by the British government, it has been supported by the Clinton administration and by this Congress, and we have played a very constructive and important role, the Members of Congress, and especially the President.

At this point, however, it is in danger of going the way of other agreements and other peace arrangements in the history of Ireland. I do not know, Mr.

Speaker, what the answer is, but it strikes me, and I don't know if anyone else has suggested this, but it strikes me that maybe what we need to do is go to the President and say, Mr. President, you offered George Mitchell's good offices once before, and he was able to bring everyone together and get everyone working together to resolve this. Maybe what we need to do is see if we can enlist George Mitchell once again, the Senator from Maine, to go back and revisit this issue and try to get people back on track and back on board in implementing the original agreement.

□ 1645

The original agreement was so finely crafted that nobody could change a comma, a period, a dot, or the crossing of a T. It was very delicate, and maybe he is the only one that can do that again.

But this was a good agreement. It needs to be stayed with. It requires the patience of all parties. But it is clear we are off track, and that even the best efforts of our president and the leaders of England and of Ireland have not been able to get parties back on track.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I would also suggest that we need to be patient. We need to pray, and we also need to stay in contact with the leadership of those political parties to try to get them to keep working this out.

Mr. Speaker, I have just been advised that the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) has reached out to Senator Mitchell to try to bring him back into this. I think that is wise, and I certainly support those efforts.

Let me conclude by saying that the issue regarding the murder of the civil rights attorney who has been discussed, Ms. Nelson, which has been discussed this afternoon, that inquiry into her death absolutely must be independent of the RUC.

The RUC was implicated, not directly, certainly, but by her own testimony before the Committee on International Relations last year. She was concerned about them, about their statements and their actions regarding her own personal security, her inability to reach out to those, to that law enforcement agency, to help her to defend herself against threats against her life. It just makes good sense that they need to be held at arm's length.

We have offered the FBI. England has offered her constabulary in Kent. They need to do the investigation. The RUC needs to take a step back, especially given the volatility of the politics of the times, take a step back and let the professionals outside of Northern Ireland conduct this investigation, and do it fairly. Because if no one has any faith in the inquisitor in this, then there will be no faith in the result. There absolutely must be good faith in this process.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to speak on these important issues. I thank my friends and colleagues for bringing this before the Congress, and I urge unanimous support.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for his excellent statement and his leadership these many years on the issue of Northern Ireland, just to underscore how important it is that that investigation be completely independent of the RUC in order to procure a result that we know we can live with, and will hopefully yield the results and catch the perpetrators, because there are people who actually did the killing, and there are many others who are probably a part of that killing, and the officials need to get to the bottom.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), my good friend and another great leader in the cause of human rights in the north of Ireland.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman SMITH) for his resolution regarding the investigation into the murder of Rosemary Nelson, and I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for his work on bringing this resolution forward on this Good Friday Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, the Irish peace process is now in a very critical point in Ireland. The fact is that it was over a year ago that the Good Friday Agreement came to fruition. It was a hard-fought compromise with all sides making concessions, moving forward.

The fact is that the Ulster Unionist Party and the leadership of David Trimble is preventing implementation of this agreement by insisting on the precondition of decommissioning.

It is really not for us to be arguing the merits of decommissioning. The fact is that the parties signed an agreement. It was ratified by over 80 percent of all the voters on the island of Ireland. It was 95 percent in the south, and 75 percent in the north agreeing to the Good Friday Agreement, which did not impose any precondition whatsoever as far as the issue of decommissioning or any other issue, for that matter.

The fact is that right now the agreement is not being fully implemented. It is being stalemated, it is being held up, and there is a real risk that the peace process could come undone unless the agreement is implemented and unless the parties go forward.

I know suggestions were made here today that Senator Mitchell get involved. Certainly to me that is a good recommendation. But I think most importantly, the parties have to realize, and the governments have the prime responsibility, specifically the British government, have to realize that the agreement must be implemented. They cannot allow David Trimble to be holding it up.

I would ask that the administration continue the very good work it has done in helping to bring about the agreement in the first place, and now to ensure that the agreement not be allowed to founder and to collapse. Too much has gone on, too many lives have been lost, too much hard work has gone into this, too many sacrifices were made to allow one party to in any way frustrate the full implementation of the agreement.

This is something which has a tremendous human rights ramification, and it is something where so many people in the United States, including the President, have done so much to bring about the Good Friday Agreement.

When we talk about the implementation of the agreement, the fact is that it will never be fully implemented unless there is faith in the law enforcement system in the north of Ireland.

Quite frankly, there is very little faith in the Royal Ulster Constabulary among those in the nationalist community. That is why the resolution of the gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman SMITH) calling for an independent investigation into the murder of Rosemary Nelson is so essential.

Rosemary Nelson testified before the Committee on International Relations last year. She felt that she was being threatened by the RUC. Now to allow the Royal Ulster Constabulary to investigate a murder in which its own members may have been involved to me is unbelievable, it is wrong, it cannot be done, it should not be done, and if it is done, then it is going to cause more and more disenchantment by the nationalist community toward the law enforcement authorities in the north.

This is not the first case. There was the case of Pat Finucane which I am sure has also been mentioned earlier today, 10 years ago where there was strong evidence that the RUC was involved in his murder, yet it has never been fully investigated.

So on both these resolutions, I think it is a tremendous step forward by the Congress of the United States to show our involvement, to show our interest; to show that all Americans, whether they be of Irish ancestry, whether they be Catholic, Protestant, Jew, Muslim, atheist, agnostic, nonbeliever, we stand for the cause of freedom, the cause of justice, the cause of human rights.

That can best be advanced by the full enactment of this agreement, and secondly, by a full, complete, and independent investigation into the murder of Rosemary Nelson. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman SMITH) for yielding time to me, I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for his resolution, and I urge the adoption.

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 54.

We are here today in for a very important reason—to recognize the importance of the

first anniversary of the Good Friday Peace Agreement.

House Concurrent Resolution 54 honors all those who played an instrumental role in bringing peace to northern Ireland—from the Irish and English political leaders, to Senator Mitchell, to the people of northern Ireland. These people deserve our deepest respect—for their leadership, dedication and courage. They are the true heroes of the Irish Peace Process.

The resolution also reaffirms the bonds of friendship and cooperation that exists between our countries and that we will continue to work together towards peace in northern Ireland. Because now is a crucial time in the peace process. It would be easy for us to say we have the peace accord and then put it on the back burner.

But we can't do that. If we are going to ensure the long-term success of the peace accords and really achieve peace in Ireland, we must remain involved.

It is only through our continued commitment and the commitment of the people involved that we will see a true and lasting peace in Ireland.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House Concurrent Resolution 54, recognizing the historic significance of the first anniversary of the Good Friday Peace Agreement. In stark contrast to recent events in Yugoslavia, the Good Friday Peace Agreement stands out as a hopeful example of how deeply-rooted, persistent and intransigent problems can be resolved peacefully, and how the cycle of hatred and violence can be brought to a halt.

In Northern Ireland, we see a situation in which the two sides have taken courageous steps towards bridging the gap that divides them. Many steps remain, but the principles for peace have been agreed upon, and they are embodied in the Good Friday Peace Agreement. Now is the time for full and timely implementation.

Problems and violence persist in Northern Ireland. The murder of human rights lawyer Rosemary Nelson represents one such unacceptable act of violence and a step in the wrong direction.

House Concurrent Resolution 54 communicates to our friends in Northern Ireland that we support them on their difficult road to a lasting peace, and that they must, now more than ever, stay the course. I urge support for the resolution.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 54, which recognizes the historic significance of the first anniversary of the Good Friday Peace Agreement. When this agreement was reached on April 10, 1998, those who's lives had been destroyed by the last 30 years of violence, rejoiced at the promise of peace. Now, a year later, this historic peace agreement is dangerously close to failing.

The resolution before us today, salutes the parties who worked so diligently to bring about this historic accord, and it does so at a very appropriate time. Not only has the first anniversary of this agreement just passed, but its future is in jeopardy, the resolution reaffirms the need for the preservation of this accord and the ideals which it stands for. In today's Washington Post the head of Sinn Fein, Gerry Adams, is quoted as having said that ''the Good Friday Agreement is in free fall.'' At this juncture, all of the parties involved in the creation and implementation of this Agreement must try even harder to work together to create a lasting peace in Northern Ireland.

The commitment and support of the agreement by the people, in both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland, was demonstrated by the overwhelmingly supportive outcome of the vote on the referendum on May 22, 1998. This affirmation further demonstrates the need to ensure that this accord make it past this troublesome point.

The United States has committed to remain involved, politically and economically, to ensure the long-term success of the peace agreement. We realize the importance of continued economic growth and stability in the region, as it will prove to be an instrumental part of any lasting peace. This resolution reaffirms this commitment, and reaffirms that the United States, as a friend of both Ireland and the United Kingdom, will continue to facilitate this peace.

None of this can be accomplished however, without the commitment of both sides to this peace. The violence needs to end and the seeds of trust need to be planted.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, this issue is very important to me. I will continue to do what I can to assist in this peace process, the violence has gone on long enough. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and to continue to support the peacemaking efforts in Ireland.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, President Lincoln once said, ''Let us have faith that rights makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.''

Today, the leaders of Northern Ireland face a delicate, worrisome situation. It is up to the leaders to decide if the path to the future will be one of peace or one of war. After centuries of animus, and thirty years of vicious factional bloodshed, the opportunity for a lasting peace is real and within grasp. Just as real, unfortunately, is the grave possibility of renewed bloodshed, further factionalism, and renewed war.

Over a year ago, the leaders of factions in Northern Ireland made a monumental decision; they decided to pursue peace. It was a brave decision, one supported by all the people of Ireland but bitterly opposed by those unable to set aside their entrenched hatreds and swallow their bitterness.

One year after the signing of the Good Friday Agreement, the people of Northern Ireland again face tumultuous waters that could easily cast their boat into the sea of despair. They must have faith that the course they are on is the right one, and must believe, as Lincoln said, that right will make might. They must do their duty as best they can, and build the peace that they seek and deserve.

Last year, Nationalists and Loyalists, Protestants and Catholics, were successful in reaching the Good Friday Agreement only by engaging in democratic dialogue, serious yet principled compromise, and a mutual understanding that continued violence benefits no one. I commend their efforts, and hope that in the future they will be able to focus on other issues of mutual concern: bettering the economy, educating their children, and creating a democratic society where every man and woman is equal.

There have been setbacks. The murder of advocates of peace and justice, like Rosemary Nelson, should not be forgotten. But it is not their untimely deaths that should be remembered, but their lives, which they gave in hopes that others would enjoy the fruits of peace.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the many Irish-American residents of Michigan, I rise today in recognition of the many brave souls who have chosen peace over violence, and compromise over confrontation. I ask that all parties work together as partners to implement the Good Friday Agreement, and end the senseless violence that has plagued Ireland for far too long.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 54, which recognizes the ongoing peace process in Northern Ireland and the historical significance of the Good Friday Peace Accord which was achieved just over a year ago, on April 10, 1998.

I join with my colleagues in congratulating the people of the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland for their courageous commitment to peace. By signing the historic Good Friday Peace Agreement in April 1998, leaders such as John Hume, David Trimble and Gerry Adams created a new era of peace and reconciliation for all the people of Northern Ireland. The recognition given to John Hume and David Trimble in receiving the Nobel Peace Prize was an important step toward memorializing the extraordinary achievements made by the proponents of peace. We should not forget, however, the many other people, without whom this process would not have even been possible. I commend the valuable and vital contributions to the peace process by President Clinton, former Senator George Mitchell, Prime Minister Bertie Ahern of Ireland and Prime Minister Tony Blair of Great Britain.

The Good Friday Peace Accord was an important achievement, marking the first step to ending thirty years of violence and bloodshed in Northern Ireland, reducing divisions between Unionists and Nationalists, and building new bridges of opportunity between the two communities. Through this process, they have committed ending years of mistrust and hatred, which has cost the lives of more than 3,200 people since 1969.

The text of the Good Friday Peace Accord contains important provisions calling for the formation of a Northern Ireland Assembly, a North/South Ministerial Council and a British-Irish Council. The agreement also contains critical provisions on human rights, decommissioning of weapons, policing, and prisoners. Voters in both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland approved the Peace Agreement by a remarkable 85 percent majority on May 22, 1998, and elections to the new assembly were held on June 25. Since that time, prisoners have been released and the British have reduced their troop levels to the lowest point in twenty years.

Last August, I had the opportunity to participate in a seven-member Congressional delegation trip to Ireland, led by the Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich and DEAN JOHN DINGELL. Our visit included meetings with representatives of the various parties to the Good Friday Peace Agreement, including representatives of the Ulster Unionist Party, Sinn Fien and the Social Democratic and Labour Party. We also met with senior leaders of Ireland and Northern Ireland, including Taoiseach Bertie Ahern, John Hume of the SDLP and Seamus Mallon, the Deputy First Minister of the Northern Ireland Assembly.

We were also able to review the peace process and discuss measures to strengthen

political, economic, and cultural ties between the United States and the Irish people. Through my experience, it was clear that there is a strong bond of cooperation between the people of the United States and Ireland, and deep appreciation for the U.S. role in negotiating the Peace Agreement.

Clearly, the discord in Northern Ireland will not be solved by the signing of one document. Significant progress must be made before lasting peace can be finally achieved. But we should recognize that the Good Friday Peace Agreement has changed the course of history for all the people in Northern Ireland. Lasting peace will only be realized by a thorough adherence to and completion of the measures outlined in the Good Friday Agreement and mandated by the people of Ireland.

As we recognize the first anniversary of this agreement, I am hopeful that all sides take every opportunity to make real progress toward its implementation. The United States has a strong national interest in helping this agreement to succeed.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr Speaker, Mr. CROWLEY's resolution on the Northern Ireland peace process is noncontroversial and worthy of everybody's full and strong support. It is also very timely. I congratulate the gentleman from New York, Mr. CROWLEY, for his efforts. The Irish peace process today needs a little more encouragement, as it has once again run into some obstacles in Belfast.

It is worthwhile praising the tireless and courageous efforts of British Prime Minister Blair, and Irish Prime Minister Bertie Ahern, and former Senator George Mitchell on the Good Friday peace accord. I have done so myself on many occasions.

President Clinton, I am also proud to say, has always had strong bipartisan support here in the Congress on his own efforts to find lasting peace and justice in Northern Ireland. I urge that he and our nation stay fully involved to help see the process through to lasting peace and justice in the north.

However, today we still see the old ''unionist veto'' in play. Once again the issue of arms decommissioning is being used to prevent the establishment of the cabinet executive as provided for in the Good Friday accord. There are some on the unionist side who when faced with the reality of living by the terms of the Good Friday accord and sharing power to which they and all of the Irish people consented to, decided to change the terms of the accord.

The negotiated solution in the north was based upon consent. It isn't the consent as dictated by one side, it's the consent of all of the Irish people—and they have spoken and agree to share power and end the unworkable unionish domination of the north.

The first anniversary of the Good Friday accord has come and gone. Yet today we do not yet have established the power sharing mechanism that the accord and the good Irish people both north and south, fully envision for the new Ireland. The people voted in referendum last May and then elected a new assembly to bring about real and concrete change. The status quo will no longer do.

I would urge both governments in the region, and President Clinton, to again call upon the good offices of Senator George Mitchell to once again be an honest broker to end the current impasse that may lead to the collapse of the Good Friday accord.

It may take again the master stroke of a man like George Mitchell, who is accepted by all sides as fair and objective, to save the Good Friday accord he worked so hard to develop and to gain consent from all the parties. George, we need you one more time! I hope both Governments will take this proposal to heart.

It is really time to get on with it, to create a new cabinet and to bring about real change and power sharing that will make the bomb and gun an obsolute means for resolution of grievances on both sides in the north of Ireland.

I urge the adoption of the Crowley resolution to both send a message of support for the peace process, as well as a call for the process to go forward within the frame work of the Good Friday accord as agreed to by all the parties.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Good Friday Peace Agreement signed on April 10, 1998, and to the continuing efforts to bring peace to Northern Ireland.

The conflict in Northern Ireland has been agonizing, not only in the region, but also among many Americans, including myself.

As a Texas State representative, I visited Belfast in the early 1990's and learned a great deal about the sources of so much tension and hatred in that historic region.

On that trip, I had a chance to meet many of the principals on all sides of the dispute.

I was able to put faces and personalities behind the struggle: members of Sinn Fein, Unionists, and other individuals that were trying to make a difference.

After my return from Northern Ireland, I worked with both parties in the Texas Legislature on the issue.

We passed legislation based upon the MacBride Principles to hold companies in Northern Ireland engaged in business with the State of Texas to nondiscrimination and equal justice.

As a Congressman, I have continued to deal with the Northern Ireland issue, endorsing efforts to leverage our presence in the region to foster a more tolerant and stable society.

I joined all of us in welcoming the breakthrough for peace last year by Special Envoy George Mitchell and the administration as they tackled this delicate problem.

As a cosponsor of this bill, H. Con. Res. 54, I continue to share in the hope that this region will take the final steps in realizing a just and lasting peace.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con Res. 54, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE DRUG ELIMINATION TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1379) to amend the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999, to make a technical correction relating to an emergency supplemental appropriation for international narcotics control and law enforcement assistance, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1379

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 ''Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Technical Corrections Act''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS RELATING TO RESOURCES FOR ILLICIT NARCOTICS IN CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Subtitle B of title VIII of division C of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 826. FURTHER MISCELLANEOUS ADDITIONAL RESOURCES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State for fiscal year 1999 such sums as may be necessary to carry out section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291).

''(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (a) are in addition to amounts made available to carry out section 481 of such Act under any other provision of law.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Title VIII of division C of such Act (Public Law 105–277) is amended in the table of contents in section 801(b) by adding at the end of the item relating to subtitle B the following:

''Sec. 826. Further miscellaneous additional resources.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in subtitle B of title VIII of division C of such Act (Public Law 105–277).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to correct a minor drafting error which was omitted in the legislative provision that

was passed last year as part of the Omnibus appropriation bill.

Because the waiver of the requirement for authorization was omitted from last year's supplemental, certain unauthorized parts of the agreed-upon package of assistance for Latin America to continue to help with the suppression of drugs cannot move forward.

In response, we have prepared an amendment to the underlying authorization bill. The change to the authorization will allow this to go forward as agreed upon in the statement of managers of the supplemental appropriations legislation.

The Department of State supports this legislation and is anxious to get these programs going. It is important, we believe, to the jurisdiction of the Committee on International Relations that the statutory requirement that all spending on foreign assistance be authorized, or that such a requirement for authorization be waived by statute.

All of this money has been appropriated and it will be spent. Our purpose here is to have it spent on the list that the Congress and the administration, and in particular General McCaffery, our drug czar, finally agreed upon. That is the list in the statement of managers accompanying the supplemental appropriations.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. This bill has been on and off the schedule today a few times, and I think we finally have a version that everyone is comfortable with. We are right to move this assistance to Peru, Columbia, Bolivia. Critical interests are at stake there. We have delayed this assistance long enough.

This bill will allow the Agency for International Development to provide assistance to those three countries for alternative development, which is critical to helping those farmers move from the cultivation of illicit and illegal crops to cultivation of legitimate and licit crops.

I was in Columbia recently, Mr. Speaker, to survey the damage of a recent earthquake in that country. The damage was unbelievable. Thousands were dead and tens of thousands were homeless. My colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and I were able to bring home to Queens two young girls who had been injured in that earthquake.

