

ought to be talking to States and local school districts and holding them accountable for what they have achieved. Because this is not about managing process. If it is, we know this education department cannot do it. This is about something much more important. It is about educating our children.

So we give the schools more flexibility, and we eliminate the red tape, which gets more dollars into that local classroom. And from a practical sense, what does this mean? It means that a school, rather than getting money for class-size reduction or hiring teachers and getting another pot of money for technology, getting another pot of money for some school construction or school modification, getting some other money for the arts, getting some other money for some other kind of training and these types of things, it is giving the money to the States and to the local schools and telling them that if they need to focus on technology, if they think technology is the answer, that we will give them the flexibility to improve the technology within their school.

That may be exactly what some of the schools in my congressional district would need, and they would have the flexibility to go out and do that. For others, they might say that they have invested in technology; but when they did, they found out that what they really needed to do, in addition to that, but they do not have the money to do it, is they need to invest in teacher training so that they could use these tools to be most effective with our kids. Let them use the money for teacher training.

If they need to use some of the money for school construction, let them use the money for school construction. But allow them the flexibility of designing the programs that are most effective for the problems, the issues, and the opportunities that they have in their local schools. Because this is about our kids. It is not about process. It is not about the education department. This is about how do we get the maximum impact in learning for our kids.

Are we going to get it by mandating from Washington and controlling from Washington; or is it going to be by continuing to invest in education through Washington, through an education department, but allowing a great degree of latitude and flexibility to the people at the local level? The local people know our kids' names, they are the people that know the school, the problems, the opportunities, and the issues that they face. The local people know the neighborhoods, know the communities, knowing exactly, maybe not exactly, it is not a science, but the local people will have the best idea as to how they could improve education in their local community.

And if they then had a resource of a Department of Education where they could go to for best learning practices or best teaching practices, what a

great partnership that might be. Local decision-making; research-based data and information to empower people at the local level to make the best possible decisions for our kids.

It is not an issue about money. We have spent and invested a lot of money in education over the years. This is a question of how we invest that money most effectively. Not even necessarily most efficiently, although that would be nice, but how do we invest it most effectively. Do we invest it through a Washington-based model or do we invest it through a locally based model?

The difference was so striking last week. The Washington-based model, with quality individuals working at the Department of Education, who have the best interests of our kids in mind, but for the second year in a row cannot even be held accountable for how they spent these education dollars on our kids. Compare that picture with the education department who cannot even take the time to put in place the policies, the procedures and the practices to track \$35 billion. Compare that to the caring and the passion that we saw on Friday where we had these individuals coming in and talking about what they were doing, improving test scores; integrating technology; reclaiming their kids; reclaiming their neighborhoods; and making a difference in their communities.

There was a concern demonstrated in attention to detail. A Department of Education that does not have the right policies and practices in place sends out erroneous information to 39 young people telling them they have a scholarship, when they really did not and then has to call them back, versus the local decision-making where the people that we saw last Friday are concerned about each and every child in that school and making sure that each and every one of those children is going to be successful, and doing what needs to be done to ensure that that is the result, forming the partnerships with business leaders, forming the partnerships with parents to make a real difference in their communities and these children's lives.

It is a really sharp contrast; a department that erroneously identifies scholarship winners, a department that makes duplicate payments, a department that prints forms wrong, a department that currently has a vigorous investigation into computer theft, a department that has fraud in a student loan program, and a department that has an account with over \$500 million in it, or at least in 1998, that they cannot tell us how it got there or where it is going.

Then compare that to the passion that, in many cases where these are charter schools, they are facing a lot of odds against their success. They have to build those schools. They do not get construction dollars. They just get their per-pupil funds. And in many cases they do not even get all the Federal dollars. The Federal dollars do not

follow these students. But in each one of these cases, they are people passionate for what they are doing in their communities.

