

Another program was the English Fluency Act. This legislation is directed at reforming the current Bilingual Education Act to provide funds to states to address the needs of English language learners and ensure that they learn English as soon as possible.

Another program, the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act. The purpose of this legislation is to help local areas have safer schools.

I could go on for another 10 or 12 programs, but the bottom line is the Republicans believe in local schools and local empowerment. We think you can spend your money more wisely than any government agency and that you will love your children more than any government program.

PROGRESS REPORT ON CONGRESS

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, we can talk all we want here, or the Republicans can talk all they want, about what they are going to do in terms of education, because most of the legislation that was just read by the gentleman in the well is legislation that they have proposed, it is legislation that may have passed this House, it is legislation that they cannot get agreement with the Senate on, or it is legislation that has come out of the committee but their caucus is in disagreement on much of that legislation.

I appreciate and I was at the signing with the bipartisan delegation of the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. That is what Congress is supposed to do. Congress is supposed to reauthorize that act when it comes due and there is no Congress that has failed to do that.

But this Congress has failed to do much more. It has failed to meet the needs of America's schoolchildren by failing to address the need to reduce class size for our younger students. It has refused to meet the need to improve our schools, the crumbling schools, some \$12 billion worth of construction that is immediately necessary, not only to make schools safe, not only to make them healthy for our children, not only to modernize those that need it, but also to make them ready for the technology that is the key to much of the educational opportunity for the students.

So this Congress has struck out on education. This Congress has struck out on managed care, where they decided they would go with the monied interest of the insurance companies and the HMO companies against the American people, against the American people and their desire to once again have a doctor-patient relationship, a doctor-patient relationship that deals with the health care problems of the patient, as opposed to the bottom line and the stock price of the HMO corporation or of the insurance company

that keeps meddling with the decisions of doctors to prescribe medicine, to prescribe treatment, to prescribe tests or to prescribe surgery.

Each and every time the doctor wants to do this, he has to pick up the phone, the doctor has to call an 800 number, get some bureaucrat on the phone and say can I have an MRI? I believe this person may have a tumor. Can I have surgery? We have discovered a tumor and now we would like to cut it out on a timely basis.

They say no, you are going to have to wait 30 days. No, send them out for massage, send them to the whirlpool. Send them anywhere except to surgery, where they need it to try to stem the ravages of cancer or other malignancies.

That is what the American people have asked us to do. This Congress could not do it. This Congress could not do it because they decided they would deal with the money interests, just as they decided they would deal with the monied interests and they would kill campaign finance reform, they would kill the ability of the American people to have a greater participation in the election process, to develop grassroots, to make sure the people in our districts are not overridden by all of the soft money that comes in in the last days of a campaign. This Congress struck out in that effort.

This Congress struck out on the effort for tobacco legislation, to try to recover for the Federal taxpayer some of the billions of dollars that they have spent in the Medicare program taking care of the victims of tobacco, taking care of the victims of cancer that is related to tobacco. The states are recovering that, but somehow the Federal Government is unable to do that. Why? Because they could not stop the flow of the tobacco contributions to the Republican party. They just could not get off that addiction that they have, not only to tobacco, but to tobacco campaign contributions. So this Congress struck out on that.

Finally, as Americans are working harder and harder and more Americans are working more than ever, we thought they ought to at least get a wage to allow them to support their families. But this Congress could not see it that way. It decided that once again it would go with their campaign contributions from the Small Business Association, from the Restaurant Association, and they would deny America an increase in the minimum wage, so those people who are working at the minimum wage would be able to support themselves and their families.

These are people that go to work all week long, all month long and all year long, but at the end of the year, they end up poor. So what do we do? We have the government subsidize them in food stamps, we have the government subsidize them in housing, we have the government subsidize them in medical care, because their wages do not allow

them to procure these basic necessities of life for them or their family. Why? Because the minimum wage is not high enough.

But this Congress, this do-nothing Congress, chose not to do anything about the minimum wage, not to do anything about managed care, not to do anything about campaign finance reform, not to do anything about the crucial bills dealing with the improvement of education and bills to protect the environment.

So this Congress that has only worked 108 days this year, this Congress that has chosen to be out of town more days than it has been here, this Congress that has chosen to come to work Tuesday night at five o'clock and leave Thursday night at five o'clock, this Congress that chose to extend the August break an extra week, this Congress that chose not to work in January, February or March more than a couple of days, this Congress now cannot find time to deal with the basic necessities of our children's education, to get a budget and to pass the appropriations bills.

That is why this Congress is being hailed by editorial boards and people all over the country as a do-nothing Congress. And I would just ask the same courtesies on time that you give the Republican Members on the other side of the aisle. The Chair belongs to the whole House, not to one party or the other.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY of Texas). The Chair will attempt to enforce strictly the five-minute limit on both sides of the aisle.

REPORT ON BIPARTISAN LEGISLATION

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I will lower the decibels. I do not have any reason to make any political statements. I do not have that need. The President, on the other hand, has misled the American people with a radio address yesterday, and I think I should try to make sure the American people truly understand what is going on. In his speech, in which he dealt primarily with education, he said we should be able to make real bipartisan progress on education.

Well, Mr. President, in the entire history of this body, there has never been a greater effort at bipartisan legislation in relationship to education, and in the last 24 years, I can assure you there has never been a better effort.

So, Mr. President, we sent you the Higher Education Act, a bipartisan effort. We sent you special education, IDEA. We sent you the Workforce Investment Act. We sent you loan forgiveness for new teachers. We sent you

quality teaching grants. We sent you emergency student loan. They are all law, Mr. President. We sent you seven.