The people of the United States have provided critical assistance to the suffering people of Columbia. We as a Congress should be doing the same, putting together emergency assistance to address that emergency in Columbia.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to make sure that the suffering people of Columbia, ravaged by a tremendous earthquake, get the help that they need from the U.S. Congress. I support the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1379, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read:

''A bill to amend the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999, to make a technical correction relating to international narcotics control assistance.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained. Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 573, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 128, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

AUTHORIZING AWARDING OF GOLD MEDAL TO ROSA PARKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 573, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 573, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

YEAS—424

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schaffer

Schakowsky	Stenholm	Upton
Scott	Strickland	Velazquez
Sensenbrenner	Stump	Vento
Sessions	Stupak	Visclosky
Shadegg	Sununu	Walden
Shaw	Sweeney	Walsh
Shays	Talent	Wamp
Sherman	Tancredo	Waters
Sherwood	Tanner	Watkins
Shimkus	Tauscher	Watt (NC)
Shows	Tauzin	Watts (OK)
Shuster	Taylor (MS)	Waxman
Simpson	Taylor (NC)	Weiner
Sisisky	Terry	Weldon (FL)
Skeen	Thomas	Weldon (PA)
Skelton	Thompson (CA)	Weller
Slaughter	Thompson (MS)	Wexler
Smith (MI)	Thornberry	Weygand
Smith (NJ)	Thune	Whitfield
Smith (TX)	Thurman	Wicker
Smith (WA)	Tiahrt	Wilson
Snyder	Tierney	Wise
Souder	Toomey	Wolf
Spence	Towns	Woolsey
Spratt	Traficant	Wu
Stabenow	Turner	Wynn
Stark	Udall (CO)	Young (AK)
Stearns	Udall (NM)	Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—9

Boehlert	Gekas	Nussle
Ewing	Kasich	Saxton
Forbes	McCollum	Serrano

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AUTHORIZING AWARDING OF GOLD MEDAL TO ROSA PARKS

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 531) to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Rosa Parks in recognition of her contributions to the Nation, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 531

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) Rosa Parks was born on February 4, 1913, in Tuskegee, Alabama, the first child of James and Leona (Edwards) McCauley;

(2) Rosa Parks is honored as the ''first lady of civil rights'' and the ''mother of the freedom movement'', and her quiet dignity ignited the most significant social movement in the history of the United States;

(3) Rosa Parks was arrested on December 1, 1955, in Montgomery, Alabama, for refusing to give up her seat on a bus to a white man, and her stand for equal rights became legendary;

(4) news of Rosa Parks' arrest resulted in 42,000 African Americans boycotting Montgomery buses for 381 days, beginning on December 5, 1955, until the bus segregation laws were changed on December 21, 1956;

(5) the United States Supreme Court ruled on November 13, 1956, that the Montgomery segregation law was unconstitutional, and on December 20, 1956, Montgomery officials were ordered to desegregate buses;

(6) the civil rights movement led to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which broke down the barriers of legal discrimination against African Americans and made equality before the law a reality for all Americans;

(7) Rosa Parks is the recipient of many awards and accolades for her efforts on behalf of racial harmony, including the Springarn Award, the NAACP's highest honor for civil rights contributions, the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Nation's highest civilian honor, and the first International Freedom Conductor Award from the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center;

(8) Rosa Parks has dedicated her life to the cause of universal human rights and truly embodies the love of humanity and freedom;

(9) Rosa Parks was the first woman to join the Montgomery chapter of the NAACP, was an active volunteer for the Montgomery Voters League, and in 1987, cofounded the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self-Development;

(10) Rosa Parks, by her quiet courage, symbolizes all that is vital about nonviolent protest, as she endured threats of death and persisted as an advocate for the simple, basic lessons she taught the Nation and from which the Nation has benefited immeasurably; and

(11) Rosa Parks, who has resided in the State of Michigan since 1957, has become a living icon for freedom in America.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The President is authorized to award to Rosa Parks, on behalf of the Congress, a gold medal of appropriate design honoring Rosa Parks in recognition of her contributions to the Nation.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purposes of the award referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 2, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, and at a price sufficient to cover the costs thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 4. STATUS AS NATIONAL MEDALS.

The medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 5. FUNDING.

(a) AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund an amount not to exceed $30,000 to pay for the cost of the medals authorized by this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals under section 3 shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

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. 573) was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING MURDER OF ROSEMARY NELSON AND CALLING FOR PROTECTION OF DEFENSE ATTORNEYS IN NORTHERN IRELAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 128, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 128, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 2, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

YEAS—421

Abercrombie	Burton	Dixon
Ackerman	Buyer	Doggett
Aderholt	Callahan	Dooley
Allen	Calvert	Doolittle
Andrews	Camp	Doyle
Archer	Campbell	Dreier
Armey	Canady	Duncan
Bachus	Cannon	Dunn
Baird	Capps	Edwards
Baker	Capuano	Ehlers
Baldacci	Cardin	Ehrlich
Baldwin	Carson	Emerson
Ballenger	Castle	Engel
Barcia	Chabot	English
Barr	Chambliss	Eshoo
Barrett (NE)	Clay	Etheridge
Barrett (WI)	Clayton	Evans
Bartlett	Clement	Everett
Barton	Clyburn	Farr
Bass	Coble	Fattah
Bateman	Coburn	Filner
Becerra	Collins	Fletcher
Bentsen	Combest	Foley
Bereuter	Condit	Ford
Berkley	Conyers	Fossella
Berman	Cook	Fowler
Berry	Cooksey	Frank (MA)
Biggert	Costello	Franks (NJ)
Bilbray	Coyne	Frelinghuysen
Bilirakis	Cramer	Frost
Bishop	Crane	Gallegly
Blagojevich	Crowley	Ganske
Bliley	Cubin	Gejdenson
Blumenauer	Cummings	Gekas
Blunt	Cunningham	Gephardt
Boehlert	Danner	Gibbons
Boehner	Davis (FL)	Gilchrest
Bonilla	Davis (IL)	Gillmor
Bonior	Davis (VA)	Gilman
Bono	Deal	Gonzalez
Borski	DeFazio	Goode
Boswell	DeGette	Goodlatte
Boucher	Delahunt	Goodling
Boyd	DeLauro	Gordon
Brady (PA)	DeLay	Goss
Brady (TX)	DeMint	Graham
Brown (CA)	Deutsch	Granger
Brown (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Green (TX)
Brown (OH)	Dickey	Green (WI)
Bryant	Dicks	Greenwood
Burr	Dingell	Gutierrez

Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Hostettler
Paul

NOT VOTING—10

Chenoweth
Cox
Ewing
Forbes
Kasich
McCollum
Nussle
Saxton
Serrano
Taylor (MS)

□1727

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSMITTAL OF ACCOUNT OF ALL FEDERAL AGENCY CLIMATE CHANGE PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on Science, the Committee on Commerce, and the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 573 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999, as contained in the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277), I transmit herewith an account of all Federal agency climate change programs and activities. This report includes both domestic and international programs and activities related to climate change and contains data on both spending and performance goals.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 20, 1999.*

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1184, EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Ms. PRYCE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–101) on the resolution (H. Res. 142) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1184) to authorize appropriations for carrying out the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 800, EDUCATION FLEXIBILITY PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 1999

Ms. PRYCE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–102) on the resolution (H. Res. 143) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 800) to provide for education flexibility partnerships, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

AUTO CHOICE ACT OF 1999

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Auto Choice Act of 1999. This bipartisan bill, which is also being introduced today in the other body, is designed to give the American people a choice in the type of auto insurance they can buy.

Auto Choice offers drivers a way out of the current expensive lawsuit lottery by giving consumers the option to buy a policy that offers them prompt compensation for medical bills and lost wages from their own insurer, regardless of fault. According to the Joint Economic Committee, those who choose the new system would save 45 percent on their bodily injury premiums. This translates into an average savings of nearly $200 per policy, with low-income drivers seeing the greatest benefits. Over 5 years, the savings could total nearly $200 billion.

Mr. Speaker, this is like a tax cut for the drivers across the country, and it does not cost the Government a single dime. But not only does Auto Choice give consumers a choice, it also gives States a choice. States retain their traditional authority over auto insurance regulation and can accept or reject Auto Choice. Because it respects States' rights, Auto Choice has by called a ''model of federalism.''

Mr. Speaker, Auto Choice protects consumers' wallets, ensures compensation for victims, respects States' rights, and gives drivers a choice when and where to buy their auto insurance.

I am proud to sponsor this important bipartisan initiative and look forward to its passage in the 106th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following statement for the RECORD:

The Auto Choice Reform Act will go far toward taking needless litigation costs out of our auto insurance system. It will save consumers billions of dollars annually, while ensuring speedier recovery of medical bills, lost wages, and other economic damages. By encouraging states to eliminate the middle-man—trial lawyers who add significant costs to the system—the Auto Choice Reform Act will produce significant savings while also fully protecting injured motorists' right to recover.

When injured parties are involved in a car accident under the tort system, legal fault must be established to recover money for economic damages. This is not an easy task, and often requires the parties involved to hire lawyers and go to court. It is a costly and tedious process, and can take up to 16 months for adjudication, and longer when the injury is serious. The delay in payment puts pressure on the seriously injured, particularly the poor, to settle their claims for less than they are worth.

The determination of legal fault is no guarantee that an injured person will receive equitable compensation. People with economic losses up to $5,000 recover two and three

times their losses, while a victim with medical expenses and lost wages between $25,000 and $100,000, recovers on average only half of those losses. For people with catastrophic injuries and losses over $100,000 recovery drops to nine percent on average. There are two main reasons for this: First, insurance companies find it more cost-efficient to settle small nuisance claims for more than they are actually worth to avoid expensive litigation costs. Second, seriously injured accident victims recover just a small percentage of their damages because their losses typically exceed the other driver's policy limits.

The Auto Choice Reform Act gives drivers a less expensive, more efficient alternative to this process. It allows victims to bypass the litigation maze and guarantees more just compensation, helps to prevent fraudulent claims, and provides the possibility of tremendous savings for American auto insurance consumers. A few of the benefits of the Auto Choice Reform Act are highlighted below:

Flexible Choice. Under the Auto Choice Reform Act, drivers can choose the form of auto insurance they believe is best for them and their families. One route would be for drivers to choose a policy similar to that now available in their state, either tort or no-fault insurance. Another route would be to choose the new PIP option.

Prompt Payment. The new choice, called personal insurance protection (PIP), would pay the injured person within 30 days for medical bills and lost wages, regardless of fault. The victim could also recover compensation from the at-fault driver for any additional medical bills and lost wages above the victim's policy limits.

Better Compensation for Serious Injuries. Under both systems, parties could make a claim against at-fault drivers for medical bills and lost wages in excess of their own insurance. In such situations, because injured persons could recover from both their own coverage and the at-fault driver's coverage, people would receive more compensation for serious injuries. Additionally, drivers in either system would be able to seek both economic damages and pain and suffering from drivers who operate a vehicle while under the influence of alcohol or illegal drugs, or engage in intentional misconduct.

Less Fraud. Because people who choose the new PIP option could neither sue nor be sued for pain and suffering, most of the incentives for fraud would disappear. As a result, for those who choose PIP, compensation for economic losses would increase dramatically, while dollars paid for fraud, pain and suffering and unnecessary attorneys' fees would plummet.

Savings. A March 1998 Joint Economic Committee study estimates the savings at about 45 percent on average for personal injury premiums, which translates into about 24 percent of overall premiums, or about $184 per year, per car for the typical American driver. The JEC also found that low-income drivers would see higher savings—about 36 percent on their overall premiums.

In addition, Auto Choice promotes federalism. It gives states the option to not extend the first-party liability coverage option to their residents by passing a law precluding such a system. Regardless of whether states choose to subscribe to the bill's insurance choice system, they will maintain their current regulation authority over all aspects of auto insurance.

Finally, it is important to note what Auto Choice will not do. Auto Choice will not abolish lawsuits or eliminate the concept of legal fault. Drivers who chose to remain in the current tort system will still be able to recover for both economic and noneconomic losses. Those who choose to enter the new system can still sue for any uncompensated economic loss. And, victims of drunken or other negligent driving may sue for both economic and noneconomic losses.

Given these significant benefits to consumers, the Auto Choice Reform Act enjoys bipartisan political support—from Rudy Guiliani to former Massachusetts governor Michael Dukakis. It is endorsed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; consumer advocate Andrew Tobias; Citizens for a Sound Economy; and taxpayer advocate Grover Norquist.

My colleague, Mr. MORAN, and I hope that others will consider joining in our ongoing effort to find ways to help hard-working Americans to save more of the money they earn.

April 20, 1999.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On Tuesday, April 20, 1999, I introduced the Auto Choice Reform Act of 1999. The Monday, April 19, 1999 edition of the Washington Times carried an op-ed by Robert R. Detlefsen of Citizens for a Sound Economy (CSE) which outlines the philosophy behind Auto Choice—ridding our nation's courts system of frivolous lawsuits and helping car insurance consumers achieve lower annual premiums. I commend this article to you as yet another way that we can help American families and consumers keep more of what they earn for themselves.

Sincerely,

DICK ARMEY,
Member of Congress.

TRAINING EXERCISE IN VIEQUES KILLS DAVID SANET RODRIGUEZ AND INJURES FOUR OTHERS

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

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon with very sad news indeed.

Yesterday, during a training exercise in Vieques, Puerto Rico, two U.S. F–18's dropped bombs that exploded 65 feet from an observation post in Camp Garcia, which is a Navy facility, and killed Mr. David Sanet Rodriguez, a civilian employee of the Navy, and injured four others.

I am saddened by this most unfortunate and tragic error, and I want to convey my deepest sympathy to the family of Mr. Sanet Rodriguez and the Navy employees that were injured.

The need to defend our democracy has required many personal sacrifices for the people of Vieques throughout the past 30 years. The bomb yesterday was off target, although still within the military base, but who can guarantee that sometime in the future it will not be off target in the inhabited part of Vieques?

Because my biggest concern is for the safety, security and welfare of the 8,500 American citizens residing in Vieques, I join the Governor of Puerto Rico in calling for an order to cease all bombing and military maneuvers in Vieques until a thorough investigation is conducted and until it can be guaranteed that there are no future risks to the residents of Vieques.

Mr. Speaker—I rise this afternoon with very sad news indeed. Yesterday, during a training exercise in Vieques, Puerto Rico, two U.S. F–18's from the U.S. Navy dropped bombs that exploded 65 feet from an observation post in Camp García, which is a Navy facility in Vieques, and killed Mr. David Sanes Rodríquez, a civilian employee of the Navy and injured four other Navy employees.

I am saddened by this most unfortunate and tragic error and want to convey my deepest sympathy to the family of Mr. Sanes and the Navy employees that were injured. Our prayers and blessings at this trying time are with them and their families.

This military accident is a tragedy. Vieques has held an important role in the defense readiness of our armed forces, and the maneuvers being carried out during this week involve the USS John F. Kennedy battle group as the force prepares for deployment in Operation Southern Watch ongoing in Southern Iraq in the Gulf War.

The ability to defend our American democracy effectively has entailed many personal sacrifices and I want to express my support at this critical time to the people of Vieques who have sacrificed throughout the past 30 years in support of our armed forces. The bomb was off target in military soil yesterday, but who can guarantee that sometime in the future it will not be off target in the inhabited part of Vieques.

Because my biggest concern is for the safety, security and welfare of the 8,500 American citizens residing in Vieques, I join the Governor of Puerto Rico in calling on President Bill Clinton, Secretary of Defense Cohen and Navy Secretary Richard Danzig to cease all bombing and military maneuvers until a thorough investigation is conducted and until it can be guaranteed that there are no future risks to the population of Vieques.

As the 8,500 Puerto Rican-Americans in Vieques have so contributed to our nation's defense readiness, I am hereby calling on the Navy to recognize their contributions and their unwavering support despite the inherent risks. The Navy must make further efforts to look for alternatives to the use of ¾ of Vieques for military exercises, so that Vieques may look forward to a peaceful, safe and prosperous future.

□ 1730

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

MEDICAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to say a few words about medical

savings accounts. Unfortunately, medical savings accounts have fallen victim to partisan political posturing. That is unfortunate because MSAs will insure the uninsured, allow for choice of a doctor, and put the health care decisions in the hands of the individual, not a managed care administrator.

Six years ago, along with a dozen of my Democratic colleagues, I cosponsored legislation to create medical savings accounts. In fact, Democrats were the initial sponsors of MSAs, and MSAs unanimously passed the House Committee on Ways and Means in 1994 during the debate on the Clinton health care plan. However, after the Republicans took over Congress, MSAs became a partisan football that was used to polarize the House of Representatives.

But I want to make medical savings accounts a bipartisan issue once again. So the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and I have introduced H.R. 614, the Medical Savings Account Efficiency Act of 1999. This bill repeals the 750,000-person cap that was placed on MSAs by the 1996 Kennedy–Kassebaum Health Insurance Act and it makes medical savings accounts permanent, thereby repealing the year 2000 sunset of MSAs.

Repealing the 750,000 cap is significant in that many insurers have been reluctant to offer MSAs because these restrictions limited the size of the market in which MSAs could be offered. Therefore, insurers will mass market MSAs and make millions of Americans aware of the benefits of medical savings accounts.

By opening up MSAs to all Americans, MSAs would encourage savings for health care. By forcing doctors and hospitals to compete for patients who are concerned about quality and cost, health care spending will slow down. Likewise, MSAs will provide a real incentive to shop around for the best values and alternatives when nonemergency treatment is needed. The incentive? Consumers will keep the money they save.

Critics of MSAs claim that this incentive will lead healthy people to choose MSAs, leaving sick people in a separate and therefore more expensive health insurance pool. But while many healthy people will choose to save the money, the sick will also choose MSAs because their out-of-pocket cost will be less.

In addition, MSAs are not just for the wealthy. A GAO study found that one-third of all new MSAs are opened by previously uninsured individuals.

These are additional reasons that MSAs are good for the consumer. Medical savings accounts will reduce administrative overhead, as small bills will be settled and paid directly between provider and consumer. They will also increase the record low savings rates of Americans. Lastly, MSAs provide an incentive to stay healthy. Preventive medicine will be encouraged.

These are the reasons I supported MSAs back in 1994 when I first heard about them, and these are the reasons I support medical savings accounts today. So I say to my colleagues, as we wade into health care reform in the 106th Congress, include medical savings accounts in any health insurance measure that will come out of this Congress because medical savings accounts will cut cost, provide choice, promote healthy lives, and save money for the consumer. Mr. Speaker, that is the epitome of reform.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ENGLISH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHADEGG addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HULSHOF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SITUATION IN KOSOVO

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, I have spoken several times over the last few days about the situation in Kosovo. Unfortunately, as a former editor of Foreign Affairs magazine wrote recently in the Washington Times, the President has put us in an impossible situation.

There is no good answer. As Henry Kissinger said, ''Ethnic and religious fighting is endemic to the Balkans and has been going on there for hundreds of years.'' We cannot stop it unless we stay there forever at unbelievable costs to our taxpayers.

Do we mortgage the futures of our children and grandchildren to temporarily make things a little bit better in Kosovo? Everyone agrees that Milosevic is a tyrant. He is a communist dictator. I am certainly not defending him in any way.