I think the final element of a reform package in education is reforming the Department of Education into a research-based learning think tank that is a resource to the rest of the country, freeing up dollars within the bureaucracy to invest in our kids. So taking money out of Washington and putting it back in the classroom, that is the second step. The third step is taking money out of the process and moving it back to the local level, out of the red tape. And the fourth part is investing more in education by providing parents and businesses the opportunity to take credit, tax credits, for investing in education.

There is a formula for improving education, but it is taking decision-making out of Washington and moving it back to parents and local school districts where we can really make a difference.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject matter of my special order and the special order of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

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

There was no objection.

GLOBAL HEALTH ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, we here in the United States, and throughout the world, are celebrating International Women's Day.

1830

Unfortunately, too many women in the world today have no cause for celebration. Nearly 600,000 women die each year from complications of pregnancy and child birth. That is one woman every minute. Of these deaths, 99 percent take place in the developing world, where maternal deaths account for up to one-third of all deaths of women of child-bearing age.

According to the World Health Organization, for every maternal death that occurs worldwide, an estimated 30 additional women suffer pregnancy-related health problems that can be permanently debilitating. A woman's lifetime risk of dying from pregnancy-related complications or during child birth can be as high as one in 15 in developing countries, as compared to one in 7,000 in developed countries.

Mr. Speaker, more than 150 million married women in developing nations

still want to space or limit child bearing but do not have access to modern contraceptives. Yet, Mr. Speaker, despite these startling estimates, the U.S. commitment to women's health remains woefully inadequate. And that is why I, along with 22 other colleagues, have introduced legislation to increase the U.S. commitment to women's health by \$300 million as part of a legislation known as the Global Health Act of 2000.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3826, the Global Health Act of 2000, authorizes additional resources to improve children's and women's health and nutrition, provide access to voluntary family planning, and combat the spread of infectious diseases, particularly HIV/AIDS.

Only the Global Health Act represents a comprehensive, balanced approach that builds upon proven existing programs to increase the U.S. commitment to go balance health as effectively as possible.

Over 100 groups, such as the Global Health Council, Save the Children, the Salvation Army World Services, and the Global AIDS Action Network support the Global Health Act 2000.

Mr. Speaker, in August of 1999, my constituents were shocked to learn that an outbreak of West Nile-like encephalitis had surfaced for the first time in the western hemisphere in the heart of my congressional district in Queens and the Bronx. This outbreak was a wake-up call for every American, not just New Yorkers. It illustrated that the Global community has truly become a local community.

As demonstrated by HIV/AIDS, West Nile-like encephalitis and tuberculosis, a disease, Mr. Speaker, respects no borders. An outbreak in Africa, Europe, Asia, or South America can travel to U.S. shores within days. No longer can diseases occurring in far-off lands be ignored. They pose a direct threat to the national security of our great country and must be addressed by the U.S. Government, this Congress, and the international community as a whole. Diseases cannot be seized by Customs, and they do not apply at the U.S. Embassy for a visa. The only way to stop them is to target them at their source.

The Global Health Act recognizes this and emphasizes the interconnectedness of global health by calling for increased funding for child survival, women's health and nutrition, reducing unintended pregnancies, and combating the spread of other infectious diseases. It also calls for increased coordination between the different government agencies administering health programs.

Mr. Speaker, with the resources provided under the Global Health Act and the assistance of other nations, we can make a profound difference in the health and well-being of millions of the world's poorest citizens, especially women, and protect our own national security at the same time.

We are the greatest power the world has ever known. We cannot continue to

keep our head in the sand on this international issue. We have to recognize that we do not live in a cocoon. We can tackle this problem as a Nation and as a world, but first we have to face up to it.

I had the great opportunity this afternoon to meet with the present Miss Universe. Her name escapes me at this time. But she is from Botswana, Africa. She came to talk to me today about the bill that I am sponsoring, the Global Health Act 2000.

To lend her voice in support, I know that she met with a number of Members of the House today, I believe also Members of the Senate, to bring attention, much needed attention, to this issue. She spoke personally to me about her homeland and about her home continent.

