

I was also saddened, I must say, by one of the previous speakers who said he wanted to express his disdain for the universities involved. We have universities here which are trying to express their disagreement with what they believe, and I agree, but what they believe to be an unfair prejudice that singles out some of their students. I understand disagreement with that, but disdain? Disdain because people in these positions feel that their students should not be unduly stigmatized and denied this opportunity?

If it is so important to have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, should not people on the other side say, you cannot deny these young people the opportunity to serve in the military. Should you not say, you should not deny these young people the opportunity to serve in the military unless they are gay or lesbian. Because if they are gay or lesbian, you want to deny them the opportunity to serve in the military regardless of any fault.

Remember, this is one that says we just stigmatize you from the outset. There is nothing you can do, there is no degree of service you can perform, there is no sacrifice you can offer to make that will allow you to serve your country. And then we will complain because we do not have enough people to serve in the military. And, again, literally thousands have been turned away. The universities are not blocking recruitment. They cannot. They are asking for the right to stand up for principle.

And now we are told by one other speaker, well, if they do not agree with the policy, you would think they would not accept the money. Please. I would say to Members, one rule in parliamentary debate: try to avoid saying something that no one will believe. I mean, this notion that if you do not agree with a policy you should boycott the government, which is using your tax money, nobody believes that. People get taxed, and sometimes they agree and sometimes they disagree. We say to people, look, you can voice your opinion, but you cannot avoid paying the taxes.

And, by the way, it is not money from the military they are seeking. Typically, what we have here are law schools. It is law schools, as people have noted, who are doing this. So people have said, well, what about the poor people? We are not getting enough wealthy people to offset the number of poor people. Well, we are talking about lawyers who are being recruited. Frankly, the poor people are not being recruited for the Judge Advocate General's office. It just does not compute.

But what they are saying is, we are not going to allow our facilities to be used in this discriminatory way. And the law schools, by the way, are not themselves, and this is an important point, under the Clinton administration the ruling was that we would look at each element of a university separately. And if the law school said no

military recruiting, that did not stop the medical school or the school of engineering from applying for Federal funds. What you now have is a policy that says if the law school says no, no other entity can get the money. So there is no connection there.

The key issue here is this: Have we not in this country come to the point where patriotic young gay men and lesbians who are prepared to serve their country will at least be given a chance? Can you not judge them on their merits? Can you not say, okay, we admire your willingness to do this. We will judge you. If it turns out you become disruptive, we will act. But this blanket denial of even the opportunity no matter how talented, no matter how diligent? You enforce that as a policy, and then you complain that we have people being turned away?

Mr. Speaker, I hope this resolution is not adopted, and I hope we will begin to reverse this blanket prejudicial policy that says to millions, millions of young American men and women, you need not apply to defend your country because we do not like some aspect about you, even if it is going to be entirely irrelevant to your service.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in closing.

This Congress should be leading the way to end discrimination of any form in this country. Unfortunately, we have a resolution before us today that condones discrimination. I think it is sad we are dealing with this today. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the resolution.

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

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume; and in closing, I would like to say I think we have had a good and substantive debate today, but let us be clear: the concurrent resolution is really about ensuring those who defend our freedom and liberty the ability to have the same access to colleges and universities that is available for everyone else.

Mr. Speaker, often today others have placed this debate in the context of the "Don't ask, don't tell" policy. I suggest that those who would like to change that policy, that they look inward, at the political process itself. This was President Clinton's policy, and one enshrined in law that can only be changed by Congress.

If the other side of the aisle would like to make this change, they should propose it and debate it at this level. To put it in the context of the Solomon Amendment, I believe, is disingenuous and dangerous to our recruiting efforts. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying concurrent resolution.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

PROVIDING FOR POSTPONEMENT OF FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 36, NOTWITHSTANDING THE OPERATION OF THE PREVIOUS QUESTION

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during considering of House Concurrent Resolution 36, pursuant to House Resolution 59, the Chair may, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, postpone further consideration of the concurrent resolution to a time designated by the Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

---

EXPRESSING CONTINUED SUPPORT OF CONGRESS FOR EQUAL ACCESS OF MILITARY RECRUITERS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 59, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 36) expressing the continued support of Congress for equal access of military recruiters to institutions of higher education, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 36 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 36

Whereas section 8 of article I of the Constitution commits exclusively to Congress the powers to raise and support armies, provide and maintain a Navy, and make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

Whereas the Nation's security interests demand high levels of military personnel readiness, which in turn demand cost-effective military recruitment programs;

Whereas military recruiting on the Nation's university campuses is one of the primary means by which the Armed Forces obtain highly qualified new military personnel and is an integral, effective, and necessary part of overall military recruitment;

Whereas a lack of cooperation by institutions of higher education with the legitimate pursuit of the Federal military recruiting function carries with it the harmful effect of increasing Federal spending to achieve the required outcome, while at the same time compromising military personnel readiness and performance, which in turn conflicts with Federal responsibilities to provide for the Nation's defense;

Whereas military recruiting will be significantly harmed if military recruiters are denied access to campuses and students that is at least equal in quality and scope to the access provided to any other employer;

Whereas on-campus recruiting and ready access to students are key components of recruiting highly qualified new employees for any enterprise and are recognized as such by