In fact, I went to Yugoslavia 2 years ago with the National Defense Council. While in Belgrade, I, along with three other Members of this body, appeared on radio station B–92, which was the main opposition station to Milosevic. But as many columnists and commentators have pointed out, our bombings have basically created the refugee situation and have strengthen Milosevic.

Everyone has tremendous sympathy for the refugees. But several hundred thousand Serbians were forced out of Croatia not long ago. They were victims of ethnic cleansing then, and we did nothing about it. And as many people have pointed out, there are small wars or fighting going on in 30 or 40 different places around this world right now. Several of those situations were far worse than in Kosovo before we started the bombing.

There apparently is little disagreement with the description that the Kosovar Liberation Army is a terrorist organization and one that has been funded primarily by illegal drugs.

On MSNBC this past Saturday night, the question was asked about the refugee crisis, whether it was created by NATO bombs or Serbian troops. Sixty-five percent of the many thousands of callers said NATO bombing was mainly at fault.

NATO is getting ready to hold one of the biggest parties this city has ever seen here this weekend. I believe NATO and our President thought Milosevic would cave after just a few days of bombing and that they could then toast each other in a great victory celebration for the 50th anniversary party of NATO this weekend.

What a miscalculation. That was certainly one of the greatest miscalculations in American history and, unfortunately, one that is costing American taxpayers $46,000 a minute and many, many, many billions before it is all over.

We are about to be asked to appropriate $6 billion in emergency funding. And if we go into a ground war, they estimate that is going to be $10 or $15 billion and that before it is all over, if this thing drags out, we could spend $40 or $50 billion that would have to be taken from other programs or from the Social Security fund.

All of this that I am saying today was said much more eloquently in a column written by A.M. Rosenthal of the New York Times which ran in the Knoxville News Sentinel this morning. Mr. Rosenthal wrote this. He said, ''The way adults of any intelligence can find out how well they are dealing with a crisis, personal or national, is to ask themselves two questions: Would we do the same things again if we had

a chance? If not, what do we now do to get out of this mess?''

Then Mr. Rosenthal asked these questions: ''Would the United States again decide that to help Kosovo's Albanians we would give Slobodan Milosevic what he wanted most, the cover to drive a million of them into foreign exile or become displaced persons at home, wandering their roads in terror? Would we spray bombs at a dictator without it occurring to our leaders he would immediately drive out or slaughter the people we were supposed to save? Were our leaders fools?'' ''Yes'' Mr. Rosenthal says.

Would the U.S. President again decide that before going to war he would guarantee not to send ground troops so Milosevic need not get all worried?

''Would we again bomb-bomb-bomb the capital of the Serbs, who thought of themselves as far more our friends than his? So far this has produced three major results: humiliating Serbs forever, turning friendship into enmity, and persuading many to rally around a man they detest and fear.

''Would we be roaming around again with a diplomatic begging cup asking Russia, the same addled country that we pity, or any other country that will answer the phone, to find a way out for us?

''Would we again allow Washington to weaken the world's human rights movements by arousing fears that they will one day mean more bombing assignments for America?''

Mr. Speaker, just to sum up what we really have done, we have turned friends into enemies at great cost to this country. And I think that, unfortunately, we have gotten into one of the biggest messes we have ever gotten into in this country, and we need to negotiate and get out of this mess as soon as we possibly can.

WAGER ON DUKE UNIVERSITY-MICHIGAN STATE GAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am here to acknowledge defeat in a wager that I encountered with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE). We bet, as unsuitable as some might feel about wagering, but we bet on the Duke-Michigan State game, and the loser was to furnish each member of the Committee on Agriculture with an agricultural product from their State.

As great a team as Michigan State is and was, they ended up slightly being defeated by Duke University. And I just wanted to announce publicly that I am furnishing each member of the Committee on Agriculture with tokens that represent Michigan, navy beans from the State of Michigan, the world's top producer of navy beans; and also from Battle Creek, Michigan, a new cereal by Kellogg.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1745

GOLD MEDAL FOR ROSA PARKS IN RECOGNITION OF HER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARY MILLER of California). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in support of H.R. 573, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Rosa Parks in recognition of her contributions to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON), for introducing this important piece of legislation to honor a true American heroine and, indeed, a great American.

Forty years ago, Rosa Parks risked everything when she refused to abide by the Jim Crow laws of segregation. In 1955, blacks were considered secondary human beings. Everything was segregated, Mr. Speaker, in 1955, schools, parks, restaurants, rest rooms and neighborhoods. I lived through that time, Mr. Speaker. This was just to name a few of the areas where segregation reigned.

In Montgomery, Alabama, Rosa Parks became a pioneer of black people, being the catalyst that changed the course of history. Rosa Parks spoke out for every black person throughout the Nation who was being denied equality and freedom. Mrs. Parks refused to move and relinquish her seat to a white man because she was tired. She was tired of the foolishness, she was tired of the selfishness, of the rudeness, and she was tired of the disrespect, and the day that Mrs. Parks refused to move was a turning point, was a turning stone in America that changed the unfair, indiscriminate laws that were made for blacks in the United States.

In one simple act of defiance, Mr. Speaker, Rosa Parks, on December 1, 1955, in Montgomery, Alabama, history was made. I am a part of that history, Mr. Speaker, and so is every other African American that we see in the Congress. Because of the courageous act of Rosa Parks, I stand before my colleagues today as the first African American from Florida elected to the Congress since Reconstruction. It was Rosa Parks who made this happen, Mr. Speaker, and we want America to understand this. This will help America understand, to see the fight that Rosa Parks put up so that the rest of us could have a better chance.

This award perhaps should have been bestowed on Rosa Parks several years ago because her deeds have paved the way for generations of African Americans today. My daughters and my son, Mr. Speaker, will have a better chance now of coming to Congress or even being President of these great United States because of Rosa Parks.

I ask my colleagues to join me and urge our President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Rosa Parks in recognition of her outstanding contributions to the Nation. She gave to the world the best she had, and now the best will come back to her.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. TANCREDO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

A DRUM MAJOR FOR JUSTICE—MRS. ROSA PARKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I stand tonight as a very proud black woman, a woman who came from Alabama, one who was there during the time of the Rosa Parks venture. Before I go on to talk about this woman who should, by all stature, receive this congressional medal, let me congratulate my colleague and friend, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON), who had to come to the 105th Congress to sensitize us of the importance of recognizing this heroine that we call Rosa Parks.

She is the mother of civil rights because it was in December of 1955, Mr. Speaker, that Rosa Parks refused to get up after having spent all day as a seamstress to give her seat to a man who was nonblack, who thought that he was to sit at the front of the bus and she was to sit in the back where there were no more seats.

Mr. Speaker, Rosa Parks showed courage, dedication and commitment

to the cause of saying that everyone should be equal when they paid their fare to ride a bus. That ignited the civil rights movement.

We know that the mother of civil rights, Rosa Parks, was the catalyst in bringing about the civil rights laws that we now know because when Rosa Parks refused to get up from her seat, it was the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King who said: I will not stand for this woman to be removed from a bus and not fight for cause. Indeed, she is a drum major for justice.

So on Monday, April 19, 1996, the United States Senate unanimously approved legislation to award the congressional medal to a woman who is deserving of that, an icon of the civil rights movement. According to Mrs. Parks, she has been pushed as far as she could stand when she was arrested in Montgomery, Alabama, in 1955, for refusing to give up her seat and move to the back of the bus.

As I look at myself as the vice chair of the Women's Caucus here in the U.S. Congress, I know that I would not be standing here had it not been on the shoulders of Rosa Parks, a woman who saw a need to open the doors for opportunities for all of us, not only African American women, but for all women in this country. Mrs. Parks is an integral part of the civil rights movement which led to sweeping changes of the laws and the social fabric of these United States. These changes, due in part to the efforts of Mrs. Parks, have paved the way for not only the opportunities for me, but for my grandchildren, my granddaughters and my grandson.

She is a quiet strength, Mr. Speaker. If you have seen her, you would wonder how this woman, who seemed to be so frail perhaps, would have done this; but her strength and her courage and her commitment and her faith caused her to say: I shall not be moved, I shall not return back to the days of degradation . . . So, she is truly a drum major for justice, Mr. Speaker.

I am so proud that this House now has seen befitting for it to bestow a congressional medal on a woman who deserved this. She will now take her position and stand with Mother Teresa and Nelson Mandela as persons who changed the core of this civil rights movement in this country and in this world and made it better for all of our children, black children, white children, brown children, red children, yellow children, to have the opportunities that should be accorded them in these United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am so happy to be a part of the 106th Congress who bestowed a congressional medal on such an outstanding woman.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 19, 1999, the United States Senate unanimously approved legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Rosa Parks, an icon of the civil rights movement.

According to Mrs. Parks she: "had been pushed as far as she could stand," when she was arrested in Montgomery, Alabama in 1955 for refusing to give up her seat and move to the back of the bus, as mandated by law. This courageous act of civil disobedience led to the Montgomery bus boycott, which helped to form the foundation of the civil rights movement in this country.

Mrs. Parks was an integral part of the civil rights movement, which led to sweeping changes of the laws and social fabric of the United States. These changes, due in part to the efforts of Mrs. Parks, have paved the way for increased opportunities for all Americans.

The title of Mrs. Parks' autobiography "Quiet Strength," is a fitting title and description of a woman whose selfless act made this country a better place, and whose life should serve as an example of public service. Mrs. Parks is truly a drum major for justice and it is for these reasons that Congress should honor this American hero with the Congressional Gold Medal.

MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to lead the House's special order on mathematics and science education.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to imagine a successful enterprise during the 20th century that has not involved proficiency in math and science. Skilled mathematicians and scientists have led the way in smashing the atom, discovering vaccines and cures for diseases, landing astronauts on the moon and developing the Internet. In fact, a notable author has heralded the last 100 years as the American Century.

It is no exaggeration to say that mathematics and science provided the bricks and mortar that helped the U.S. construct its prominence on the world stage as a leader in the global economy and its sole status as superpower.

Mr. Speaker, if the U.S. is to maintain its status as a world leader, it is necessary to fundamentally change how America looks at education and specifically mathematics and science education.

The House Democrats have joined with President Clinton to improve education. We recognize that a high-quality education will ensure that today's students will become the skilled employees and business leaders of tomorrow. The Democrats have strongly supported measures to reduce class size, to repair outdated school facilities, to construct new schools and to ensure that public schools are safe places for our children to learn. These are important initiatives.

We believe that it is in the national interest that improvements are made not only in our country's school architecture, but also in how we teach our students mathematics and science in kindergarten through the 12th grade. Toward this end, we believe that greater emphasis needs to be placed on the training and recruitment of mathematics and science teachers. We need to make changes in mathematics and science curricula to give some students more access to computers. We can make improvements to study math and science in greater detail rather than focusing on just the basics.

Today I would like to highlight some of the problems that exist when it comes to mathematics and science education. We will examine how these educational shortcomings adversely affect the recruitment of employees to businesses, particularly in the field of information technology and other information-based fields.

When it comes to mathematics and science education in the U.S., students need practice and more practice. Compared to their international peers, American students ranked near the bottom in the Third International Mathematics and Science Study that was released last year and in 1996. Results at the third and fourth grade levels showed that Korea was the top-performing country in science; Japan was second; and the U.S. and Austria shared the third position.

In mathematics, Singapore, Korea, Japan and Hong Kong were the top, while American students came in in 12th place. For 12th graders, U.S. students ranked 16th in their knowledge of science and 19th in their knowledge of mathematics among the 21 competing countries. That is unsatisfactory.

These findings underscore that U.S. students do not share the same proficiency in mathematics and science that their overseas peers have. Since these students will comprise tomorrow's work force, they will have a direct impact on our country's ability to compete in the global economy.

There are many of us in the House who believe that the President and Congress need to embrace public policies to improve mathematics and science education. As the Subcommittee on Basic Research's ranking member, I have had several discussions with representatives of the information technology community. These business people have expressed their frustration in not being able to find qualified job applicants. In fact, one chief executive officer testified last month that in his company he had received 630 resumes in the first 6 months of its start-up, and of those considered qualified, none were American born. One out of 10 jobs in information technology is currently unfilled according to the Information Technology Association of America. One in three job applicants tested by U.S. companies lacks the reading and mathematics skills for the job as reported by the American Management Association.

These statistics reveal that there is a direct relationship between proficiency in math and science as a student and one's ability to be a successful employee in the evolving information-based workplace.

□ 1800

American Airlines, for example, is a major employer in my congressional district. This company has written me to express its interest in having a highly-trained workforce.

''Dear Representative JOHNSON: American Airlines, for instance, relies heavily on complex computer systems in order to plan and coordinate 2,200 flights, track over 300,000 pieces of baggage moving through our system and manage 343,000 reservation calls each day. Approximately two-thirds of American Airlines' 125,000 employees use computers on a daily basis, and our pilots, yield management specialists, and flight operation personnel depend on advanced math and computer skills in the routine performance of their jobs.''

Some schools have already recognized the importance of promoting mathematics and science education. They have implemented programs that are developing our students' skills in math and science. These institutions ought to be commended for their efforts and encouraged to push the envelope when it comes to math and science instruction.

The Yvonne A. Ewell Townview Magnet Center located in Dallas in the low income area of my district is one school that provides cutting edge instructions of mathematics and science through its School of Science and Engineering.

In addition to the Science and Engineering School, the Townview campus has schools of business and management; education and social services; government and law; health professions; and talented and gifted.

The Townview campus, particularly in the Science and Engineering School, has many of the features that other American schools need to help other students compete in the 21st century's workforce. These components include small classroom size, the latest in computer technology, job site based internships that are related to the curriculum, independent learning, and a highly trained teaching staff.

Townview students participate regularly in academic and technological competitions. They have even built voice-activated robots. I salute Townview students and its faculty. One component of the Townview experience sheds some light on one way that schools can improve education opportunities for children. That is through the development of partnerships between schools and the businesses in their community.

Businesses can work with schools in their communities to do such things as donate computer equipment, set up job site internships for students, as well as the establishment of college scholarships for promising math and science students.

Last month, I introduced the Math and Science Proficiency Partnership Act, H.R. 1265, to improve mathematics and science education for students kindergarten through the 12th grade, as well as to increase training for math and science teachers.

The purpose of H.R. 1265 is to encourage partnerships between schools and businesses in their communities, to improve lower test scores by students and to enrich the applicant pool for high technology firms in other fields dependent upon engineering and math. My area is prolific in its need for this skill and it will grow as we move into the 21st century.

Schools in urban and rural areas do not always have the resources that other schools have. Schools and the businesses located in their communities are strategically poised to partner with each other. My bill authorizes the National Science Foundation to award 10 partnership grants through its urban and rural systemic initiative programs.

The National Science Foundation director will make five grants to urban areas and five grants to rural areas. Each grant will not exceed $300,000 and the total amount authorized is only $3 million, a small amount for the need that this entire Nation needs for its workforce for the future.

The purpose of the partnership grants is to assist in training of math and science teachers and to further education opportunities for science and math students. The grants will be awarded to schools that have successfully established partnerships to accomplish the above-mentioned teacher training and educational opportunities for mathematics and science students.

Eligibility of the grants will be based on how well the participating schools and businesses have forged their partnerships. Ways that schools can participate include sponsoring advanced and innovative training for math and science teachers. Ways that businesses can participate in the partnership include setting up college scholarship programs for promising math and science students, establishing mentoring and internship programs at the company's job site, as well as donation of computer hardware and software to participating schools.

The legislation directs the National Science Foundation director to conduct a long-range study on the students who have participated in the partnership program and their ability to land and to retain jobs in math and science and information technology.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill but, moreover, I continue to urge the entire Congress to look at these areas because it impacts directly on our economy in this global society. The ability of students to be skilled in mathematics and science education is directly linked to whether the U.S. and its companies will be successful in the 21st century. That is why schools and businesses need to increase their efforts to establish these partnerships now, so that today's students can take their places in the skilled information workforce tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as a former high school physical science teacher, I know the value of science education, and I remember the sense of anticipation and excitement that my students shared with me when we huddled around a television set as Neil Armstrong stepped onto the moon in 1969. I saw the gleam in their eyes that inspired them to become our future engineers and scientists, those of today.

Unfortunately, today's scientists and engineers do not accurately represent the ethnic and racial makeup of our melting pot society. In fact, the Beaumont Independent School District is comprised of about 70 percent minority students and, of those, 55 percent are considered to be economically disadvantaged.

We must do something today to ensure that every child in every home or apartment building in this Nation, regardless of their color, religion, economic status, can realize their dream of becoming an astronaut or physics instructor or researcher.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about an exciting program in my southeast Texas district that motivates school-aged minority students to study math and science and explore new frontiers where no man or woman has gone before.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, I was able to help Lamar University in Beumont to secure a space, science and technology educational program grant to provide disadvantaged high school students with science curriculum and related hands-on interactive learning activities.

For example, students from my hometown will be going on a field trip to Austin, Texas, to explore the relationship between astroid impacts and the extinction of dinosaurs more than 65 million years ago by studying dinosaur tracks. So far, this program has trained more than 200 teachers and has benefited more than 23,000 students in Beaumont public schools.

It is also worth pointing out that the in-kind and cash contributions of the consortium members total more than $800,000. Moreover, Lamar University, which is my alma mater, waived the institutional overheads for this program because of its wide-ranging regional impact on the education of southeast Texas youth.

I am not a gambling man, Mr. Speaker, but I bet that NASA's educational grant will turn out to be a wise investment in the future of engineering, technology and scientific research. My guess is that a decade or so from now there will be men and women who attended Beaumont Independent Schools working as astronauts and physicists at NASA and other space industries. That is what I am banking on.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for putting this together and giving us a chance to speak on the important subject of science and math, and also for representing our subcommittee.

I also want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas, our distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on Basic Research, for bringing us here together today. I am very proud to serve on her committee, and under her leadership I am enjoying exploring important issues like math, science and technology education for our children.

As one of the few members of both the Committee on Science and Committee on Education and the Workforce, how our children learn math, science and technology is extremely important to me and I consider it important for everyone in this Nation.

Math and science have not only shaped our history but now, more than ever, will shape our future. I am concerned, however, that our students are not learning math, science and technology as well as students of other countries, the countries that we compete against in the global marketplace. This is reflected in the Third International Mathematics and Science Study, which measured fourth, eighth and twelfth grade students in the United States with comparable countries.

Disturbingly, by the 12th grade our students were ranked among the lowest in math and science, and in physics we finished last. I know we can do better. We must do better and we will, but we first need to deepen our commitment to math, science and technology education.

A recent President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology, or PCAST, report recommended an applied research study to determine what has been effective and what has not been effective in teaching our children math, science and technology. The Ehlers report last year pointed out that we spend about $300 billion annually on education but only about 1/100th of a percent of that is spent on researching how our students learn.

Again, I hope that the bipartisan desire to improve math, science and technology education will lead to increased funding for education research so that our children can grow into our country's current role as a nation of innovation.

Even more concerning to me, however, is that too many girls have been largely left out of the technological revolution. A recent news story had a brother and a sister talking about their interest in computers. The girl said, and I quote, I do not like them. I only use them when I have to. The boy, on the other hand, saw computers as a tool to make his work easier.

It is clear that there are inequities in the education system between boys and girls, and that this would be the worst time to step away from fixing those imbalances. We are finding that girls do well with math and science education until about the ninth grade. After that, they are largely absent in classes and programs that teach math, science and technology.

