

The compromise language uses some terms to describe these conditions also used by the IMF to describe an existing IMF loans facility, but there are essential differences that are important to note.

Finally, or next, the clear intent of this reform initiative is to require interest rates comparable to market interest rates, as expressed in H.R. 3331. Prior to these negotiations, the staff of the Joint Economic Committee devised a floor to permit an objective limit on how the rate could go in an attempt to prevent backsliding.

In the course of four hearings held by the Joint Economic Committee, the issues involving transparency and an end to the interest rate subsidies were explored in extensive detail, as well as many other issues. A complete legislative history of IMF reforms about to be enacted with a view towards establishing congressional intent must include not only H.R. 3331, but also the germane material covered in these JEC hearings, the only hearings held to examine these reforms in detail, I might add.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, the congressional intent behind the IMF reforms is clear. It is reflected in the legislative history. A good-faith effort to carry out these IMF reforms in keeping with the letter and spirit of the law will be as evident as will the failure to do so.

URGING MEMBERS TO SUPPORT LEGISLATION REGARDING HATE CRIMES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a Member of the Human Rights Caucus of this Congress. That caucus takes as its responsibility sort of a checks and balance for human rights violations around the world. That is why I rise today with such pain about our own situation here in the United States of America.

Last evening many of us joined with throngs to mourn the loss of Matthew Shepard, the young man who died in Wyoming as the result of a brutal and devastating murder. Matthew Shepard was gay, but he was also, as was claimed and was pronounced last evening, filled with vitality and life. He loved life; small in stature, but well worth the value of his life and, as well, the opportunity to continue to live his life.

My sympathy goes to Judy and Dennis, his parents, and all of his friends in the State of Wyoming. But frankly, the brutal attack against Mr. Shepard is not an uncharacteristic once-in-a-lifetime manifestation of hatred. It happens too many times in this country.

During 1985, 7,947 bias-motivated criminal incidents were reported to the FBI by approximately 9,600 law enforcement agencies in 45 States and the

District of Columbia. Sixty-one percent of the incidents were motivated by racial bias, 16 percent by religious bias, 13 percent by sexual orientation, and the remainder by ethnicity, national origin bias, or multiple biases. The 7,947 incidents involved 9,895 separate offenses, 10,469 victims, and 8,433 offenders.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that in these waning hours, there should be nothing more to dictate to us that we should pass the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1998. Let me thank the President for so quickly denouncing both the brutal killing of Matthew Shepard, but as well, calling on this Congress to pass this legislation. Allow me to thank those negotiators in these last hours who are negotiating on this final omnibus bill who have pressed over and over again, why can we not pass a Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1998?

Let me ask my colleagues, why not, in the name of James Baird, an African American in Jasper, Texas, who was dismembered a few months ago out of hatred, or Fred Mangione, in Houston, Texas, who was killed because of his sexual orientation? How many more deaths do we need to tolerate to be able to pass a Federal law that stands up to the Nation and says, we will tolerate hatred no more? We will not accept the intolerance of not tolerating those who are different.

What is wrong with this Nation, in a unified voice, promoting laws that protect people who are different because of their religious difference, their racial difference, whether or not they have disabilities, their sexual orientation, or their gender?

I have been asked over and over again, why create other laws? Do we not have murder, assault, and other laws that will take charge of these issues? I simply say that the question has to be asked, what kind of moral standing does this Nation want to have?

Certainly, there are State laws dealing with murder and assault, and there are State laws dealing with rape and other types of incidents. But the State laws are disorganized, and many of our States have not passed hate crimes legislation, including the State of Wyoming. Some States who have made a good-faith effort find that their legislation is overbroad and vague, and therefore it is not a valuable tool for prosecutors.

In talking to U.S. attorneys who would have to prosecute this law, this Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1998, they say it clearly answers the question of preciseness, because it delineates those who would be covered by such a law. It enhances the sentencing for those who would perpetrate violence because others are different.

