

Several school districts are banning military recruiters for social reasons. For some reason they just do not believe in the ideology of a military. So, therefore, they rob students of the privilege of hearing about the opportunities available in the Armed Services.

If school board members wish to oppose the military in their private lives, of course, in this Nation, they have the freedom to do so. Ironically, they have that freedom because men and women, of course, have served in the military and have sacrificed their lives for Americans to have this freedom. But to impose their personal ideology, their views, on a federally-funded public school is not right.

The Washington Times, on May 29 this year, reported about a resolution passed by the San Francisco Unified School District during the height, during the height of the Persian Gulf War, while our men and women were putting their lives at risk. It said, "Unbridled military spending in the last 40 years has, in large part, been responsible for the growing national debt and for inadequate spending on education and other necessary social services." This resolution was coupled with the school board's determination to deny the military all access to their school campuses or student lists. School board members should take their views to the polls, not restrict access to public schools by our military recruiters.

The United States Navy missed its recruiting goal by nearly 7,000 sailors in 1998, forcing many ships to be deployed understaffed. In response, the Navy's leadership decided in 1999 to accept a higher percentage of recruits without high school diplomas. That same year, both the U.S. Army and the U.S. Air Force also missed their recruiting goals.

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

Mr. STEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the policy expressed in the amendment, and we would accept the amendment.

Mr. STEARNS. I appreciate the Chairman's acceptance. If I could, Mr. Chairman, I just would like to finish my statement. How much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

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

Mr. STEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, we are informed by the Secretary of Education that they have no intention of trying to prevent this kind of activity. In fact, the Secretary indicates he sent a letter urging them to emphasize the value of military service as a post high school option.

So, since it does not really do anything that I know of, I have no problem with accepting it.

Mr. STEARNS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues, and I conclude by saying that we should support our military tonight. My amendment helps them to gain access so that they have the opportunity to get future soldiers.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 518, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. PAUL:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to promulgate or adopt any final standard under section 1173(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320d-2(b)).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, June 12, 2000, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment says that none of the funds in this appropriation can be used for implementing a uniform medical identifier. It is a privacy amendment. It was in the bill in 1998 and 1999. I think it would be a good idea to have it in this year's bill.

This comes from authority granted in the Health Insurance Portability Act of 1996 and it was designed to establish a medical data bank. But because many, on both sides of the aisle, have objected to this invasion of privacy to set up a medical data bank, there has been some resistance to this. Although the removal of the authority would be the proper way to solve this problem once and for all, I think that it would be very appropriate to continue the policy of not permitting any Federal funding to be spent on developing this universal medical identifier, which by all indications would be our Social Security numbers.

Many people object to this invasion of privacy. They do not place full trust in the U.S. Congress and in the U.S. Government to protect our privacy.

Many say that this would not be an invasion of privacy and there would be some strict rules and regulations about how this medical information would be used, but that is not enough reassurance.

As a physician, I can tell my colleagues that this form of invasion of our medical privacy will not serve us well in medical care. What it leads to is incomplete and inaccurate medical records, because it becomes known to the patient as well as the physician that once this information is accumulated that it might get in the hands of the politicians and used for reasons other than for medical care, I think, it could damage medical care endangered from having a medical data bank set up.

The American people have spoken out strongly in recent years about their invasion of privacy. There was a proposal to implement a know-your-customer bank regulations. These were soundly rejected by the people, and I think that this same sentiment applies to the medical data bank. Also, efforts to establish a national identification card for the American people has not met with a great deal of acceptance with the American people.

So my effort here in limiting this development of a universal medical identifier is to keep the Federal Government out of this business. It is too easy for abuse of this type of information to occur. We have heard that the various administrations over the years have abused records kept in the IRS as well as the FBI. This would just be another source of information that individuals could use in a negative fashion.

I believe it is a fallacy for those who promote the setting up of a universal medical identifier and a universal medical data bank that it is an effort to simplify the process, to streamline the system, to make government more efficient, to facilitate medical research. It has also been said this could be used in law enforcement. But just think about this. If these records can be turned over without the approval of the patient to law enforcement, it really, quite clearly, is a violation of the fifth amendment of self-incrimination. So this idea that this medical bank might be beneficial for law enforcement is rather scary and something that we should prevent.

Already, under authority that was given to Health and Human Services, they have started to draw up regulations which regulate privacy matters, not so much the medical data bank but in other areas. The other thing that concerns me a great deal is these medical regulations that have been proposed not only deal with the privacy of somebody that may be receiving medical care from Medicare but also in the private sector.

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

Mr. PAUL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the policy of this amendment

also, and we would be happy to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. PAUL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to accept the amendment on this side of the aisle. I think the gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to engage in a colloquy with my colleague from Illinois.