She is headquartered today in New York. She sees it and I view it myself as the headquarters of the world. We will not say the capital of the world, but certainly it is the headquarters of the world. It is convenient in that it is the home to the U.N. But also, New York at times can command international attention.

We are happy that she is in New York working on this very, very important issue and, at the same time, sparing some time from her busy schedule to come down here to Washington to lobby Members of the House and the Senate on this important issue to get their support. We need more support for this legislation. I hope we can all keep this in mind as we observe today International Women's Day.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to address an issue deserving of much attention by the international community and especially the U.S. government. In honor of International Women's Health Day, I believe it is especially relevant for us to reaffirm our commitment to global health.

I urge my fellow Members today to support the legislation that recognizes the overwhelming problem of the spread of infectious diseases across the world.

Children are suffering as we speak. More than 10,000,000 children under 5 years of age die annually in developing nations from preventable causes.

As founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I must emphasize the tragic circumstances of children across the world.

As a Cosponsor of this legislation, I must stress the need for the Congress to increase our commitment to global health.

Global Health concerns all persons, American citizens included.

The CDC alone cannot stop the spread of disease worldwide and although imposing, Customs cannot seize diseases at country checkpoints. So we must not allow ourselves to assume that outbreaks in other countries will not affect Americans also.

Infectious diseases such as HIV/AIDS and malaria are of the type that must be continually monitored and studied in order to prevent future outbreaks.

Investing in global health will help prevent the spread of these types of diseases because

it is a preventative measure and we all know that prevention is the best method of elimination.

Over 100 national organizations support our commitment to global health, which should signal to any skeptic the national appeal of this legislation.

Organizations such as Save the Children, the Salvation Army, and the Global AIDS Action Network are the type that all party member can recognize as being committed to the health of all notwithstanding their ethnic or religious affiliation.

In this Congress today, we will be continuing the debate over whether prescriptions can be included for Senior Citizens under a health insurance plan called Medicare, yet most persons across the world do not even have basic health coverage.

This is an issue that should cut across partisan lines. What we are asking for today simply is funding to provide such basic health coverage such as immunizations, reproductive health services and educational programs informing families about proper nutrition and infant care.

Furthermore, this legislation would assist in preventing the spread of HIV/AIDS, which has become the world's leading infectious disease threat, with 34,000,000 people infected worldwide.

This disease is spread between Children also. Daily, more than 7,000 new cases occur each day in people between the ages of 10 and 24.

An investment of an additional \$1 billion dollars for global health for such a wealthy nation is not too much to ask for the survival of the people in this world.

Over 13 million die annually from preventable or curable diseases and we must not be so isolationists to believe that this number does not include American as well. Let us make the commitment to invest in global health—our health. This is a subject that can no longer be ignored.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE).

HONORING UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT WILMINGTON MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the University of North Carolina at Wilmington men's basketball team for their tremendous accomplishment this week. Their spirit and determination throughout the entire season has been an inspiration to all of us and especially the young people everywhere.

This past Monday, the UNCW Seahawks defeated the University of Richmond 57-47 to win the Colonial Athletic Conference Tournament for the first time in school history. This is truly an amazing achievement for coach Jerry Wainright and the entire Seahawk team. UNCW was the number four seed in the CAA tournament and had to defeat the number one ranked team just to make it to the finals. The Seahawks will now embark on a new journey, playing in the NCAA tournament for the first time ever.

Throughout the year, the Seahawks have represented the students and faculty of UNCW well by sticking together and demonstrating good sportsmanship. Jerry Wainright, the coach, has

instilled in his players the ethic of dedication, sacrifice, and teamwork in the pursuit of excellence, following the rules, and instilled in the rest of us in this Nation a sincere and renewed appreciation of what it means to win with dignity and integrity.

I am sure that the Seahawks will demonstrate these important characteristics on the national stage as we all get ready for the March madness of the NCAA basketball tournament.

I hope my fellow colleagues will join me in congratulating this extraordinary group of young men and their coaches, parents, and classmates and others who support and cheered them on and made this year a special year to them and their example to others.