As we talk today about the criteria to measure success, we want to include criteria for measuring the progress of girls and boys in these fields. We need to learn more about how girls and boys learn, both about math, science and technology; what makes it interesting and what keeps it interesting. We cannot expect girls to be motivated the same way as boys.

We also need to improve what our students are being taught and by whom. Teacher training is a vital link in improving our students' math, science and technology education. Again, the Ehlers report saw this need and recommended recruiting teachers with a formal education in these disciplines. However, retaining quality math, science and technology teachers is very difficult. That is why I strongly recommend compensating them accordingly.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for convening this very important special order. Hopefully, through events like these and through our work on the Committee on Science, we can help find a direction that takes all students, girls, boys, wealthy and disadvantaged, younger and older, into the 21st century.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), an outstanding legislator.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), my good friend and colleague from Dallas, for organizing this special order tonight on education in math and science.

Just to digress for a minute on a personal note, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and I have served together since both of us were many years younger, starting in 1973 as a State representative in Austin, Texas, and then in the State Senate before we both felt the urge to run for Congress in 1992. It is good to serve with her for all these 26 years. I need to go back to my math to count all of those years now.

□ 1815

Mr. Speaker, our country, a leader in the world, has fallen dramatically behind the rest of the world in the critical subjects of math and science. When compared to students in European nations, our students finish at the bottom of their class.

I would like to commend my colleague for introducing the Mathematics and Science Proficiency Partnership Act, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation. This important legislation will help us provide both students and teachers the critical skills in math, science and information technology. Without these skills, our youth will be ill-equipped to compete in tomorrow's high-tech, computer-oriented marketplace.

I would like to also highlight the success of our home State of Texas in developing the tools necessary to begin addressing the problem. Texas, in 1984, set an example and created the TAAS test, the test that represents a comprehensive assessment of problem-solving ability and higher-order thinking skills that all students must pass to earn their high school diplomas. It is given all during their latter years in school, but it is an exit-level exam that is required for graduation.

Texas has taken it even one step further. In 1994, Texas schools began administering an end-of-course exam. These exams are designed to measure student progress toward the achievement of academic goals. These tests not only provide a solid measure of student achievement, they can also provide a benchmark that can be used to measure the performance of future students and provide for institutional accountability.

Texas schools have used these tests to find out what works and what does not when it comes to educating our children. I sometimes think we can test too much, and with both TAAS and the end-of-course exams, that may be too much, but I know we do not need anymore, because now we need to focus on content, and that is what my colleague has in her legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in 1994 in the Houston ISD, only 49 percent of the students in HISD could pass the TAAS exams for mathematics. Among African-American students, it was only 41 percent. Among Hispanic students, 44 percent, and among low-income students, the rate was 42 percent. That was in 1994. In 1998, four years later, we have seen the dramatic impact that these tests have in helping increase the rate of passage.

Mr. Speaker, 77 percent of all students passed the TAAS mathematics test, an increase of 28 percent in 4 years. Among African-American students, the passage rate went to 73 percent; that is a 32 percent increase in 4 years. Among Hispanic students, the passage rate rose to 74 percent, an increase of 30 percent; and the passage rate among low-income students also rose to 74 percent, and that is a 32 percent increase.

We saw similar results in the Aldine ISD, a district that is just north of Houston; again, two very urban districts, Mr. Speaker, and another school district that I am proud and honored to represent. In Aldine, we have seen an even more dramatic increase in the number of students passing the mathematics portion of the TAAS test. In 1994, in the Aldine district, 56 percent

of all students passed. Among African-Americans it was only 42 percent, and among Hispanics, 55 percent, and among low-income students, 49 percent. In four years, what a difference four years makes. In 1998, 87 percent of all Aldine students passed their math TAAS, an increase of 31 percent. Among African-American students, the passage rate rose to 82 percent, an astounding increase of 40 percent. Among Hispanic students, their passage rate rose to 88 percent, an increase of 33 percent, and among low-income students, the passage rate rose to 86 percent, an increase of 36 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we are testing the students now on the quality of what they are learning. We have seen success in the last 4 years, at least in the two districts that I represent, and that is true with a lot of our districts. But we still need to do programs like my colleague from Dallas has suggested, because what may work today will surely be behind the times tomorrow.

Two weeks ago I had the opportunity with NASA, and NASA assigned an astronaut to me in my district, and so we went to middle schools in a predominantly Hispanic community in my district and had an astronaut, Dr. Franklin Chambias, along with a businessperson to talk about the importance of math and science. That is a one-day-a-year chance, we can only do three middle schools, to encourage those seventh and eighth graders to realize math and science are important. Programs like my colleague has introduced is something that needs to be done every day of the year, because if we do not, surely our students will be behind and the United States will not be the competitive Nation that we are now, and that is why this legislation is so important.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague not only for tonight, but also for authoring this legislation, and again, I am proud to be a cosponsor.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding me time, and I also want to express my deep appreciation for her setting up this Special Order and providing leadership on this very important issue. It is an issue of grave importance I think to this country and certainly to the economic life and viability of America.

I also want to thank the gentlewoman and congratulate her for introducing this legislation, and I am proud to be a cosponsor, that will go a long way, in my opinion, in encouraging our youngsters to take an interest in the fields of science, math, and really an area we sort of tend to forget sometimes; we talk about it as if it is a separate piece, and that is this whole area of information technology that really is deeply rooted in science and mathematics.

We can talk about standards for students and teachers and we can talk about the math and science curriculum until we are blue in the face, but if we do not generate more interest in these fields among our children, these efforts will mean very little. Talk is cheap, but it takes a lot of hard work to do it. So I want to thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this issue. It is an issue that I think deserves the interest and an awful lot of time of Members of this Congress.

I am sure it does not come as a surprise to the gentlewoman or to anyone else on this floor tonight that as the former superintendent of the schools of the State of North Carolina, the topic of science and math education is not only near and dear to me, but it is an important one that I have spent an awful lot of time working on. When I was superintendent in our State, one of our primary goals was to improve the science and math education for our children, and we did a number of things in this regard in North Carolina.

As the gentlewoman knows, her home State and my State of North Carolina, the States of Texas and North Carolina are two States that have been singled out by the Secretary of Education and the President on numerous occasions as two States that really are doing some of the right things. But, the thing to remember is, we have a long ways yet to go. Science and math education is a long journey.

We have worked hard in North Carolina to encourage local curriculum. We have a State system of schools really, and we worked on it hard in the early grades to make learning of math and science fun for our children, but at the same time, putting a lot of rigor in it. We have done a lot of applied learning at the same time. Rather than just the analytical kind we have done for years, we have put a lot of applied opportunities in the classroom, and that takes money. It means that we need to have tools to work with.

We have worked hard in North Carolina to increase the availability of technology in the classroom and to link our schools to the information highway, what we now call the Internet, and that is so critical. If we want to open up the opportunities for teachers to teach and children to learn, they have to have access to the things that we take for granted in the business community every day.

I used to say when I traveled the State that if one wants to go into any modern office, one will find a telephone, a computer and a whole number of other things. If one goes into a school, we expect the teachers to go to the office to use the telephone, and they may have a computer in the library or the media center, as we call it, and that is not acceptable in the 21st century if we want our children to learn.

We placed a great emphasis on putting children into a more rigorous math and science curriculum and we have done a lot of that in North Carolina. We raised standards in our math and science curriculum, increased the units of math and science every child needed for graduation, and probably one of the most significant developments that we made, and this was done early on as I went in as superintendent, we required algebra as a requirement for graduation for our students. We said, well, that is nothing great. Well, the truth is, too many students were allowed to get out with just general math and we went to requiring it for graduation, and many said, it will not work. We are going to fail a lot of students. Well, what happened, too many times algebra has been used as a filter. It filtered out an awful lot of students that had an opportunity and ability to do it: females, African-Americans and a number of our minority students were filtered out. We turned it into a pump primer. And what that meant is we forced more into it, and we got better at teaching; we had to do a better job of staff development for our teachers. And lo and behold, guess what happened. Math scores went up, and so did our reading scores.

So we have used it in a way to make a difference. I think if we enrich the curriculum and we give the teachers the tools and we help them in staff development and we encourage students, they will rise to the occasion. I read with interest this weekend that other States are beginning to follow our lead and require algebra in earlier grades.

Obviously, there is no silver bullet to improve science and math education. It is hard work. However, there is no doubt that we must start in the earlier grades to help our children develop the skills that they need to be successful in the science and technology-based economy of the 21st century.

The debate over science and math curriculum is not simply one of improving test scores or making our children smarter. It is fundamental to the future of our country and its prosperity in the 21st century, and it is absolutely fundamental to our children's ability to deal with the complicated issues that they will face in the 21st century.

North Carolina has become a hub of our Nation's technology revolution. The Research Triangle Park area boosts some of the best research universities in the world and is the home to a host of a world renowned pharmaceutical, biotechnology, telecommunications and computer companies, the same list that you can read in Texas and some of our other high-tech centers.

The technology revolution has been good to North Carolina. But hardly a week goes by that I do not talk to a company's CEO who tells me that we need to improve science and math education and that we need more people with technical skills entering the workforce. It is true in our State, it is true across this country. Unfortunately, too often in this town, what is best for our children gets bogged down

in petty politics and partisan power struggles.

Take the Dollars for the Classroom program, block grants that were just introduced today by the loyal opposition. Having been a superintendent for 8 years and been at that level, I can tell my colleagues that block grants are great if we have a great grant-writer. It is a sorry way to dispense money for poor folks who do not have grant-writers. Guess which children have the greatest need for science and math education? It is those children in those districts that do not have good grant-writers. And I think it is a sham if we go through such a charade talking about putting more in the classroom. People who have the greatest need are hurt the most by block grants.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we are forced to stand on the floor and debate whether or not we should increase the number of foreign workers we allow in this country to meet the needs of our companies here for workers in some of the fields that our high-tech companies and biotech companies and others need, something is wrong. I can tell my colleagues that something is wrong, and we need to fix it. I am here to tell my colleagues that there is one Member of Congress that is committed to fixing it, because the future of this country, the future of my State and the future of our children depend on it.

□ 1830

I want to thank my friend, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), because she has decided that she is going to do more than talk about it. She has put together a bill, and I commend her for it.

I am proud to be a cosponsor on a piece of legislation that does something about the issue of putting resources out there where children are across the country in rural districts that have great needs, as well as urban districts, because the one thing that we are short of in this country is having the kind of staff development that teachers need to be able to teach math and science in a way that children can learn, and we can move them into a higher level as we approach the 21st century.

I commend the gentlewoman from Texas for her vision, and I thank her for highlighting the importance of this issue.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, and I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for her leadership on the Committee on Science.

I am delighted to join her this evening as a member of the Committee on Science, and also a chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, to congratulate her for her legislation that really has as its underlying premise that children can learn.

I think that that is the key element of what we are discussing this evening: One, the importance of math and science, and the fact that America's children should not be at any less of a level than any of the children of the world; that America's children can learn math, they can learn science, and more importantly, they can enjoy it.

As a member of the Texas delegation and a member of the Committee on Science and a member of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, I interact a lot with NASA and the needs of NASA, the funding needs, of course, but the technological needs.

How exciting it is for young people, as I had the opportunity to bring into my district a number of the astronauts to introduce to young people what the fun things are that one can do by knowing math and science. How interested they were, elementary school students, high school students, in being exposed to the career options that math and science can bring about.

The fact is that our children are not willing to not learn, if I can use a double negative, science and math. They only have to be inspired to do so. I think it is very important that we include the corporate combination that the gentlewoman has included in her legislation, the partnership, the mentoring that is so very important to encourage our young people to study math and science.

Mr. Speaker, I am a ranking member on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims. In that there is great discussion always about the number of individuals we must bring in from other places outside the United States because we do not have enough of an employee base to provide for the various technological companies around the Nation. We do not have enough people to fill the slots.

This past weekend I met with and talked with one of the human resource persons of our number two company in this Nation that deals with technological issues. He documented that there are not enough Americans trained in math and science or coming through the pipeline to be able to provide all of the positions that will be needed as we move into the 21st century.

I say shame, shame, shame on us. So I hope that this legislation can move quickly. I hope we can collaborate with the gentlewoman to do even more.

This is an authorizing piece of legislation. I hope that we will find more dollars in the appropriating forces to ensure that we give dollars to our school districts or complement the school programs that will help make math and science interesting.

My daughter had a professor, or there was a professor in her school, and there was a rumor going around that he taught physics, and he taught it by laying horizontally across the desk. Some people say he even levitated into the air. That was a rumor going around in the school. Well, there was standing room only in his physics class, as we can imagine. That is because he made math and science interesting.

Therefore, I would look forward to supporting the legislation of the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON). I think it is extremely important that we say to America's children, you can learn, and that we pass legislation that will emphasize the value of math and science to provide career opportunities for all of the children of America, and that we can stand equal in the world's market, that we will be the leaders in math and science. I know we can.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), the chair of this subcommittee.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. I would like to commend the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for moving ahead with something we need to accomplish, because it is so important that we look at all avenues in encouraging additional students to pursue the sciences.

Let me just say, as we contemplate more seriously the world's situation, as we consider where America might be in the next 10 or 20 or 30 years, the challenges of staying ahead and being on the cutting edge of science and technology and information so that we can maximize our productivity and therefore our competitiveness is so very important today, probably more so than it has ever been in history.

Again, I commend the gentlewoman from Texas for exploring and looking at these avenues of how we might continue to encourage more students and higher qualifications in the area of science and mathematics.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to also express my appreciation for having the opportunity to visit scientists from New Zealand on a recent trip.

I appreciate the gentleman's leadership in looking to see what other places around the world might be doing so that we can better understand what we need to be doing. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to do some final closing remarks by reading a portion of the statements of the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE BROWN), ranking member of the full committee, an outstanding Member of this Congress, who knows full well what we are talking about here. He is not able to be here this evening, but he sent his statement.

In part, it reads:

''The importance of science and math education to the Nation's future well-being is without question.

''The post-industrial society will have an ever growing need for highly trained individuals in science and technology. Clearly, we must ensure a full pipeline of students moving towards careers in these fields, if we are to compete successfully with our Major

economic competitors in the 21st century. To meet the demand, the Nation must take advantage of the human resource potential of all the people.

''But there is an equally important reason for effective science and math education in all parts of the Nation. Technology now infuses more and more aspects of daily life. Most workplaces are becoming increasingly technological. This means that all citizens need a basic grounding in science and math to function in an increasingly complex world and to lead fulfilling lives.

''The situation is complicated by the uneven quality of educational opportunities across the broad diverse Nation. We are running the risk of a widening gulf between those with the training to thrive in this new work environment and those lacking the basic skills to qualify for the high-tech workplace.

''It is important to find ways to spur the interest and encourage the study of science and math by students at all levels of ability. The growing reality is that a strong back and a strong work ethic will not be enough to ensure a good job in the 21st century.

''In addition to mastering the three Rs, students must learn as much as they can about science and technology, because such knowledge will be a key to their future. Efforts to reform science and math education must seek to engage and cultivate the interest of all children.

''There is much evidence that young children are naturally interested in science and that grade school students in the U.S. perform well in science and math. This was shown to be the case in the recent results of the Third International Math and Science Study, known as TIMSS. U.S. students at the fourth-grade level were near the top in the international comparison.

''However, the picture changes for the worse as students move through the school system. By middle school, again from the TIMSS findings, U.S. students have drifted down to the average performance level of the international comparisons, and well below most of our major economic competitors. And by the terminal year of high school, U.S. students are near the bottom of the rankings in math and science performance.

''There are no simple answers for reversing this dismal situation. Many interrelated factors are involved. Engaging curriculum materials coupled with a hands-on, inquiry-based approach to teaching have promise for improving student outcomes in science and math. This will require curriculum development and teacher professional development.'' But we also must be motivated, and our children must be motivated and excited.

''An excellent example of an educational program that has a proven record for providing such excitement is the JASON Project. The brainchild of world-famous explorer Dr. Robert Ballard, JASON is a year-round scientific expedition designed to engage students in science and technology through live satellite and Internet broadcasts.

''For 2 weeks, students at interactive network sites in the U.S. and other countries can watch the expedition live, interact with scientists, control live-feed video cameras. The JASON network now reaches over 2 million students.

''The tenth expedition in this series this past march focused on a comparative study of temperate, tropical and fossil rainforests, with the live segment originating from the Peru tropical rainforest.''

The gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) had the opportunity to spend a day participating in this exploration at one of the JASON network downlink sites located at the A.B. Miller High School in Fontana, in his district. This is currently the only JASON downlink site in Southern California.

''JASON is helping to change how science is taught in the classroom and will help to reverse the harmful decline of students interest in science and technology.''

The gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) has been a JASON supporter since its inception, and is pleased to see its expansion and continuing excellence.

''The JASON Project is driven largely by private sector initiatives and supported mainly by industry contributions. But there is also a role for Federal programs to improve science education.

''There is no doubt that the Federal role in K–12 education is limited and that the Federal resources available are but a small fraction of the national investment in K–12 education. But the Federal Government can be a catalyst for constructive change in our schools, if its a relatively small education investment and is wisely directed.''

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the text of the entire statement of the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN).

The text of the statement of Mr. BROWN of California is as follows:

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the importance of science and math education to the nation's future well being is without question.

The post-industrial society will have an ever growing need for highly trained individuals in science and technology. Clearly, we must ensure a full pipeline of students moving toward careers in these fields, if we are to compete successfully with our major economic competitors in the 21st century. To meet the demand, the nation must take advantage of the human resource potential of all our people.

But there is an equally important reason for effective science and math education in all parts of the nation. Technology now infuses more and more aspects of daily life. Most workplaces are becoming increasingly technological. This means that all citizens need a basic grounding in science and math to function in an increasingly complex world and to lead fulfilling lives.

The situation is complicated by the uneven quality of educational opportunity across this broad and diverse nation. We are running the risk of a widening gulf between those with the training to thrive in this new work environment and those lacking the basic skills to qualify for the high-tech workplace.

It is important to find ways to spur the interest and encourage the study of science and math by students at all levels of ability. The growing reality is that a strong back and a strong work ethic will not be enough to ensure a good job in the 21st century.

In addition to mastering the 3R's, students must learn as much as they can about science and technology, because such knowledge will be a key to their future. Efforts to reform science and math education must seek to engage and cultivate the interest of all children.

There is much evidence that young children are naturally interested in science and that grade school students in the U.S. perform well in science and math. This was shown to be the case in the recent results of Third International Math and Science Study, known as TIMSS. U.S. students at the fourth-grade level were near the top in this international comparison.

However, the picture changes for the worse as students move through the school system. By middle school, again from the TIMSS findings, U.S. students have drifted down to the average performance level of the international comparisons, well below most of our major economic competitors. And by the terminal year of high school, U.S. students are near the bottom of the rankings in science and math performance.

There are no simple answers for reversing this dismal situation. Many interrelated factors are involved. Engaging curricular materials coupled with a hands-on, inquiry-based approach to teaching have promise for improving student outcomes in science and math. This will require curriculum development and teacher professional development. But we also must have motivated, excited children.

An excellent example of an educational program that has a proven record for providing such excitement is the JASON Project. The brainchild of world-famous explorer, Dr. Robert Ballard, JASON is a year-round scientific expedition designed to engage students in science and technology through live satellite and Internet broadcasts.

For two weeks, students at interactive network sites in the U.S. and other countries can watch the expedition live, interact with scientists, and control live-feed video cameras. The JASON network now reaches over two million students.

