

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