Do we want to live in a country that accepts a random, reckless attack because you happen to be an African American walking along a lonely road, or you happen to be someone of a dif-

ferent sexual orientation who is sitting in a bar, minding his or her own business, engaging in what most Americans would like to do, enjoying themselves?

Do we want to be a Nation who points the finger at others who are violating human rights, and yet we do not have the courage to stand up and pass legislation, simple as it might be, in order to protect those who are different?

□ 1745

I call upon my colleagues in these last hours of this session, if we do anything as we have done to help our children and others, can we not stand up for human rights and human justice? Can we not pass the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1998? I hope the answer is a resounding "yes."

DETAILS OF THE FINAL OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, we are coming to the end of the session here and we have a tentative agreement reached on how we are going to continue this government for fiscal year 1999. We found out that we can agree with this President.

Now, he did think that he got his way on the 100,000 teachers program and IMF funding, and we are glad that the \$18 billion is there for IMF funding with the needed reforms that were associated with it, and we are glad that we have additional money for teachers.

But I wonder if anybody has actually done the math. The President said that he wants 100,000 teachers and we set aside a billion dollars to do that. If we divide 100,000 teachers into a billion dollars, I know this is high level math for some, if we divide it out we get \$10,000 per teacher. I would ask my colleagues to go back to their districts and ask any teacher if they are willing to start a new full-time job for \$10,000 a year. I know that when my wife was teaching in the public schools in the late 1970s, she was willing to teach for \$10,000 a year in southwest Missouri, and the cost of living was not nearly as high as it is today. I think at best we will get 30,000 teachers out of this program, and they will be paid some reasonable sum.

But more importantly, the Republicans insisted on and won the provision that says that this money will go directly to the classroom. This money will not be spent in Washington, D.C. on the bureaucracy. Right now we have a Department of Education bureaucracy and the average salary at the Department of Education is \$52,000 per year. There are millions of people across the United States that would like to teach for \$52,000 a year. I can think of a lot of them in Wichita, Kansas, where the average salary is below \$30,000. I think rather than waste the

money here, it is much more important that we send that money directly to the school districts.

One other thing that we agreed on with the President is that there is a surplus that can be spent on something other than saving Social Security. I think we need to keep in mind that the Republicans have put at the top of their list that we need to save Social Security and we passed a bill that said that 90 percent of the surplus would be set aside for saving Social Security and 10 percent would go to tax relief.

The President has insisted that we do not have any tax relief this time, but we wanted to make sure that we did have that money available. He has agreed that it is available, except he wants to spend it on the bureaucracy. So, we have agreed, in order to get some type of compromise, we have agreed with the President that we would take the Republican priorities and spend some of that on emergency spending.

One of those things that we did for emergency spending was provide tax relief for the financially strapped farmers. If my colleagues have been following the nationwide news, and certainly in Kansas it has been followed closely, farmers have been having a hard time this year. Weather has been a problem. Around the world prices have been depressed and that has caused a lower demand for farm commodities and so the prices have been down. Combine that with the natural problems that we had with the weather, and it has been a tough year.

We have also provided tax relief for farmers and other self-employed individuals by allowing 100 percent deductibility of their insurance premiums.

One of the other things that was a great victory for the Republicans in this settlement is that we now have much-needed increased funds for national defense. About \$9 billion of emergency spending for defense and intelligence needs.

This administration has increased the work level of the Department of Defense much more than any other bureaucracy that we have here in Washington, D.C., and yet they have limited the funds. They have tried to divert the funds. They have allowed much of it to be wasted, and they have sent people overseas on numerous missions. Bosnia comes to mind, and now we are looking at Kosovo. We have had intervention in Haiti and in Africa and different places.

Mr. Speaker, all of this costs money and the administration has been more than willing to send our young men and women abroad and not fund it. Well, because of that, we have created an emergency in our national defense system. We are going to now, with this final bill, be able to do something for our young men and women who are willing to risk their lives.