The tenth expedition in the series this past March focused on a comparative study of temperate, tropical and fossil rainforests, with the live segment originating from the Peru tropical rainforest. I had the opportunity to spend a day participating in this exploration at one of the JASON network downlink sites located at the A.B. Miller High School in Fontana in my district. This is currently the only JASON downlink site in Southern California.

JASON is helping to change how science is taught in the classroom and will help to reverse the harmful decline of student interest in science and technology. I have been a JASON supporter since its inception and am pleased to see its expansion and continuing excellence.

The JASON Project is driven largely by private sector initiative and supported mainly by industry contributions. But there is also a role for federal programs to improve science education.

There is no doubt that the federal role in K–12 education is limited and that the federal resources available are but a small fraction of the national investment in K–12 education. But the federal government can be a catalyst for constructive change in our schools, if its relatively small education investment is wisely directed.

School budgets are tight and meager resources are available for such things as supporting experimentation with new curricular materials or training teachers on how to implement science standards in the classroom. The federal science and math education programs can provide an important supplement that can have an influence on reform efforts out of proportion to the size of the investment.

In addition to providing financial resources, the federal government can bring to bear the scientific talent available in federal laboratories as an important resource for support of teachers, many of whom are unprepared to teach science and math subjects.

An example of a Federal program to help train science and math teachers is a recent initiative involving the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy's national labs. Teachers from school systems participating in NSF's education reform programs will be eligible to attend in-service training programs at the labs where they will use state-of-the-art facilities and instrumentation.

The program will provide hands-on experience and help improve teachers' skills in integrating the tools of computer simulation and modeling with implementation of science and math standards. In California, the Lawrence Berkeley Lab, Lawrence Livermore Lab, and the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center will participate in the program.

Another example of an innovative federal education programs is the NASA Student and Teacher Excellence Project, or STEP. STEP includes participation by some schools from San Bernardino County in my district.

STEP has several complementary components to increase student performance in science and math. It will draw on NASA's resources to develop curriculum tied to real-world problems; it will provide professional development opportunities for teachers; and it will provide for home access by students and parents to STEP resources.

The last component is a particularly important innovation which will greatly enlarge student access to the educational materials and draw in participation by parents.

As I indicated earlier, there are no simple answers for improving K–12 science and math education. Federal, state and local government, and the private sector all have important roles. We must identify best practices and effective programs, and then work to achieve their widest dissemination. Much remains to be done, but we cannot afford not to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by simply making one more plea, that we must give attention to this most critical need. We owe it to our Nation. We certainly owe it to our future.

Our jobs will ultimately follow where the skills are located. If our companies are now having to hire mostly people that are non-American born, we can be sure that our companies cannot remain competitive until we make sure that every American child is excited about math and science.

We must start with teacher preparation. Many of our best teachers graduated more than 10 years ago from college. Our colleges did not have the integrated system of including our technologies at that time, so most of our teachers will have to return for further education.

That further undergirds the notion that education is lifelong, and teachers more and more will have to continue to return for their offerings of improving their skills, but our institutions must be responsible for offering those needed skills. Mr. Speaker, we will continue working.

AMERICA'S NATIONAL DRUG POLICY AND THE ROLE OF CONGRESS IN REDUCING DRUG USE BY AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House again tonight to talk about the subject of our national drug policy, and what Congress can do to improve the situation relating to the abuse and misuse of illegal narcotics, not only by our young people but by all Americans.

I come before the House as chair of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources, which has been charged with trying to help develop a better policy, better legislation, and better action by Congress to deal with the growing social problem that we have.

Tonight I am sure that the eyes of the Nation are focused on Kosovo, where we have a very difficult international situation, and probably rightfully so. We have thousands of our troops in potentially harm's way. We have our pilots and other dedicated military involved in that conflict.

I believe that the focus of attention tonight also is on the tragic shootings in Colorado. I believe some young people were involved there. A large number of young people were killed in that tragic incident.

Rightfully, America should be concerned about Kosovo. America should be concerned about international situations and also about a situation where we have death and mayhem of young people in our Nation. It is a very serious situation. I know that both the Colorado situation and Kosovo will capture the attention of the Nation for the next number of days.

As a courtesy to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), who has expressed concern about what has happened in that State, Mr. Speaker, I yield to him at this time for his comments on that, again, tragic situation.

PRAY FOR PARENTS AND CHILDREN, VICTIMS IN TRAGIC COLORADO HIGH SCHOOL SHOOTINGS

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I come here tonight to ask everyone listening, watching around America, I come here to ask you for your prayers for those parents who have lost children in this incredible, horrible, devastating event.

There are no words any of us can utter from this position, even in this House, that can ever soothe the hearts of the people who have lost their family members. But it behooves us all to think about how precious life is and how quickly it can be taken away any time, any place, anywhere.

It must make us all think again about turning to God and asking for his counsel and for wisdom which we all need in order to address these kinds of issues and others that will confront us.

So I have no other speeches to make. I have no other words to utter than to simply say again to everyone, please pray for the grieving, pray for the lost, and pray that this never, ever happens again.

Mr. MICA. Again, my prayers are with the gentleman from Colorado and with the families who have experienced this great tragedy in their community. Again, it is something that will be reflected in the news reports for the coming days just as Kosovo and other tragic events of our Nation.

Tonight I came to the House to really address another social tragedy that is facing our Nation. As I said, I chair the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources and trying to formulate some legislative efforts, some actions by this Congress to deal with a situation that has taken last year the lives of 14,000 Americans.

We have an illegal narcotics and drug abuse problem in this country that is reaching unparalleled proportions, particularly among our young people. I want to review again, and I did this last week, and I have done this a couple of times before, the situation that led I believe to the current problem we see with epidemic narcotics use by our young people across the Nation and the drug situation that faces almost every community across our land.

In 1993, when I came to Congress and I was in the minority, the majority party at that time, the Democrats that controlled both the House, the other body, and the White House, I think that they made some very tragic mistakes at that point in, first of all, cutting the resources of the drug czar's office, almost eliminating all of the staff in the drug czar's office.

The next step that was taken was to appoint a Surgeon General that in fact did not take the drug situation seriously, that helped advocate a policy of ''just say maybe'' to our young people, and this of course eventually has had consequences as we see in the drug statistics which I will cite.

Unfortunately, the administration also, and the majorities of 1993 to 1995, with the concurrence of the administration, they held majorities again in

this body, the other body, they cut the source country programs where drugs are produced, slashed some of the funds to countries. I for one believe it is most cost effective if we stop illegal narcotics at their base of production, in the country of origin, in the fields where they are produced. I think that the cuts that were made back then had some tragic results, and we will talk about them.

The next thing that the administration did, and the Democrat-controlled Congress, was to take the military out of the drug war, to a large extent cut the Coast Guard resources. The Coast Guard is important in protecting our shores. Even the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was protected up until that time by our Coast Guard.

Again, this theme of ''just say maybe'' and tolerance to illegal narcotics has eventually found its way into the minds of our young people, and we are now suffering with tremendous problems, particularly in the abuse of heroin.

Let me cite some statistics, if I may, tonight. The number of Americans who used heroin in the past month increased since 1992. The number of Americans who used heroin in the past month increased from 68,000 in 1993 to 325,000 in 1997. This is from a national household survey on drug abuse.

Now, I come from Florida. I come from central Florida. Florida has been particularly hard-hit by this epidemic of illegal narcotics, and in particular heroin. Heroin deaths in Florida increased by 51 percent from 1997.

I reported this last week to the House and my colleagues, and I thought that these statistics were quite remarkable and should get everyone's attention. There were in Florida 206 heroin deaths in 1997. I also thought that that was a very startling figure, and I have some additional information tonight I would like to reveal.

Orlando's 36 deaths yielded the highest death rate. So although we had, maybe, a lower number of heroin deaths in central Florida than larger populations, south Florida areas, we ended up with 3.6 deaths per 100,000 population, the highest death rate in Florida.

Heroin deaths again have just blossomed and mushroomed out of proportion. We have a new drug czar who was the deputy director of the Office of National Drug Policy, Jim McDonough. Jim McDonough stated in the Miami Herald that the drug problem in Florida, and his quote is, ''is totally out of control.'' That is from the Miami Herald comment and quote from him, April 7, 1999, recently.

What is interesting is that change in the pattern of drug trafficking in central Florida. A recent article in the Orlando Sentinel pointed out that $20 hits, $20 doses of heroin were being sold in central Florida last year that were considered as much as 90 percent pure narcotic. That means the purity level was 90 percent.

Ten, 15 years ago, the heroin that we saw on the streets in the United States was 10, 12 percent pure. The heroin that we are seeing today is particularly deadly. Ninety percent pure is what they are seeing. Formerly on the street, this article says that the product of heroin that was found there had a much less deadly content; and that is one of the reasons we are seeing so many tragic deaths in central Florida.

According to Tim Moore, the director of the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, at these purity levels heroin is killing many of our first-time users. I quoted again how dramatically the number of deaths have increased in the State of Florida and in central Florida. Unfortunately, the news in Florida is actually worse than was reported for 1998.

I bring to the floor a copy of an article that appeared this week. The headline is, ''News on Heroin Gets Even Worse'', and it is from this Monday's Orlando Sentinel.

This report indicates that in some counties up to 20 percent of the people who died after taking heroin did not make the statewide list that I cited last week and again tonight of 206 deaths which were released several weeks ago. This is because the State Medical Examiner's Commission tracks only what it considers to be fatal overdoses. College students who drop dead after drinking beer and taking heroin were not counted. The same was true for motorists killed in an automobile accident while stoned on heroin. This is also part of this report revealed in an Orlando Sentinel article this week.

In contrast, the Florida medical examiners have a long-standing practice of reporting in Florida every cocaine-related death. State officials reported 1,128 such fatalities. That is deaths by cocaine in Florida in 1998. That is a startling figure by itself.

But we see that the figures that I have been given previously on heroin deaths were not accurate. They are even higher, and the situation gets much worse. Again, in the Orlando area, which has the highest rate of heroin deaths in Florida, State guidelines prompted the Orange-Osceola medical examiners, our local county examiner's office, to disregard eight heroin deaths. The office reported 36 deaths in two counties, not the 44 that actually took place.

In Daytona Beach, the Volusia County medical examiner discounted one of five heroin deaths. So, again, this practice is not common just to central Florida and Orange County and Osceola, but Volusia County. In West Palm Beach, the medical examiner's office reported 19 heroin deaths. The office spokesman said two more deaths from 1998 had been confirmed and 19 more cases were still pending.

So the epidemic that we have heard about is even worse than what has been initially reported. The Florida Department of Law Enforcement is now asking the State's 24 medical examiners to expand the way they track the drug deaths. Florida has also asked the medical examiners to create a separate category for users who die after taking one or more drugs, which is a problem that appears to be on the rise.

In the Orlando area and somewhere else, the trend appears to be abuse of heroin and cocaine with alcohol, all of which, I might tell my colleagues and those listening, has a very deadly effect again with this high purity, high content of heroin. Even small doses of heroin can be fatal when taken with beer, wine, or whiskey. The research clearly shows this. Alcohol increases the odds of a fatal heroin overdose by a factor of 22. The three heroin deaths that were discounted in Orlando in 1998 involve victims who died after taking heroin and alcohol, according to this report.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked about what has happened in central Florida, what has happened in our Nation. From 1993, when we had this change in policy, when we had this lack of direction by the administration, the lack of attention to the national drug problem, heroin use among our teens has increased in a 5- or 6-year period 875 percent.

□ 1900

I have mentioned the deaths in central Florida. Up dramatically. Actually undercounted, as we reported from this article released this week in this investigative report by the Orlando Sentinel, a situation totally out of control with, again, our young people.

I want to do something tonight to show my colleagues and to show the American public and those listening that we have a very serious situation. We have thousands of deaths in Florida. We have hundreds of deaths in central Florida. We have over 14,000 deaths across the Nation from drug overdoses or drug-related deaths.

This situation is not making the front page every day across our country, even though we have a heroin epidemic, a methamphetamine epidemic across this land, and other hard drugs. But these heroin deaths and these other deaths have a face and a name on them; and tonight I want to share with my colleagues just for a few minutes a photograph that I hope will be riveted in everyone's mind forever.

I want to show my colleagues that this death and destruction has a face on it and it is a face one can never forget. It is a face that was provided to me by a mother who lost a son to heroin in central Florida. It is a face that this mother and other mothers who gathered together, dozens of mothers in central Florida and parents who gathered together, some of whom I met with, related their stories of how their young people did not realize the purity of heroin, they did not realize the effects of heroin, they did not realize the impact of heroin or hard drugs on their bodies and their minds.

What I am going to show my colleagues should happen to no parent and should happen to no young person in our Nation. This is a picture of a man who is 26 years old. He was loved by his parents, the Stevens family. Loved by his family. He had a life to live. He was loved by his parents, and this young man died tragically of a drug overdose of heroin. I am going to show this picture only for a few seconds because it is quite shocking.

If there are young people watching, I do not want them to look if they do not want to. But this is the face of these 14,000 people who are dying of drug overdoses. This is the tragedy that we see. This is how this mother found her son and this is the sad effect of heroin on our young people across this Nation.

The glory that is portrayed by drug use and abuse in Hollywood and pop songs, this is the result; and this is what happens to those young people, and this is a face, a very tragic face.

This is how that young man ended up, on a sofa, and then in a morgue. The mother gave me permission to show this and has also put other pictures of her loved one from these police reports in a videotape, along with photos and evidence gathered from other scenes of tragic deaths of young people in central Florida, because they want to let the parents know what is happening. They want to let the young people know what is happening. They want the people who are considering using heroin and other hard drugs to know what is going to happen to their loved ones, to their bodies.

I had described to me a scenario of what happens when a person ingests heroin into the body, and I will describe that, if I may, tonight, to give those who are listening, my colleagues, a flavor of what happens and the horror of the death that these young people, thousands and thousands of them, have experienced across our Nation.

Heroin is ingested into the body. There is a period of time, usually within 30 seconds, where the drug hits the nervous system. Euphoria and a warm sensation overcomes the user. The user is beginning to feel the effects of the respiratory system breaking down and the user's breathing becomes labored.

As the respiratory system breaks down, the breathing becomes very slow. A corresponding drop in the body temperature begins and the heart becomes irregular. If the user is conscious at this point, this is the stage where fear grips the user.

Soon, the body is demanding more oxygen, and the user's respiratory system cannot accommodate the growing need for oxygen. The user feels cold. Fluid begins to enter the lungs. This is the beginning of the drowning stage.

So first there is the choking stage and the drowning stage.

Sometimes, during this phase, blood vessels and capillaries begin to rupture, as evidenced by the photograph that we saw of the young Mr. Stevens. The blood on the face of the heroin user is a result of blood vessels rupturing. It is not a very pretty sight. It is not a way for anyone to meet their Maker.

Entering into the final phase, the user is now in great distress and experiencing severe pain throughout the chest and throat, much like a heart attack. The user's head is splitting with pain. The amount of fluid in the lungs has increased. The user is now in excruciating pain and begins to drown as his lungs fill with fluid.

The pain is now overwhelming and the user becomes fitful, jerking wildly and thrashing at the air. This continues for a time until the user becomes unconscious and begins seizures. Death is slow and inevitable.

And this is how these young people end up, unfortunately. This is how a young person in central Florida ended up paying with his life for this use and abuse of drugs. And, in particular here in central Florida, as I have said, we have this incredible epidemic of heroin use.

The high purity in this heroin, mixed sometimes with alcohol, mixed sometimes with other drugs, the results are inevitably fatal. And this has been repeated over and over and over and over again, to the tune of thousands and thousands of people across our land.

So I bring a message tonight that is not very pleasant, but a message, I think, that is very necessary about what is going on and about how people end up who become the victims of this surge of heroin that we see coming into our communities.

My next point to my colleagues, Madam Speaker, is where is this heroin coming from? I submit, my colleagues, that we know exactly where this heroin is coming from. And let me point out tonight how we know where heroin and other hard drugs are coming from, and let us take just a moment to look at this chart.

Our Drug Enforcement Administration has a very sophisticated system of tracking illegal narcotics, and in particular in this case, heroin. It is almost like a DNA tracking where they can trace a DNA back to an individual. This is so sophisticated, this heroin signature tracking program, that they can tell exactly where the heroin came from, what country, almost what field.

Seventy-five percent of the heroin entering the United States in this 1997 analysis came from South America. Seventy-five percent came from South America; another 14 percent from Mexico. Add those up and we have 89, nearly 90 percent of the heroin coming into the United States, this highly deadly, very pure heroin is coming in from two places, South America and from Mexico.

We know about 90 percent, 99 percent of this heroin that is now coming from South America is coming from Colombia, one country, and we know the balance is coming from Mexico. We have 6 percent from southwest Asia and 5 percent from Southeast Asia. But through the sophisticated tracking and analysis program DEA can tell us exactly where these narcotics are coming from, and this deadly heroin that I spoke of.

Now, the question is, what has the administration done about stopping this? We know this heroin is coming in. I have shown very graphically what the heroin does to our young people. I have cited 14,000 deaths in the last 6, 7 years of this administration. Nearly 100,000 Americans have met their death through these sorts of drug-related incidents, and no one is paying attention to this.

The Clinton administration does not pay attention to where these drugs are coming from. In fact, as I said, most of the heroin is coming from South America and, in particular, from Colombia.

What is absolutely amazing, if we were to look at this chart for 1992 and 1993, we would see almost zero percent of heroin coming in from Colombia. There is very little heroin produced in Colombia, and there was a small percentage of heroin coming in from Mexico, much smaller than the 14 percent we see there.

Over the history of this administration, what has this administration done to keep illegal narcotics from coming, and in particular deadly heroin and cocaine coming from Colombia? We know it is produced there, and heroin is now produced there.

Actually, what they did is, they blocked all of the aid, all of the assistance to Colombia on a repeated basis.

I cannot tell my colleagues, as a member of the committee with jurisdiction, working with other Members of the Congress, how many times we wrote, requested, how many times this new majority has funded equipment and ammunition resources to go to Colombia that we have been blocked repeatedly by this administration.

So now, today, I am here. And instead of being a small producer of cocaine, Colombia is now the largest producer of cocaine. Previously, the cocaine came from Bolivia and from Peru. Now we have the distinction of Colombia winning this award, this deadly award, for being the biggest producer of cocaine. Because, again, this administration blocked any type of assistance to stop the production and growing of coca.

Additionally, and of even greater concern, is the heroin production, again of incredible proportions, that has grown up as an industry in Colombia since 1993. Again, the administration failed to get equipment, helicopters, parts, ammunition, assistance, resources to Colombia to deal with this problem.

Additionally, they cut the source country programs of eradication of coca and poppies at their source, the most cost-effective programs, to stop narcotics.

□ 1915

So this is where heroin comes from. This is where the bulk of heroin and

cocaine comes from. And the administration has not acted properly to assist the biggest producer, which is Colombia.

Now, the biggest source of these narcotics coming into the United States in this past 5 or 6 years is Mexico. Mexico has become the major transit center of illegal narcotics, hard narcotics, heroin and cocaine. Not only are they the major transit center, as we can see now from the signature program on heroin, they are also getting into the big league of producing very deadly, very pure heroin in Mexico. And, again, they were a very small player just some short years ago.