We also have awaiting on your desk school nutrition, including help after school, so that we can try to deal with the problems of juvenile delinquency. We sent you charter school legislation, Mr. President, in bipartisan fashion, \$100 million extra every year for five years. We sent you quality Head Start. And what are your people trying to do? They are trying to eliminate the quality from the Head Start bill that we sent to you.

We have sent you vocational education for the 21st Century, not the 20th or the 19th. We sent you community service block grant. We sent you \$500 million extra for special education, and you sent a budget up here which as a matter of fact reduced spending for special education.

We have a Reading Excellence Act waiting for you to sign, Mr. President. All you have to do is decide whether that is truly your first priority, and it surely should be your first priority. All of those bills, 14, and a lot of them in a bipartisan fashion.

Well, you said in your speech that our Nation needs 100,000 new highly qualified teachers to reduce class size in the early grades. Mr. President, where do you get your statistics? Every study I have seen has indicated that there is no shortage of elementary teachers now or in the foreseeable future. We have more than 100,000 elementary teachers now who are working in department stores, who are working at fast food places, who are working in offices, because they cannot get a teaching job.

Now, Mr. President, there are some places where they need teachers, but these 150,000 who are out there who do not have a teaching job did not want to go to center city, did not want to go to rural America. So what did we do to try to help that situation? If you read our higher education bill, Mr. President, you will discover that we give some breaks in relationship to your loan that you have if you will go to center city, if you will go to rural America.

Now, Mr. President, if you know the Elementary Secondary Education Act, you also know that Title I allows them to employ teachers. If you wanted to do that, why not increase that amount of money?

You see, as I said at the White House, who gets credit is not important if you are trying to help improve the quality of education. So you do not need something special that says, "I get credit because I did this." It is there. It is in Title I. All you have to do is put more money in that particular area.

In the higher education bill we also dealt with quality, because you mentioned quality. We made it very clear to all teaching training institutions, this is the 21st Century and we expect you to turn out quality teachers for that 21st Century. Right in the bill, Mr. President. You signed it. I was there.

□ 1445

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to the President in the second person.

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

(Mr. DOGGETT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE ROLE OF FEDERAL MONEY IN EDUCATION

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to my statement that I made in the 1-minute on the spirit I felt in this country when I remember first getting involved and getting committed.

Many of us are sitting here as parents. I think we have children growing up, and as a parent, we are more worried about the future of this country and this world for their livelihood. We all want to make the world better. I do not think that our Congress, with all the capability we have, a lot of very bright people elected on both sides of the aisle, are really focusing in on trying to bring out the best that is in America. I think that is where we are failing.

We can get into the specifics of a program, and whether it is a mood to go to what I think is a fear of privatization, let us remove the safety nets, the gentleman is right. The last speaker talked about it. It is not who gets the credit. I believe that. We can accomplish a lot in life if we do not care who gets credit for it. But we have to accomplish it. What we are doing is not accomplishing it.

One of the speakers earlier said we have too much Federal money in education. That is just factually wrong. That is wrong, wrong, wrong. Of all the money spent in education in America, the Federal contribution is 7 percent. Seven percent. That is not too much money. There is not anybody in America that will not tell us that if we have a top priority, it is educating our kids to prepare them for the 21st century.

We have heard a lot of reasons. It has been debated and it will be stated here again today, I am sure. Why can we not do that? The one thing we have never done in this country, the Federal Government has never put one Federal dollar into school construction, not even a penny.

If we are going to have overcrowded classrooms, and we all agree they are, if we are going to have more teachers

to have smaller classrooms, which everybody agrees we need, then we have to build more space. We have to do that by offering incentives other than the mechanisms that are there.

My colleagues, the gentlemen from California, know that we have a requirement in California that to pass the school bond issue to construct school buildings, you have to get a two-thirds vote. In a lot of communities where the need is great, they can never get the two-thirds vote. There is no option. There is no option. Nobody is out there volunteering to build public schools for free out of their own private contributions.

Mr. Speaker, we have to put some money into the school construction effort. The President, as we all learned in high school when we took government classes, the President proposes and we dispose. The President stood here in this very room and proposed to us that we put money into school construction.

He had a clever idea, that we would give tax incentives so private individuals could pick up the interest rates on school bonds, as an incentive for schools to use more of the money for school construction, rather than less.

What happened to it? It was destroyed here in Congress. We talked about putting 100,000 new teachers in the classroom. People say that is too much Federalism. If we go to a police chief in the United States today and ask if the Cops on the Street program is too much federalism, all of my chiefs of police that have received these Cops in the Street program told me they have never seen less bureaucracy. It is very easy, once you have made the decision that you want them, to get them. The program for schools would be the same way. There is not a lot of Federal bureaucracy there.

Do Members know what it would do over the next 7-year period if we took the President's proposal and adopted it here? It would provide in our State alone, in California, 9,271 new teachers by the year 2005. We need those teachers. We need those classrooms. We need computers. We need all of the things that people talk about. But we are not going to get there if we are going to try to say well, the Federal Government should not help.

I am passionate about this, because I think what we do in this country that is so great, and we are picking away at it and wanting to lose it, is that we have one Nation, indivisible. That indivisibility, it seems to me, is the safety net; that we will treat everybody, at least in this country, with a minimum amount of care.

If we look at the education programs that we have created in the United States, they are that safety net. They are Head Start, they are ESEA Title I, they are grants to college students, Pell grants, they are things that are out there as safety nets. They are not the education system. The gentleman is absolutely right; America's education is run by the local school districts. But they cannot do it alone. We