Both the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, and the gentleman from Illinois have been tremendous supporters of the asthma programs under the CDC Chronic and Environmental Disease Prevention program. Members on both sides of the aisle have agreed that this program is critical in addressing the increases in asthma amongst children. Under the subcommittee's leadership last year, we were able to provide an increase of \$10 million to this program. This year the total CDC Chronic and Environmental Disease budget was approved for an increase of over \$21 million, bringing its overall total to \$317 million. While this commitment is a wonderful step in the right direction, it is my hope that the subcommittee will continue its work in conference to assure that increases for asthma control and prevention are continued.

Asthma rates are rising dramatically across this country in all populations. Tragically, our children, in fact, are affected the most. Between 1980 and 1994, the rate of asthma incidence rose by 160 percent for children under 4 years of age. Across the Nation, 17 million Americans, 5 million of them children, are afflicted with asthma. As an asthmatic myself, I can assure my colleagues that prevention programs are vital. They teach asthmatics as well as their families how to develop strategies within the home to reduce allergens, as well as to treat the disease of asthma.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the commitment of the gentleman from Illinois to the CDC and its programs regarding asthma control, and it is my hope that the gentleman will continue to work throughout this legislative process to ensure that the issue is provided additional funding in the final bill.

In this regard, Mr. Chairman, I know it is the gentleman's last year in this body, and I want to thank him for all of his hard work. He has been critical to our Nation's health programs, and I

know that all of our Members widely regard the gentleman as just having been a great champion for the NIH and for so many important areas. There are few Members who have worked so hard on areas of critical concern, like our health care system, and the gentleman has been terrific.

I also want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for his efforts in his position as ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations. He has also attended to our national health programs with the utmost of integrity, and I want to thank the both of them for showing what it means to be both good appropriators as well as supporters of essential health programs.

Mr. PORTER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for his very kind words.

We have agreed in the subcommittee that the increased prevalence of asthma is of great concern. My sister is a sufferer from asthma. She is in the hospital right at this time.

As the gentleman mentioned, last year we increased the CDC Chronic and Environmental Disease program by \$10 million. We have provided an additional \$21 million this year for all programs in this account. The gentleman can be sure that we will do our best through the remainder of the process and within budget constraints of the bill to increase funding for asthma control programs.

I will be pleased to work with the gentleman from Rhode Island on this issue.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I want to thank him and wish his sister a speedy recovery.

□ 1830

PART B AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. WILSON

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B Amendment printed in House Report 106-657 offered by Mrs. WILSON:

Page 84, after line 21, insert the following new section:

SEC. 518. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES", and increasing the amount made available for "HIGHER EDUCATION", by \$25,000,000, to be used to carry out the 21st Century Teaching Scholarships Act, if such legislation is enacted.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 518, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON).

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have at the desk and that I am offering today launches a G.I. bill for teachers.

I recognize that some may oppose this amendment today for procedural reasons and others for ideological reasons, but I believe it is very important for this country to lower our voices and to raise our sights with respect to public education and to embrace the greatest challenge that we face in the 21st century. And I believe that that is public education.

I want to commend the chairman and the ranking member for bringing forward a bill that does increase funds for education. While I realize that there are still disagreements on details and on programs, this bill does include an almost 10 percent increase in education in the bill, and I support additional increases as we go on.

But I do not think that we can do things the same old way and expect different results. We know that we are going to have a shortage in this country of 2 million teachers that we will need to hire over the next decade. I believe we need to get the best and the brightest we possibly can and get them, train them, and put them in the classroom. I would like to start this year.

I introduced a bill earlier this year which I call the GI Bill for Teachers. It is much larger than the amendment that I am offering today, but I would like to get a start.

The amendment that I am offering today would take \$25 million to start this GI Bill for Teachers. It would provide scholarships of \$10,000 a year for full-time students, \$5,000 a year for part-time students. Students who would be eligible include high school graduates, as well as certified teachers; and those scholarships would be available for up to 5 years for each student.

The idea is that teachers would give back 2 years in the classroom for every year that they are on full-time scholarship, or 1 year given back in service for every year that they are in a turnaround school, a school that has been identified by the State as one that needs to improve its performance for its students.

The scholarship program gives the money to the States based on student population, and it has the States set up selection boards and those selections would be based on merit.

It also allows States to set up up to 35 percent of the value of the scholarship to recruit teachers into critical-shortage areas so States like my own that are short of bilingual teachers or short of secondary school teachers in mathematics and science could set that as a special area of concern and try to recruit young people who are the best and the brightest to teach in those areas.

This is only a beginning. It would create 2,500 scholarships for young people who are committed to the profession of teaching or even for teaching assistants who want to go back to