What has the administration done to deal with Mexico? Well, repeatedly they have certified Mexico as fully cooperating in the war on drugs. We have on the books, on our Federal legal statutes, a requirement that the President and Department of State every year certify every country that is a drug-producing or drug-transiting country, that the administration must certify that they are cooperating, taking positive steps to stop the production and trafficking of illegal narcotics. It is called drug certification.

What do they get in return? If they cooperate, they are eligible for trade assistance, for foreign aid, for international financial assistance and other resources that we make available as a Congress and also as a government to our allies.

We have had no greater friend or ally or closer neighbor than Mexico. There has been no ally that we have assisted more in trying to maintain their financial stability, treating them as an equal trading partner, granting them NAFTA trade status, assisting them again as a good partner and much to our advantage.

We now have a big trade imbalance. They are shipping more goods, dramatically more, into the United States. And they are also the source of illegal narcotics. This Congress and I were part of that effort several years ago when the administration certified Mexico as fully cooperating. We knew they were not fully cooperating. And we passed about 2 years ago, March 13, 1997, by a vote of 251–175, a resolution that asked that the President be responsible for reviewing the progress of Mexico in helping with some specific items.

First of all was to allow the United States law enforcement agents in Mexico to carry firearms and also to protect themselves in defense and also to increase the numbers in Mexico and the cooperative effort in going after illegal narcotics dealers. Basically, nothing has been done in that regard. Our agents are still at risk. Mexico still refuses to cooperate. And this is a request of the Congress from 2 years ago.

We asked, secondly, that Mexico take concrete measures to find and eliminate corruption in Mexico, particularly among law enforcement and also among military, and to cooperate fully with the United States law enforcement personnel on narcotics control matters. Now, they have not complied with this second request. Mexico has not complied.

In fact, when we conducted an investigation of money laundering in the hundreds of millions of dollars, the Mexican officials in this operation, called Casablanca, instead of assisting the United States Customs officers who were involved in it, threatened to indict and prosecute and go after our agents. Is this fully cooperating?

So, again, this request of 2 years ago of Mexico still has not been attended to by Mexico. In fact, they slapped us in the face, our enforcement officers in the face, with their actions.

We have asked, thirdly, and we continue to request, we asked 2 years ago that Mexico extradite one major drug trafficker. Have they done that? Not really. We want, again, cooperation in extraditing those identified drug traffickers, major drug traffickers, to the United States for prosecution who are under indictment and under request. Have they complied with that? No, not really. They have actually, just close to the decertification time here, extradited one individual and not a major drug trafficker. They know who they are.

What is even worse is, I accompanied some of my colleagues and met with Mexican officials, the attorney general and others, and we know that the Yucatan Peninsula was completely controlled by drug lords, including the corrupt governor of Quintana Roo, the Yucatan Peninsula state. We know the Baha Peninsula is completely controlled by drug and other narco-traffickers. We know that other states in Mexico are completely overrun by drug dealers and they control the political apparatus, judicial apparatus.

Not only have they not cooperated on extradition, they promised when we were there that they would seek the arrest of the governor of the Yucatan Peninsula, who they knew was involved in drug trafficking, who our agents had the goods on, who internationally is renowned for drug trafficking, who turned the Yucatan Peninsula in a narco-terrorist state.

Unfortunately, in Mexico they have a law that does not allow them to really go after folks in office and it makes it difficult to prosecute. So we were told that as soon as the governor of the Yucatan Peninsula leaves office, he will be arrested and he will be made responsible for his actions, which everyone knew were corrupt.

And what happened 4 or 5 days just before the governor was to leave office? He fled the country, I believe on a banana boat, and is on an island off of Cuba we are told. So again the Mexicans failed to extradite, they failed to keep their commitment to go after corrupt officials.

And what is also a request that has been pending for over 2 years now is that Mexico sign a maritime agreement with the United States, that it allow us to halt and hold drug traffickers and pursue them into Mexican waters. This request was made several years ago, has been made repeatedly, and still the Mexicans have not complied with the simple request of trying to bring this situation under control.

Now, if this is not bad enough, if all these requests that were made by this House of Representatives and this Congress 2 years ago, a little over 2 years ago, March 13, 1997, are ignored, just toss it, forget about it, if this was not bad enough, listen to what the Mexicans have done in trying to assist us with stopping the huge quantities of illegal narcotics coming into the United States. These are the statistics we have for Mexican drug seizures, opium, heroin.

From 1997, the number of metric tons that have been seized by Mexican officials, heroin, again killing our young people, a 56 percent drop in drug seizures from 1997 to 1998 of heroin by Mexican drug officials. A 56 percent drop. And this stuff is flooding into our communities in unprecedented quantities, in unprecedented levels of purity.

Cocaine. What did they do to stop cocaine coming into the United States? How much cocaine did they seize in 1997 versus 1998? A 35 percent drop in the metric tons of cocaine that was seized in Mexico. Have they been fully cooperating with the United States? I say not.

The vehicles seized by Mexico. These are actually vessels seized by the Mexican Government. The boats, in 1997 they seized 135. In 1998 they seized 96, a 29 drop in the number of vessels seized. My colleagues can see why we want a maritime agreement because they failed to even interdict. These are these folks who are dealing in huge quantities of deadly drugs.

According to again the DEA, 14 percent now of the heroin in the United States is of Mexican origin. That was a very small figure some years ago. So what Mexico is doing rather than being a small producer, is now even a large producer in producing deadly heroin into our communities and across our open commercial borders with Mexico.

So these are some of the things that the administration has done in the past several years in dealing with Colombia, a major producer of death and destruction through cocaine or coca production and poppies and heroin production. This administration failed to respond, failed to aid, failed to stop it.

Mexico, they certified them even though Mexico is kicking dirt in the face of every Member of Congress in the United States of America by their lack of cooperation on the basic items that we have asked for and their lack of effort in trying to seize illegal narcotics, particularly heroin, cocaine, and now the rage is methamphetamines.

I conducted a hearing yesterday on INS and illegal immigration in Atlanta, Georgia; and the district attorney in the Atlanta region told us that methamphetamines are becoming a serious problem in that community. And also in hearings we have heard across the Midwest, places like Minnesota, Iowa, and again the western part of the United States, where endemic levels of meth, which is very deadly, and designer drugs are now making their way from Mexico into these parts of our country.

Now, my colleagues might say, this new majority Chair up here talking, what has he done? What has the new Republican majority done? I might say that under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), who is now the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, who had this responsibility for putting back together the last 2 years our drug policy, we have made great progress.

Through his leadership and the work of the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and other chairs, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) who has worked on the demand side in the community programs dealing with drug abuse and community efforts in that regard, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), who works on legislative efforts particularly as they deal with the criminal justice system and also helping to restore some of our international efforts, these individuals, part of the new majority, part of the new team, with the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), put nearly a billion dollars into various programs, additional dollars into programs, raising our expenditures on this drug issue to $17.9 billion.

Now, this administration, ironically, proposed a $100 million cut in the drug budget and they portrayed that as an increase. I do not know when $100 million less can be an increase, but somehow they are trying to suggest that to the Congress.

But again, we put money into education, into interdiction, money into stopping drugs at their source, starting with these source countries, getting aid to Colombia, helicopters, equipment, resources, the manpower necessary to support their effort to eradicate the poppy fields, the coca fields, the drugs at their source, which I guarantee is the most cost-effective way.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the full Committee on International Relations, and myself have talked for many days about this situation with Mexico.

The situation with Colombia is a little bit different. We do have the cooperation of the new government, President Pastrana. We are getting aid and assistance there. This Congress has provided that assistance, again, under the new majority leadership.

The situation with Mexico is much more difficult, and we have discussed this with leadership and with others. We took the unprecedented steps 2 weeks ago, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and myself and other Members of the House, to extend the period of decertification consideration by the House of Representatives indefinitely until we come up with some additional concrete solutions, until we come up with cooperative efforts, until we come up with some concrete cooperative measures that we can take working with Mexico to gain their cooperation, to seek their real actions in stopping illegal narcotics at their source, stopping the tracking through their country, working on a maritime issue, allowing our agents to be armed and to protect themselves when they are working on these problems in their country, working on real extradition, and identifying these individuals that are major drug traffickers that are under indictment from the United States and extraditing them to the United States and seeing that they are prosecuted and serve time and are taken out of the streets, and also enforcing the laws that Mexico has passed.

□ 1930

They have passed some laws, I will give them that credit, but they are not executing those laws.

So we need the cooperation of Mexico. We will find a way, working with Mexican officials and with Members of this Congress, to gain their cooperation because they are an important ally, they are an important trading partner, but we cannot sell our souls and the lives of our young people for the sake of trade, for the sake of dollars, for the sake of doing business with a narcotrafficking state.

And we would hate to see Mexico become a narcotrafficking state, and I am quite concerned, Madam Speaker, that we may be on the verge, after having seen Mexico lose the Yucatan Peninsula, after seeing Mexico lose the Baja Peninsula with hundreds of deaths, narcoterrorist deaths, in that state right across our border, some of them heinous, lining up women and children and machine-gunning them. Again, narcoterrorist drug trafficking that has taken over a great deal of Mexico.

We must work together and find some solutions to stop these hard drugs, heroin, cocaine, methamphetamines, other illegal narcotics coming into the United States and restore the programs that again are cost effective, that have unfortunately been ignored by this administration, but will be passed by this Congress, were passed in the last Congress, to restore effectiveness in dealing with these problems.

Again, the toll is tragic. Over 100,000 Americans have lost their lives in the years since this administration took charge, due to the problem of illegal narcotics, and the problem is growing worse particularly among our young people.

Tonight I did detail one tragic death, a young person who lost his life, whose family now is bravely portraying the horrendous death that he died to set an example for others, particularly young people who may not know that there is not glory, that there is not celebrity status in using narcotics, that the narcotics out there today are very deadly when mixed with other drugs or with alcohol, or sometimes for first-time users with 90 percent purity. These individuals meet very tragic, painful, ugly deaths that are just too horrible to describe in additional detail.

But we want the Members of Congress to know what is taking place across this land, we want the American people to know that there is an effort in Congress to correct this situation and that, although the tragedies, as I said at the opening, that have occurred in Colorado and have taken the lives of numerous young people, although Kosovo is a serious situation and there has been ethnic cleansing, we still have a number one social problem in this country that took 14,000 lives last year, is taking lives as I speak tonight, and will continue to take them until we get this situation under control, until we make a commitment to just say no, until we make a commitment to make certain that our young people are educated about the potential tragedy of using illegal narcotics and until we restore those source-country programs that were cut and get the military and whatever other agencies we need, including resources to law enforcement, and to cooperative countries like Colombia, Bolivia and Peru to stop drugs at their source, again in a cost-effective manner. All of us, particularly those who pay the taxes, their hard-earned tax dollars, want an effective program that deals again with the major social problems.

So tonight, as I conclude, I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to correct the problems of the past. Hopefully, we will not make the same mistakes to draw the attention of the Congress to this problem, to draw the attention of the American people and particularly our young people about illegal narcotics and what it can do to their lives. We do not want anyone else to end up like this young person did on this sofa, so badly mangled, his life destroyed, his family's future destroyed in a body bag in central Florida or in any other community.

So that is why we are here, that is why we will be back next week. It may get to be a somewhat repetitive message, and people may get tired of hearing me. But I guarantee for the next number of months that I continue to chair this drug policy subcommittee we will call this to the attention of the Congress. The American people seek our help and support, every Member, until we get this situation under control.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair and not to the television audience.

SHARING THE PROSPERITY OF AMERICA WITH WORKING FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I would like to talk about the need to share the current wealth and prosperity of America with working families.

In 1989, the value of the stock market was $3 trillion. Ten years later, today in 1999, the value of the stocks in all the exchanges is $13 trillion. From $3 trillion to $13 trillion, that is what the increased value of the stock market has been. That is quite an overwhelming increase in wealth.

Madam Speaker, we enjoy unprecedented prosperity today, so I would like to talk about how this prosperity and wealth should be shared with workers. Instead of attacking working families, we need to find ways to reward working families and to share this wealth.

There are many ways to share the wealth and prosperity of the Nation at this point. Certainly I do not propose that we do what the Roman Empire did. At one point the Roman Empire was so wealthy as a result of its conquests, its taxation policies on its oppressed victims, defeated nations around it, that it had so much money that it decreed that every Roman citizen would be paid each year a certain amount of money out of the Treasury. That was real sharing.

I do not think it succeeded for very long because once the word got out that every Roman citizen could share in the booty and they would pay them part of the accumulated wealth of the Nation, all the people in the surrounding countryside moved into Rome. In large numbers, they filled up Rome, and that policy was brought down by the sheer weight of numbers.

Madam Speaker, I do not think we should ever try to repeat anything of that kind; however, I think that we can share the wealth of the Nation with working families by improving health care and making certain that every American citizen has decent health care. I think we can share the prosperity and the wealth of the Nation by making certain that education is available for every American citizen.

The children of working families, for example, are the children who go to public schools. They have no alternative. So our public system of education which, by the way, has 54 million enrolled pupils, that system should be given as much help as possible by all sectors of our economy, governmental and private as well.

So education, health care, I think if you improve those things, it would be two ways to share the wealth with working families.

There is another very concrete and direct way to share the wealth with working families, and that is to share the dollars. The best way to help somebody who is poor is to give them money directly. Dollars in the hands of the poor are the most efficient and effective way to deal with poverty. So, instead of attacking the working families, as some of our present Republican legislation is seeking to do, let us have a bipartisan coalition on helping working families by raising the minimum wage. Let us raise the minimum wage and put some dollars in the pockets of working families, and they can put food on the table, better clothes, better housing and take care of themselves.

We do not have that spirit here in this Congress. I appreciate the fact that we do not have a situation similar to the one that existed just a little more than 2 years ago in the 105th Congress. The 105th Congress started out with a set of direct assaults on working families. We had direct assaults, and we came on with the very first bill of the year. The very first bill in the 105th Congress was H.R. 1, which was designed to take away the cash overtime payments from working families.

Madam Speaker, that may seem like ancient history now, but it was on a roller coaster in the first debates of the 105th Congress. It was on a roller coaster because it had support from the White House, it had support from the majority of the Democrats, a bill which said we will not pay workers any more in cash overtime, we will force them to take comp time, and the comp time has to be taken at the discretion of the employer.

I pointed out, in fact, that what the workers needed was the cash, extra cash that the overtime provided, more than anything else. An argument was offered that, well, there are a lot of professionals and middle-class people who would like to have the option of having time off instead of more cash. I pointed out at that time that we in no way, the Fair Labor Standards Act does not really interfere with people having time off instead of cash. There are ways to deal with that if people prefer that voluntarily.

But what they were doing by mandating that the Fair Labor Standards Act be changed was mandating that every worker had to accept the situation where time off would be at the discretion of the employer and no cash. I pointed out at that time that two-thirds of the people in America who worked for a living, wage earners, two-thirds made less than $10 an hour, less than $10 an hour, and I said: Let those two-thirds who make less than $10 an hour be exempted from your proposed legislation which would mandate time off instead of overtime. And it did get a few votes on the floor, my amendment, but it did not pass.

However, thank God, the forces of common sense were at work all the time, and what seemed like a steamrolling proposition in the early days of the 105th Congress petered out. The labor unions got moving, the common sense of the average worker out there got moving, public opinion became involved, and the whole concept of forcing a change in the Fair Labor Standards Act to require comp time instead of overtime and cash just disappeared. I am very appreciative of the fact that we do not hear any more about it.

There are some other frontal attacks on working families that we do not hear about this year, and I am glad we do not hear them any more. There were frontal attacks on OSHA to merely wipe out the agency, reduce the budget by two-thirds.

□ 1945

OSHA takes care of the health and safety of workers. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration is there to take care of providing safe workplaces. There were attacks which said that OSHA was threatening American industry, that business could not survive if OSHA continued to exist.

These attacks persisted despite the fact that many of us pointed out the fact that OSHA staff had been so reduced that in my lifetime it was not likely that a business would be visited. It takes a cycle of more than 100 years for the inspectors to get around to visiting those businesses out there to examine the conditions to see if they meet OSHA standards.

So OSHA was not a gestapo like agency with numerous staff members to come down on business. That was not true. That frontal attack has ceased, and we are grateful for that.

There was also an attack on the unions and their ability to use their funds for any political purposes. It was called the Paycheck Protection Act. The Paycheck Protection Act was really going for the jugular vein. Wipe out the ability of unions to speak for their members, cut it off completely and if it could not be won at the Federal level there were also movements in the States fomented and encouraged by the leadership of the Republican majority here in the House.

The Paycheck Protection Act is no longer being discussed this year. We are grateful that working families do not have to worry about losing their voice in the political arena. That is no longer a problem.

Then there were the attacks on Davis-Bacon that came loud and frequently. Davis-Bacon was being attacked relentlessly, although as I often point out Davis and Bacon were two Republicans who devised a system for protecting workers in situations where large Federal contracts were involved. They did not want the wages of the local areas to be eroded by having these large contractors come in and bring outside workers in to do the work at lower wages. So it was common sense built in all the way from the beginning.

These frontal assaults, the constant unrelenting attempt to batter down the protections for working families, are not happening here in the 106th Congress.

I serve as the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee for Workforce Protections of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and I know that at the committee level and the subcommittee level we are getting a guerilla attack. Guerilla ambushes have replaced the frontal assault. Not the same amount of noise is being made. They do not rush these items to the floor and expect immediate endorsements and passage, but there is a slow chipping away at the protections for working families.

Working families are still in danger in this Republican controlled Congress. Working families still have to fear a bush whacking, a quiet assault, an ambush, in a number of areas. I say that I want to call on this 106th Congress, where all of us, most of us, subscribe to the notion that we are more civil and would like to have a bipartisan approach to certain issues, let us have a bipartisan approach to rewarding working families.

Working families make up the majority of America out there. Working families need better health care. They need decent education. They need more help from the Federal Government for education. First of all, working families need dollars in their pockets, and we can do that by increasing the minimum wage.

Increasing the minimum wage is what I want to talk most about. It is all integrally interwoven. We need to increase the minimum wage and the minimum wage is where there are entry level workers who are now making $5.15 an hour. We have proposed to raise that by fifty cents in one year. That is the President's proposal, fifty cents in one year and then another fifty cents another year, which means a dollar increase over a 2-year period. It will not make anybody rich. People who are making $10,000 a year would be making a little more than $12,000 a year after we raise the minimum wage.

A lot of people have a lot of questions about whether the minimum wage really is important because, after all, most Americans are not making minimum wage. I am going to show some statistics, recent statistics, in a few minutes, to let everyone know that quite a number of Americans still make minimum wage and there are a lot who make below minimum wage, that are working every day for wages below minimum wage because minimum wage is not mandated for the smallest business. There are a number of situations where minimum wage does not impact.

So instead of attacks on working families, I propose that we move forward in a bipartisan effort to reward working families by increasing the minimum wage.

At a town meeting that I had just last night, where there were quite a number of people who came out, people are very concerned about a number of items, a number of Federal actions that are being taken. At the top of the list, of course, is Kosovo and what is going to happen with Kosovo and the intervention of our American forces along with NATO; will we send in ground troops or will they appropriate more money for the effort and in the process of appropriating more money for the war effort will we downgrade the efforts to improve Medicare by having something added to Medicare which will cover prescription drugs; will we downgrade our efforts to improve the education system and say that we have no money because this war effort is going to absorb all the resources? Those are very important questions and people are very concerned about that.