Congratulations to the Seahawks.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I just want to point out, for the record, that I know a number of Members have submitted statements on behalf of the bill that I spoke about this evening, the Global Health Act of 2000, including the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). She has submitted statements. I want to thank the gentlewoman and the other original cosponsors of the original Global Health Act 2000, H.R. 3826.

BILATERAL AGREEMENT ON ACCESSION TO WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION WITH PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106-207)

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 Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Last November, after years of negotiation, we completed a bilateral agreement on accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO) with the People's Republic of China (Agreement). The Agreement will dramatically cut import barriers currently imposed on American products and services. It is enforceable and will lock in and expand access to virtually all sectors of China's economy. The Agreement meets the high standards we set in all areas, from creating export opportunities for our businesses, farmers, and working people, to strengthening our guarantees of fair trade. It is clearly in our economic interest. China is concluding agreements with our countries to accede to the WTO. The issue is whether Americans get the full benefit of the strong agreement we negotiated. To do that, we need to enact permanent Normal Trade Relations (NTR) for China.

We give up nothing with this Agreement. As China enters the WTO, the United States makes no changes in current market access policies. We pre-

serve our right to withdraw market access for China in the event of a national security emergency. We make no changes in laws controlling the export of sensitive technology. We amend none of our trade laws. In fact, our protections against unfair trade practices and potential import surges are stronger with the Agreement than without it.

Our choice is clear. We must enact permanent NTR for China or risk losing the full benefits of the Agreement we negotiated, including broad market access, special import protections, and rights to enforce China's commitments through WTO dispute settlement. All WTO members, including the United States, pledge to grant one another permanent NTR to enjoy the full benefits in one another's markets. If the Congress were to fail to pass permanent NTR for China, our Asian, Latin American, Canadian, and European competitors would reap these benefits, but American farmers and other workers and our businesses might well be left behind.

We are firmly committed to vigorous monitoring and enforcement of China's commitments, and will work closely with the Congress on this. We will maximize use of the WTO's review mechanisms, strengthen U.S. monitoring and enforcement capabilities, ensure regular reporting to the Congress on China's compliance, and enforce the strong China-specific import surge protections we negotiated. I have requested significant new funding for China trade compliance.

We must also continue our efforts to make the WTO itself more open, transparent, and participatory, and to elevate consideration of labor and the environment in trade. We must recognize the value that the WTO serves today in fostering a global, rules-based system of international trade—one that has fostered global growth and prosperity over the past half century. Bringing China into that rules-based system advances the right kind of reform in China.

The Agreement is in the fundamental interest of American security and reform in China. By integrating China more fully into the Pacific and global economies, it will strengthen China's stake in peace and stability. Within China, it will help to develop the rule of law; strengthen the role of market forces; and increase the contacts China's citizens have with each other and the outside world. While we will continue to have strong disagreements with China over issues ranging from human rights to religious tolerance to foreign policy, we believe that bringing China into the WTO pushes China in the right direction in all of these areas.

I, therefore, with this letter transmit to the Congress legislation authorizing the President to terminate application of Title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 to the People's Republic of China and extend permanent Normal Trade Relations treatment to products from China. The legislation specifies that

the President's determination becomes effective only when China becomes a member of the WTO, and only after a certification that the terms and conditions of China's accession to the WTO are at least equivalent to those agreed to between the United States and China in our November 15, 1999, Agreement. I urge that the Congress consider this legislation as soon as possible.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 8, 2000.

1845

NATIONAL MONEY LAUNDERING STRATEGY FOR 2000—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) 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 Committees on Judiciary and Banking and Financial Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the provisions of section 2(a) of Public Law 105-310 (18 U.S.C. 5341(a)(2)), I transmit herewith the National Money Laundering Strategy for 2000.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 8, 2000.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

2215

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 376, THE ORBIT ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-514) on the resolution (H. Res. 432) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the Senate bill (S. 376) to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to promote competition and privatization in satellite communications, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.