We also have some relief here for the need that we have to provide for our national defense. We have about a bil-

lion dollars that have been set aside for missile defense. Most people do not realize that we have no defense for incoming ballistic missiles. We have had in the past a policy of mutually assured destruction. We would not fire on anybody else because they would fire back on us and vice versa. If someone was to fire an intercontinental ballistic missile on the United States, they could be assured that we would enjoy their country too. And so this mutually assured destruction has been our policy.

Now, with the breakdown of the USSR and other Third World countries becoming nuclear powers, we find that we have no policy that is working and this mutually assured destruction cannot be guaranteed when we have terrorists that we are dealing with. So, it is very important that our country provide for a missile defense system.

We have now, because of the Republicans in our negotiation, our leadership in negotiations, we have provided the first step in continuing this missile defense program that is much-needed.

There are other provisions in here that were very important that we see become law. We are now protecting children from pornography on the Internet. We are now going to stop needle exchange programs, which have been proven not to work.

So we think that we have a good settlement and a good agreement and it shows that our system of democracy does work. Nobody got 100 percent of what they wanted, but we got an agreement and we are moving forward to make sure that this country is safe and secure and that our needs are met.

CONGRESSIONAL WOMEN'S CAUCUS LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

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. Mr. Speaker, I have kept the count for the Women's Congressional Caucus of our legislative achievements in a productive session for our achievements, working closely with my Republican co-chair, the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

I come to the floor this afternoon cheered to know that one of the last of our seven must-pass provisions has now finally been passed, after having been passed several times, twice in the Senate and in the House, and that is a provision that will allow the full range of contraceptive drugs and devices for Federal employees who faced Federal insurance that was very diverse in what was offered.

This was a major fight. Abortion politics somehow made its way into this mainstream contraceptive issue. Finally, it has been settled and these drugs will be provided. That means that four of the seven must-pass bills of the Women's Caucus, which is a bi-

partisan caucus in the House has been passed.

We are grateful that the reauthorization of the Mammography Quality Standards Act was passed; the reauthorization and strengthening of sections of the Violence Against Women Act occurred; that a new Commission on Women, Minorities and People with Disabilities in Science, Engineering and Technology Jobs will take place.

Now that the contraceptive priority has passed, the House and the Senate have now been passed four out of seven of our priorities. It shows what bipartisanship can get us if we are willing to do it.

The women of the Congress have set the example for the entire Congress. I do want this body to know that in addition to our annual must-pass provisions, there were other legislative priorities that the caucus had and that were passed.

I am particularly cheered that gender-integrated military training, a strong bipartisan goal of the Women's Caucus, occurred. And my hat is off to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER), who were on the committee and carried the matter for the caucus.

Child care, as we desired it, did not come about because no bill came to the floor. But I am pleased to note that \$45 million was included in the Higher Education Reauthorization Act for campus-based child care.

Mr. Speaker, with all of the concern about taxes, this House did not overlook the need for tax relief for innocent spouses, women who were left holding the bag after divorce when taxes they did not know were not paid fell to them.

The Women's Caucus has led the notion that women and minorities are to be included in clinical trials. Now we have been able to get that proposition accepted under the Federal Food and Drug Administration Reform Act.

Mr. Speaker, child support enforcement continues to be a priority concern of the congressional women. We are moving along incrementally until this full job is done. There are incentive funds that we have passed in order to improve the performance of child support enforcement programs. We take heart that it has now become a felony if parents do not pay their child support for a year, or if they owe more than \$5,000. That is what a felony ought to be, when we consider what is at stake is the lives of children.

We are pleased that the House, in fact, has helped displaced homemakers find job skills. These are women who will not qualify for welfare, many of them divorced or separated, women who now under the Job Training Reauthorization Act will in fact be able to get job training targeted and focused on them.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to the floor this week already with a strong set of disappointments about women's issues.