By the way, I asked for a show of hands in an audience of about 200 people as to was there support for the present actions in Kosovo, the bombing of Kosovo, to stop the dictator Milosevic, Slobodan Milosevic, which I call a sovereign predator, responsible for unspeakable horrors in that area of the country, was there support for the present action that the United States was taking along with its NATO allies. Practically every hand in the house went up supporting it. The overwhelming majority, 95 percent of the people, supported taking action.

However, I might point out that when I asked how many would support escalating the combat effort, escalating the effort to the use of ground troops, I had just the opposite reaction. Only about 5 percent raised their hands. I think that is very informative.

To get back to today's subject, their primary concerns, or I might not say primary but equal to Kosovo were concerns about Social Security and concerns about Medicare and concerns about education. These are all things that are very important to working families. When we help to improve education, we are improving a lot of working families.

The public school system that is being attacked by a lot of people in the majority, the Republican majority, they want to replace the public school system with a privatized system. They want vouchers to replace Federal aid to education. They want to give up on the public school system. As I said before, there are 54 million students in the public school system. Fifty-four million students are enrolled.

Only a small percentage of our population of school-age students attend private schools today and if we were to make some kind of effort to greatly increase the funding for private schools, it would still be a very slow process of moving more and more of our youngsters into private schools. So just logistically and statistically, not much help is going to come in the near future from a private school effort or from giving vouchers and sending working family children off to find a private school. So any attacks on public education are also attacks on working families.

One might want to know that the Federal Government does not do very much for these 54 million children out there in public schools. Our expenditure for elementary and secondary education presently is about $22 billion a year. The annual expenditure for elementary and secondary education is about $22 billion. Our current expenditure for highways and transportation is $51 billion, to let everyone see what the contrast is. We are spending only $22 billion for education but $51 billion for highways.

I use that example because a lot of people continue to confront me with the issue of local control and say that it is not the Federal Government's business to worry about education. It is not the Federal Government's business to be involved in education. They ask, why would I want to saddle the Federal Government with responsibilities in the area of education?

Well, let me ask this: Is it the Federal Government's responsibility to be involved in roads and highways? That was always a local responsibility. Highways and roads were for States and local governments to take care of. Nothing in the Constitution gives the Federal Government the responsibility for maintaining the highways and the roads, but now we are at the point where we currently are spending $51 billion.

Last year we had the biggest expenditure in history for highways and transportation approved. That expenditure will be about $218 billion over a 6-year period, $218 billion over a 6-year period. Contrast that with what the President is proposing to spend for school construction. Over a 5-year period he is proposing to spend $3.7 billion to pay the interest on $25 billion worth of loans that the local governments and the State governments will have to make for education. So the contrast is overwhelming.

These are children of working families who go to the public schools. School construction would be an initiative to help working family children.

People say that inner cities do not deserve to be given priority for education funding and we should take away the Title I money and put it into ed-flex and let the governors and the local decisionmakers spend the money for anything they want to related to education. Do not concentrate on the original purpose of Title I. The original purpose of the Federal Government's involvement in education was to help the poorer communities. Forget about that. They do not deserve that. There are Democrats who say that we should not have a construction bill, a school construction bill which gives first priority to the cities. Well, we give first priorities to the inner cities because that is where most of the children are. Most of the population of America lives in the big cities.

When it comes time to fight wars, most of the people who go off to die are the young people from big cities. If one goes to the Vietnam Memorial wall they will find that the wall is full of people who come from the big cities and it is full of the children from working families. Children from working families went out to die in World War I and World War II and children from working families died in Vietnam. If we have a war in Kosovo that expands to a ground war, the majority of those who would die in combat will be from working families in big cities.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I wanted to come down here to the Floor of the House to compliment the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), my fine colleague, for his special order this evening.

Madam Speaker, I was listening to the gentleman in my office and I was motivated to come down here when he was talking about the minimum wage and the struggle of people from our country to earn a decent living.

I wanted to engage the gentleman in a colloquy, if I might, based on a speech that was made over the weekend and reported in the gentleman's home city of New York City by none other than the chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan.

The story was reported in my local paper back home, the Toledo Blade, because he was talking about workers in our country and saying that, and I quote from the article, ''pockets of workers in America sometimes have to suffer for the national economy to get stronger.'' It was very interesting and, Madam Speaker, I would like to include that article for the RECORD at this point.

Madam Speaker, I ordered a copy of his speech today, and I have read it, because he was speaking to a group in Texas and he was talking about NAFTA. He was talking about how successful it has been.

I was very interested in the gentleman's remarks on minimum wage because Mr. Greenspan, in his speech, argues that international trade has lifted the standard of living of people in this country. I guess I wanted the gentleman to comment whether it is his view that some of the trade arrangements that we have locked ourselves into have been beneficial to the standard of living and to working families' incomes in this Nation. From what the gentleman was saying about the minimum wage, something is not working here.

Obviously, all boats are not being lifted. What was interesting to me about Mr. Greenspan's remarks, in fact, when he said who had to suffer as a result of our trade agreements, he only said workers. He did not say shareholders. He did not say chief executive officers. He did not say executive assistants. He did not say managers.

[From the Toledo Blade, April 17, 1999]

GREENSPAN CONTRADICTS U.S. TRADE VIEW—COMPETITION IS THE GOAL, HE SAYS

WASHINGTON (NYT).—Alan Greenspan waded into the debate over trade policy yesterday, denouncing protectionist pressures and arguing that pockets of workers sometimes have to suffer for the national economy to get stronger.

The Federal Reserve chairman did not address the biggest question on the trade agenda, the possible entry of China into the World Trade Organization. But he outlined a broad case for eliminating trade barriers and warned that attempts to halt the development of a more global economy are futile and harmful.

Mr. Greenspan's influence could help the Clinton administration as it seeks to complete a deal with China and win congressional approval for the pact.

But Mr. Greenspan criticized the administration for framing the benefits of trade in what he called the wrong way. The point of expanding trade is not to create jobs, Mr. Greenspan said, contradicting the President's main argument for why the United States should open new markets.

Rather, Mr. Greenspan said, trade forces the United States to become more competitive, and to use its resources—people, technology and money—in the most productive way.

The Fed chairman took the administration and Congress to task for taking what he called an overly narrow view of trade relations.

''I am concerned about the recent weakening of support for free trade in this country,'' Mr. Greenspan said in a speech to business executives and foreign ambassadors in Dallas.

''Should we endeavor to freeze competitive progress in place, we will almost certainly slow economic growth overall and impart substantial harm to those workers who would otherwise seek more effective long-term job opportunities,'' he said.

Mr. Greenspan spoke after 10 days of debate within the administration and throughout Washington over how hard to push for a deal that would put China under the international rules of trade.

Last week, Mr. Clinton backed away from a deal with China's prime minister, Zhu Rongji, despite sweeping concessions from the Chinese on a variety of trade issues. Mr. Clinton concluded that he would not be able to win approval from Congress because lawmakers are unhappy with China over accusations that it has violated human rights, spread nuclear weapons, and spied on American weapon programs.

But after criticism from business leaders, Mr. Clinton restarted talks with China.

□ 2000

My own view, and perhaps the gentleman would want to comment on this, if we look at our trade deficit with Mexico, now nearly $16 billion a year, making more down there than we are able to sell. They ship their goods here, we do not get as much down there, their people cannot afford to buy; our people lose jobs.

China, which is an issue we are going to be discussing here, $50 billion, $60 billion in trade deficits. The poor workers in China are making 10 cents an hour, and yet we have the downward ratcheting of wages and benefits in this country, which force us to come to the floor here to ask for an increase in the minimum wage.

I just wanted to come down to the floor and to introduce this news article where Mr. Greenspan contradicts U.S. trade views and criticizes Congress. I am mystified why we might be concerned. I thought the gentleman might want to add something to his earlier remarks.

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I certainly appreciate the gentlewoman from Ohio joining me because she has studied this situation very closely over a long period of time and has a great deal of knowledge and institutional memory as to how we have progressed to the present situation.

I think the gentlewoman will sympathize with me when I say any country which is earning in its stock markets $13 trillion in 1999 versus $3 trillion in 1989, has seen a $10 trillion increase over a 10-year period, why are they worried about the economy faltering and why must that keep going on the backs of workers? We certainly have no danger; if we raise the minimum wage or if we were to pay workers better and create more jobs, that $13 trillion cannot be threatened, or if it wavers a bit and goes down to $12 trillion, what is the difference?

So I had to restrain myself because when I began, our colleagues from the other side had just finished talking about Mexico and the drug trade, and NAFTA came to mind right away. We should have disapproved of NAFTA just for the reason that the Government of Mexico is overwhelmed by the drug trade and that any kinds of laws that we try to enforce there are impossible. We cannot enforce laws that require trade unions to have freedom. We cannot enforce laws on the environment. We cannot enforce laws which would maintain decent minimum wages and working conditions.

Then, when we move to China, China overnight has an overwhelming balance of trade with us, and it is obscene, the amount of the surplus with China in their favor at this point. They not only employ people at low wages, they use prison labor. I heard just this past weekend a manufacturer of toys who openly said that it is manufacturing in the prisons of China. We do not want anything to do with that; do not ask me any questions about it. I do not care what it manufactures, we get a much cheaper price.

So the workers here are directly threatened by that kind of activity in Mexico and in China, and of course the people who benefit are the ones who reap tremendous profits by bringing the very cheap goods in here and selling them at prices that are more consistent with our standard of living and reaping the profit. That is where the $13 trillion versus $3 trillion has been accumulated.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would just yield to me for one more minute, I would say that Mr. Greenspan seems to think that all trade raises the standard of living of the American people. It might raise the

standard of living of people who can afford to take him out to lunch or dinner along Wall Street in New York City or K Street here in Washington, D.C., but it has not raised the wages of the people that the gentleman from New York is talking about here, where we in Congress have to forcibly ratchet up the minimum wage because people are being told where they work here in the United States, well, if you want any kind of a small wage increase, or maybe you want better health insurance or health insurance at all, if you do not agree to that, we are going to Mexico. I do not understand why an intelligent person like Mr. Greenspan cannot feel the pain and understand the impact of these trade agreements on the vast majority of the American public that has not benefited from the big bang on Wall Street.

The average wages of people in this country and their real buying power has not been going up. They are working; thank God we have done some things right in this country, but they are not able to meet prices.

The other day I went to get a blouse back home, and I walked up to this one rack and I pulled it off the rack and I looked at it, it was $129 made in China. And Mr. Greenspan says in his speeches here that this trade is great for America because we get all these cheap goods. Where? Where are the cheap goods? All the garment workers in the gentleman's city who lost their jobs who were making not great wages, but at least they could keep house and home together, when those jobs were wiped out and replaced by Chinese jobs, I really do not see how he can say this helps the standard of living of the ordinary rank and file, the majority of people in this country. It certainly helps those who trade in stocks on Wall Street, would the gentleman not agree?

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, the $129 blouse probably cost less than $10 to make.

Ms. KAPTUR. I know.

Mr. OWENS. So large profits are reaped by somebody, and that is where the $13 trillion has been accumulated, a $10 trillion increase over the last 10 years. That is obscene when we look at the fact that 40 million people are not covered with any kind of health care and we are nickel and diming our education system in terms of support from the Federal Government, and on and on it goes.

Mr. Greenspan insulted all working people previously by saying that unemployment is good for the economy, and the last thing we wanted was to have full employment. It is ridiculous to allow these icons to go on unchallenged, but as the gentlewoman and I know, we are lucky that lightning has not come down and struck both of us for criticizing Mr. Greenspan. The power structure wants Mr. Greenspan. The President keeps reappointing Mr. Greenspan, the majority of Republicans want Mr. Greenspan. Mr. Greenspan is no friend of working families, and there is a philosophy, and a lot of people in decision-making positions who are not friends of working families. We are missing a golden opportunity in America to have the working families share the prosperity, and it would be good for the entire country to have them share it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, would the gentleman, who has been such a leader on education, allow me just to say this, because I do not know of any member of the gentleman's committee that has fought as hard for education as the gentleman has in his tenure here in this Congress, and the American people owe you a debt of gratitude for that.

What is very interesting to me in our area of Ohio and around the Midwest, many companies that used to pay taxes for education and used to help schools, got abatement, tax abatement over the last 20 years, and now what is happening is educational systems across this country are faltering at the local level and asking the Congress to appropriate money in order to help for school construction. The President of the United States a couple of months ago was up here asking for money for school construction. This is a shift in priorities of the Federal Government to move into school modernization and construction.

One of the reasons this is happening is that locally, these very same companies that have gotten abatement and are cutting back on their public responsibilities are then shifting that burden up to the Federal Government where we have a lot of other responsibilities, and it is very interesting to me that the gentleman has to fight for dollars for education, dear dollars that we need for curriculum, for instruction, for making up the differential between lower income districts and higher income districts, and yet now we also have to fund buildings. It is amazing to me how much foregone tax revenue there is at the local level. Just another example of corporate America not meeting its public responsibilities.

I would wish for the Federal Reserve to do a study on that.

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, as soon as the tax abatement run out for many of these companies, they are going to leave the gentlewoman's State and go to Mexico or somewhere else.

This is a great argument; of course, I do not like to see the Federal Government be forced to assume new responsibilities, but it is a great argument for the Federal Government assuming more responsibilities for school construction, because the wealth is in the country. It is not in the counties, as it was before, but it is somewhere in the country when we see the $13 trillion stock market value. Let the Federal Government take part of that wealth and use it to build schools across the country. It did not apply 20 years ago; it was not necessary 20 or 25 years ago, but it is necessary now.

What is wrong with safeguarding the national interests by seeing to it that we have adequate schools and school construction is one of those areas where it is most intense in terms of capital. School systems are struggling for operating budgets to keep the right number of teachers and suppliers and all of the other expenses going. Surely, a one-shot expenditure on a massive scale to deal with the fact that the General Accounting Office says we need about, in 1995, we needed about $110 billion just to repair schools that needed repair and to build, to keep up with the current enrollment in 1995, and now we need much more.

So we need a massive injection, similar to the highway bill injection. When we need big money for a purpose that people see day-to-day in having some applicability, then let us spend the money there instead of wasting it in other places, and school construction is one of those places where it is needed.

I think the Federal Government expenditure right now for elementary and secondary education is about $415 per child per year. That is our involvement. Most of the cost of education is still borne by State and local governments. We could afford to have an infusion, a one-shot, one-time set of expenditures for construction and let the Federal Government then get out and leave it to the States on an ongoing basis.

I sympathize when some people say the Federal Government should not interfere with education at the local level. Well, if we build schools, we are not interfering with curriculum and procedures and processes, we are just helping to build schools and then getting out and leaving it to the local government. That is an area where we should be involved. Of course, as I said before, most of those schools are for working families who cannot afford the alternative in terms of private schools. No matter how we play around with that, most working families are going to have to send their children to public schools.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing more light on this subject.

The minimum wage right now is $5.15 an hour. That comes out to $10,000, $10,300 for a worker who works 50 weeks in a year, $10,300 per year. Let that sink in and let people understand that two-thirds of the workforce makes less than $20,000 a year. I did this research when I was fighting the bill which required people to take time off instead of receiving overtime. Two-thirds of the workforce is at the level where they are making only $10 an hour. Two-thirds of the workforce in America are making only $20,000 a year, twice the minimum wage at this point. That is two-thirds of those who earn a living as wage-earners.

The Fair Labor Standards Act of course was amended, and the minimum wage, on September 30, 1996 it was raised to $4.75 an hour, and then September 1, 1997 it was raised to $5.15 an hour. That was when we had the last

increases. Of course at that time we also had to bear an amendment which was called the Opportunity Wage Provision. The Republican majority insisted that workers under age 20 can be paid $4.25 an hour for the first 90 consecutive calendar days after they are hired. That was a compromise that I did not care for, but we had to make that in order to get the bill passed.

Now, people say that well, most workers are already above the minimum wage; they do not have to worry about that. But 1.6 million workers were paid by the hour at hourly wages of $5.15 in 1998. Madam Speaker, 2.8 million workers were making less than that. Some workers are paid below the minimum wage because, as I said before, because of the provision for youth workers, and then there are small businesses that are exempted from the minimum wage, very small businesses exempted.

Over the last 30 years, how has the minimum wage kept pace with inflation? I just said before that in 10 years, the stock market value went from $3 trillion to $13 trillion. Now, do we have any kind of overwhelming increase like that with the minimum wage? No. From 1961 to 1981, the real value of the minimum wage was above $6 an hour every year but one. During that period, it fell below $6 an hour one time in 1973.

□ 2015

Since 1981 the real value of the minimum wage has stayed below $6 an hour. President Clinton's proposed increase would restore hardworking minimum wage families' purchasing power to the level that it held for almost 6 years, almost 20 years, way back.

It did hold, with the cost of living and inflation, for a 20-year period, but now 20 years has gone by since it was at the level of $6 an hour. We would be going to that level if we increased the present minimum wage in two stages, $5.15 and then, 35 cents one year and 50 cents another year up to the point where it would be $6.15.

People say that most of the minimum wage workers are young people in fast food joints and odd jobs after school, and it does not matter if they make the minimum wage, but the statistics and the studies show that 65 percent of minimum wage workers are adults 20 years or older. Sixty-five percent of the people who earn the minimum wage are adult workers 20 years or older.

Some people say it does not help women and minorities because as we raise the minimum wage, employers lay off people, and a lot of women and minorities who would benefit from more jobs lose jobs as the minimum wage forces employers to cut the number of jobs.

Well, women would be helped by increasing the minimum wage. Most minimum wage workers are women right now. Almost 1 million women are paid $5.15 an hour. An additional 5.8 are paid wages less than $6.14 an hour.

Fifty-nine percent of all who would benefit from the increase are women. Nineteen percent of all hourly paid women would benefit from the increase. Seventy four percent of female low-wage workers are adults. Five million of the women are age 20 years or older. They are paid these minimum wages. Raising the minimum wage would provide a modest pay raise to the poorest working women, many of whom are raising children.

Over 15 percent of those who would benefit from an increase are African American women, and 18 percent are Hispanic women. Together they number 3.8 million workers.

The question was asked, is the minimum wage targeted to help poor people? As I said before, the myth is that as we raise the minimum wage, we have decreased the number of jobs because employers lay off people, or they cut the jobs in order to increase their profits.

That is not true. According to a study by the Economic Policy Institute on the impact of the 1996 50-cent increase in the minimum wage, the benefits of the increase went primarily to low-income working families.

The minimum wage can provide a foothold into the middle class. A family with two full-time workers who work all year round would earn $25,000 a year with a $6.15 minimum wage. Increasing the minimum wage will help these workers to make up for lost ground due to inflation. It will help make work pay.

Some other facts are, people always argue that the unskilled jobs and the disadvantaged workers are not going to be benefited, again because the number of those jobs will be decreased if we raise the minimum wage.

But between September, 1996, and March of this year, 1999, the unemployment rate for high school dropouts has declined from 8.2 percent to 6.1 percent. The unemployment rate for African Americans has dropped from 10.6 percent to 8.1 percent.

The unemployment rate for Hispanic Americans has dropped from 8.3 percent to 5.8 percent. The unemployment rate for teens has dropped from 15.7 percent to 14.3 percent. The unemployment rate for black teens has dropped from 33 percent to 31 percent.

We would like to see all of these drops be more dramatic, but the fact is that the arguments that we do not help the poorest people or we do not help teenagers or we do not help minorities when we raise the minimum wage are totally discredited. No study has shown that this is true.

When we talk about welfare recipients, a major problem of welfare recipients who entered the labor market so far is not their inability to find a job, but the fact that the earnings are very low. Increasing the minimum wage would increase the earnings of former welfare recipients and make it really worthwhile for them to be working instead of on welfare.

Starting wages of welfare recipients in the job market average about $6.50 an hour, with significant fractions of recipients earning $5 and $6 an hour. Quarterly earnings of welfare recipients tend to be about $2,000 to $2,500 per quarter when they work, and just about $1,500 to $2,000 for high school dropouts.

These low earning figures reflect the low wages as well as the high turnover rates in these jobs. Two problems, the low wages, and these jobs do not usually last for all year round. They are sporadic. There are periodic layoffs, and people do not earn money 50 weeks in a year.

Virtually all research on minimum wage increases show little or no effects on the employment rates of young people. The vast majority of studies also show that minimum wage increases do reduce poverty rates, and no credible study has shown anything different, as I said before.

Minimum wage workers benefit more and sooner if we raise the wages, as we did before, 50 cents per year. So the present proposals that are being floated by the Republicans, where some call for increases of only 25 cents per year, do not propose to move fast enough with enough money to make it significant. It is not sharing with workers, when we have a $13 trillion economy, to talk about we will give them a minimum wage increase of only 25 cents per year.

Minimum wage workers benefit more and they benefit sooner under the proposed Kennedy-Bonior proposal than under any of the Republican proposals. The Republican proposals would take money out of the minimum wage pockets.

For example, in the first year of the Quinn bill, a full-time minimum wage worker earns nearly $200 less than under the Kennedy-Bonior bill. In the second year, the Republican bill gap rises to $571 less than they would make under the Kennedy-Bonior bill.

There is a Shimkus proposal also, and the wage gap is worse under the Shimkus proposal. If the minimum wage increases by 25 cents in 1999, a full-time minimum wage worker earns $487 less in real terms than they would earn under the Kennedy-Bonior proposal.

A second 25-cent increase in 2000 leaves workers even further behind, with a $951 gap between the Kennedy-Bonior proposal and the Shimkus proposal.

In the first 2 years, the Kennedy-Bonior bill would benefit more workers than the Quinn proposal, which is 11.4 million workers compared to 7 million. The Quinn bill does nothing for over 4 million needy workers and their families. The Shimkus proposal helps even fewer low-wage workers.

As I said before, the President's proposal is a simple 50-cent increase on September 1, 1999, and a 50-cent increase on September 1, 2000. As I said before, that would bring the minimum

wage earner from the $10,000 a year up to $12,000 a year if they worked 50 weeks in a year, still much too low but an important improvement.

Congress did raise the minimum wage by 50 cents in 1996 and 40 cents on September 1, 1997, and this time we propose to do it, through the President's proposal, a little better than that.

The minimum wage is still low in historical terms. The value of the minimum wage reached its peak in 1968, when the value in real dollar terms was $7.49 in terms of dollars, dollar values in 1998. We were up that high, $7.49 in 1968.

During President Reagan's 8 years in office, the real value of the minimum wage went down by about 25 percent. Today, even after the 90-cent increase that President Clinton pushed through Congress, the minimum wage is only $5.15 an hour, and the new proposal would increase it by another $1 in two steps. This last increase in percentage terms is in line with previous ones that helped low wage workers without adversely affecting the economy. Both this proposal and the last one increased the minimum wage by about 20 percent.

I could go on and on, but I do not want to talk more about facts related to the minimum wage. I think the point is made, that no studies have been brought forward to show that the economy is in any way harmed by an increase in the minimum wage. Workers certainly are not harmed by losing jobs. Unemployment now is much higher than it was when the minimum wage increase started 2 years ago.

States have minimum wages. A few of them have minimum wages larger than the Federal Government minimum wage, but some States, of course, have no minimum wage, and often do not abide by the Federal minimum wage. They have a lot of jobs that do not pay even the minimum wage.

I think Texas, if we want to look at the largest number of people earning the minimum wage, Texas has 211,000 in its State, and 4.2 percent of the work force is earning minimum wage. They have another 838,000 people who earn between $5.15 an hour and $6.14 cents an hour. That comes to 16.6 percent of the work force at very low wage levels.

So we need to share the wealth. If we have $3 trillion, if we move from $3 trillion to $13 trillion on the stock market, there is no sound argument for not raising the minimum wage. Of all the ways to share the wealth, the best and easiest way, the most direct way, is to increase the dollars in the pockets of the workers. Working families need more money.

So I appreciate the fact that we are not openly attacking workers, as we did in the 105th Congress. I appreciate the fact that the first bill on the agenda was not a bill to take away overtime, as we did in the 105th Congress.

I appreciate the fact that we are not any longer waging war on labor unions, to take away their ability to speak for their workers by having a so-called Paycheck Protection Act, which throttles the voices of unions. I appreciate the fact that there are no loud voices being raised to try to end Davis-Bacon for Federal contract jobs.

But the truth is, in all of these areas there is still a guerilla war going on. The guerilla war is more subtle. The guerilla war is designed to hoodwink working families.

Davis-Bacon is being attacked behind the scenes. Davis-Bacon is being again used as a scapegoat for not approving a massive school construction appropriation. They are saying that Davis-Bacon drives up the cost of school construction, despite the fact that there have been several scientific studies which show that Davis-Bacon does not drive up the cost.

Mr. Peter Phillips has made several studies showing that if we remove Davis-Bacon, the cost may remain the same or go higher, but what happens is that the wages of the workers go down and the profits of the contractors go up. That is the only thing we accomplish when we remove Davis-Bacon from contracts.

State Davis-Bacon laws, similar State Davis-Bacon prevailing wage laws have been changed in certain Midwestern States. They have seen that it does not lower the cost of school construction, it only raises the profits of contractors. So Davis-Bacon should not be an issue.

However, in the circles of Congress there is still talk of blocking any appropriation for school construction because of Davis-Bacon, or holding school construction appropriations hostage by saying that we will do it only if you get rid of Davis-Bacon.

I understand the Committee on Ways and Means has made some steps forward in terms of the Democratic leadership over there. The ranking Democrat on the Committee on Ways and Means recently announced in a session of the Congressional Black Caucus that he would certainly support the continuation of Davis-Bacon on the school construction bill proposed through Committee on Ways and Means.

That is the President's proposal that we borrow $25 billion, and the States and local governments would be helped by the Federal Government, by the Federal Government paying the interest through a tax credit vehicle on the $25 billion for school construction.

So I hope that the guerilla warfare will cease. We had some problems recently in the subcommittee on Workforce Protections, my subcommittee where I serve as the ranking Democrat. We had a problem with an attempt to get rid of bonuses as part of the computation of the rate of pay for a worker.

If we remove the bonuses, then the hourly rate of the worker goes down, and we can have the worker work overtime and he gets less money if the bonus is not computed as part of his hourly pay. That is what we call a bushwacking, an ambush of the working families, to try to take away their overtime through a much less visible approach.

□ 2030

H.R. 1 was a highly visible direct assault by mandating, it called for mandating the use of comp time instead of cash payments for overtime. So we would like to see working families not have to fight so hard to get their share of the wealth.

I would like to even go further and say that the problem of Social Security, problem of health care, we should look at taxing unearned income. Unearned income may be the source of the solution to the Social Security problem. If we would put a Social Security tax, as I am proposing, on unearned income, we would guarantee Social Security for an infinite number of years in the future.

At the same time, we could lift the tax off the backs of the workers. Working families have had the biggest tax increase over the last two decades through the payroll tax. Most people do not realize that because they do not look at taxes in that way. But the payroll tax increase has been not a progressive tax, but a regressive tax, and fallen on the backs of wage earners. At the same time, we have had this tremendous increase in wealth for the people who have unearned income.

I did not invent these two terms. These are economic terms that have been around for a long time. Earned income is the income of working people, the people who earn wages. Those dollars are called earned income. Investments and income from rent and other sources are called unearned income.

I do not know why we discriminate against earned income and all the taxes are just on earned income. Only 11 percent of unearned income is taxed. We ought to take a look at a tax reduction policy for working families. That is another issue that should be considered.

But, first of all and foremost, I think that the current consideration is the need for a bipartisan approach to the passage of a meaningful increase in the minimum wage, a meaningful increase. We do not want a bipartisan increase. The bipartisanism forces us to sacrifice the reality of it.

The reality is that no less than $1 over a 2-year period is acceptable. We need so much more than that. Consider the $13 trillion versus the $3 trillion, and my colleagues will see the kind of magnitude that our wealth has increased by.

No less should happen in terms of the various programs that we, as the policymakers here in Congress, approve for working families. We need to help working families through health care. We need to help working families by providing health care plans and health care systems that take care of everybody.

We need to help working families by increasing Federal aid to education, first of all building more schools and better schools and repairing schools and modernizing schools and equipping schools with the technology that they need.

Finally, we need to help working families first of all, most immediately and most directly, by passing immediately an increase in the minimum wage.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1999 AT PAGE H2135

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 16, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 16, 1999 at 12:00 noon.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 911.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1376.

That the Senate agreed to the Conference Report on H. Con. Res. 58.

Appointments: Congressional advisers on trade agreements. United States Commission on Civil Rights.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SAXTON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and until 3 p.m., Wednesday, April 21, on account of personal reasons

Mr. NUSSLE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

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. OSE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SHADEGG, for 5 minutes, today and April 21.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, April 21.

Mr. HULSHOF, for 5 minutes, today and April 21.

Mr. DEMINT, for 5 minutes, April 21.

Mr. PORTER, for 5 minutes, April 21.

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG, for 5 minutes, April 21.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, April 21.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUTCHINSON, for 5 minutes, April 21.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 60 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 249. An act to provide funding for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

S. 426. An act to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, to provide for a land exchange between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Huna Totem Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 430. An act to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, to provide for a land exchange between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Kake Tribal Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 453. An act to designate the Federal building located at 709 West 9th Street in Juneau, Alaska, as the ''Hurff A. Saunders Federal Building''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 21, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1594. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for livestock price reporting; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1595. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report that the enclosed appropriation to the Department of Agriculture has been apportioned on a basis that indicates the necessity for a supplemental appropriation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1515(b)(2); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1596. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1597. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Bumper Standard [Docket No. NHTSA 99–5458] (RIN: 2127–AH59) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1598. A letter from the Director, Office of Administration and Management, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to section 3349 of the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1599. A letter from the Director, Office of Administration and Management, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to section 3349 of the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1600. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting notification of two vacancies within the Department of Agriculture in positions which require appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1601. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a copy of the Government National Mortgage Association management report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1602. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the authorization for Title XI of Public Law 104–333, California Bay Delta Environmental Enhancement Act; to the Committee on Resources.

1603. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company GE90 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98–ANE–39–AD; Amendment 39–11123; AD 99–08–17] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1604. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6–80A, CF6–80C2, and CF6–80E1 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98–ANE–49–AD; Amendment 39–11119; AD 99–08–13] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1605. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney PW2000 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98–ANE–61–AD; Amendment 39–11120; AD 99–08–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1606. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service,

Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT9D Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98–ANE–47–AD; Amendment 39–11118; AD 99–08–12] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1607. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; CFM International (CFMI) CFM56–2, –2A, –2B, –3, –3B, and –3C Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98–ANE–38–AD; Amendment 39–11122; AD 99–08–16] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1608. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines AG (IAE) V2500–A1/–A5/–D5 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98–ANE–45–AD; Amendment 39–11117; AD 99–08–11] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1609. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6–6, CF6–45, and CF6–50 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98–ANE–41–AD; Amendment 39–11124; AD 99–08–18] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1610. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney PW4000 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98–ANE–66–AD; Amendment 39–11121; AD 99–08–15] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1611. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Robinson Helicopter Company Model R44 Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–25–AD; Amendment 39–11127; AD 99–07–18] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1612. A letter from the Program Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Robinson Helicopter Company Model R22 Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–24–AD; Amendment 39–11126; AD 99–07–17] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1613. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Model L–1011–385 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–315–AD; Amendment 39–11128; AD 99–08–20] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1614. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29528; Amdt. No. 415] received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1615. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Port Clinton, OH [Airspace Docket No. 98–AGL–73] received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1616. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Ways and Means, Government Reform, Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Resources, Rules, Banking and Financial Services, International Relations, Veterans' Affairs, and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

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:

Mr. GOODLING: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 800. A bill to provide for education flexibility partnerships (Rept. 106–100). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 142. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1184) to authorize appropriations for carrying out the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–101). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 143. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 800) to provide for education flexibility partnerships (Rept. 106–102). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ARMEY (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. COX, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. DOOLEY of California):

H.R. 1475. A bill to enable drivers to choose a more affordable form of auto insurance that also provides for more adequate and timely compensation for accident victims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. DANNER, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1476. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish additional national cemeteries for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. KING, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. STARK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 1477. A bill to withhold voluntary proportional assistance for programs and projects of the International Atomic Energy Agency relating to the development and completion of the Bushehr nuclear power plant in Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1478. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to protect breastfeeding by new mothers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1479. A bill to amend the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 to provide for renewal of contracts for rental assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 for moderate rehabilitation projects in the same manner as other projects with such expiring contracts; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 1480. A bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the United States Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, 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 Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 1481. A bill to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 333 Las Vegas Boulevard South in Las Vegas, Nevada, as the ''Lloyd D. George United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. COYNE, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 1482. A bill to reauthorize the Welfare-To-Work program to provide additional resources and flexibility to improve the administration of the program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. CAMP, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 1483. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the proper payment of approved nursing and paramedical education programs under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, 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. FILNER:

H.R. 1484. A bill to authorize appropriations for homeless veterans reintegration projects under the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. FROST, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr.

GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. LEE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1485. A bill to permit certain long-term permanent resident aliens to seek cancellation of removal or waiver of inadmissibility under the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 1486. A bill to provide for a transition to market-based rates for power sold by the Federal Power Marketing Administrations and the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Commerce, 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. HANSEN:

H.R. 1487. A bill to provide for public participation in the declaration of national monuments under the Act popularly known as the Antiquities Act of 1906; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1488. 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 the disbursement of such support and to require the Internal Revenue Service to collect and disburse such support through wage withholding and other means; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 1489. A bill to clarify boundaries on maps related to the Coastal Barrier Resources System; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. KOLBE:

H.R. 1490. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to set aside up to $2 per person from park entrance fees or assess up to $2 per person visiting the Grand Canyon or another national park to secure bonds for capital improvements to the park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.R. 1491. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to consolidate and enhance the trade adjustment assistance and NAFTA transitional adjustment assistance programs under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARY MILLER of California:

H.R. 1492. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to provide for parity between private entities and public entities with respect to civil actions against the entities that arise from the ownership or operation of public water systems; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. NUSSLE:

H.R. 1493. A bill to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to transfer Federal participation in the America's Agricultural Heritage Partnership in the State of Iowa to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. DELAY, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. SUNUNU, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. TALENT, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HORN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. BASS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. STUMP, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. COBURN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. EWING, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. MICA, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. POMBO, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. REGULA, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. BONO, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BUYER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 1494. A bill to provide dollars to the classroom; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. FROST, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 1495. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of outpatient prescription drugs under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mr. TALENT (for himself, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. GOODE, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. ARMEY):

H.R. 1496. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve access and choice for entrepreneurs with small businesses with respect to medical care for their employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. WEINER):

H.R. 1497. A bill to amend the Small Business Act with respect to the women's business center program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. WILSON:

H.R. 1498. A bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. KUYKENDALL, and Mr. GARY MILLER of California):

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution urging the Congress and the President to increase funding for the Pell Grant Program and existing Campus-Based Aid Programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MINGE:

H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution recognizing the Hermann Monument and Hermann Heights Park in New Ulm, Minnesota, as a national symbol of the contributions of Americans of German heritage; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LAMPSON (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. FROST, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. FILNER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. WU):

H. Res. 144. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a postage stamp should be issued commemorating Cesar E. Chavez; to the Committee on Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. LAMPSON introduced a bill (H.R. 1499) for the relief of Jean-Loup J. M. Chretien; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. COBURN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. EWING, Mr. TALENT, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 8: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HILLEARY, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 9: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 17: Mr. DICKEY.

H.R. 19: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 25: Mr. NADLER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. KING.

H.R. 36: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 44: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CANADY of Florida, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 45: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. MICA, and Mr. ISAKSON.

H.R. 49: Mr. WYNN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MATSUI, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 65: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 88: Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. HOLT, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FORD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SANDLIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 104: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 106: Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 107: Mr. COX and Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 148: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 165: Mr. HYDE and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 170: Mr. WU, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 194: Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 206: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 208: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 218: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 220: Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 284: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 303: Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. TURNER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 347: Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 351: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 357: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 382. Mr. FARR of California and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 383: Mr. COOK, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 410: Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 413: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 423: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 424: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 430: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 456: Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 464: Mr. HILLEARY.

H.R. 497: Mr. BONILLA, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. JOHN, Mr. NEY, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 498: Mr. BONILLA, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. JOHN, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 518: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 521: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 614: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 623: Mr. BARR of Georgia and Mr. RILEY.

H.R. 673: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 690: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 721: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 728: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 749: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 750: Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 762: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEINER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. VENTO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 765: Mr. TURNER, Mr. MOORE, Mr. PASTOR, Mrs. CHENOWETH, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 776: Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 777: Mr. RUSH and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 783: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GOODE, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 784: Mr. SISISKY, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. HAYES, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 796: Mr. RILEY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. SHAW, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 803: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 811: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 834: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 842: Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BARCIA, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 845: Mr. WYNN, Mr. BALDACCI, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 860: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.

H.R. 875: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 878: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 879: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 895: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 899: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 912: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 932: Ms. NORTON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 942: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 958: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 959: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DIXON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BALDACCI, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

H.R. 976: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KLINK, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 1032: Mr. CANNON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 1039: Mr. SAWYER, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1046: Mr. BONIOR and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1050: Ms. WATERS and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1054: Mr. RILEY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 1063: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1070: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WOLF, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. CONDIT, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1079: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1082: Mr. VENTO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. STUPAK, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 1095: Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MORELLA, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1109: Mr. HILLIARD and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 1129: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1130: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1144: Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 1180: Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. LARSON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. RIVERS, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BASS, Mr. NEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 1193: Mr. WELLER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 1203: Mr. SUNUNU.

H.R. 1219: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1224: Mr. COYNE and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1229: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1248: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MOORE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1250: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1253: Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 1275: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1278: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. METCALF, Mr. DOOLEY of California, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1295: Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 1298: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1307: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. KUYKENDALL.

H.R. 1320: Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1326: Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SAWYER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1328: Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 1349: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1355: Ms. LEE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. VENTO, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1356: Mr. WOLF and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 1358: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 1363: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 1366: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. CRANE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. TURNER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. HILL of Montana.

H.R. 1368: Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. NEY, and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1395: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 1458: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.J. Res. 21: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.J. Res. 41: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. Biggert, Mr. WYNN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.J. Res. 45: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Con. Res. 22: Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. BONIOR.

H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. TIAHRT.

H. Con. Res. 54: Mr. LUCAS OF KENTUCKY.

H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H. Con. Res. 82: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. TANCREDO.

H. Res. 41: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. LARGENT, and Mr. SHAYS.

H. Res. 82: Ms. LEE and Ms. BALDWIN.

H. Res. 94: Mr. GREENWOOD and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H. Res. 106: Mr. TIAHRT.