United States because of the resorts: Aspen, Vail, Steamboat, the beauty of the San Luis Valley, the mountains. You name it, a lot of people who have traveled, a lot of people who have traveled in our Nation and been fortunate enough to travel have been to the mountain district of Colorado.

It would be a shame, it would be wrong, but it would also be a shame to go into Colorado and divide that mountain district, divide its unified voice, divide its ability to elect its representative from the mountains.

If we divide this district up in any significant way, we are going to shift the political power out of the mountains into the big cities, or out of the mountains into the plains. There is not a community of interest there.

Obviously, we feel very proud of the fact that we are all Coloradans, and we love those Colorado Buffaloes. There are a lot of things on which we feel as a State we are unified. But within the family, some parts of the family have assets and the other parts of the family have different assets. We all bring to the table our own unique strengths.

It would be a mistake within the family to take one of our family member's strengths, and I am speaking of the districts, and to split it up. What we should do is try and maintain the strength of each member of our family. We have six members in our family. We are bringing in a seventh member. What we need to do is, with the least amount of disruption, to provide for the seventh member of the family.

We can do that by protecting the interests of Pueblo, for example, and yet protecting that community of interest which bears out so strongly, so strongly in Colorado.

Again, let me just repeat, and I could go on in much more explicit detail, and I am sure that I will be doing that within the immediate future, but my point is this: the mountain district of Colorado, which includes the headwaters of the rivers of Colorado, which includes the San Luis Valley and the vast mountain ranges of the San Luis Valley and the plateaus, the high plateaus, and the western slope, what some people have called the western slope, that all combines now to make a very well-suited, a very strong and a very commonsense district when we consider the community of interest.

Again, that community of interest is everything from ski areas to tourist traffic, the heaviest tourist communities. People go to Colorado to see the mountains. They go to Colorado primarily to see the mountain district. Now, sure, they love to go see the Air Force Academy, that is gorgeous, and things like that. But overall, when we speak of Colorado, we think of mountains. That is the mountain district.

So it is not only ski areas, it is not only tourism, it is the water. Remember that I said earlier that the mountain district has 80 percent of the water. The other five districts have 80 percent of the consumers. It is the national forests. By far, the mountain district probably has 98 percent of the national forests. It has probably three and a half of the four national parks. It has almost all the national monuments.

When we take a look at it, and in fact, if we think about it, the sports teams, even the sports teams here, they do not go out of the mountains to play other sports teams, they play within it.

So I urge that we keep the mountain district unified.

H.R. 1, NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT, A GOOD BEGINNING WHICH REQUIRES ADDED RESOURCES TO ASSURE AN EDUCATED POPULACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow or the next day we will have on the floor the long-awaited H.R. 1, Leave No Child Behind Act, an education bill initiated by the President shortly after he was sworn in, inaugurated.

It is a landmark event. It is a history-making event. We should all look forward to it. It is an example of intensive bipartisan cooperation. It does break new ground, and we should see it as a commencement, a second commencement.

Lyndon Johnson began the Federal role in elementary and secondary education more than 40 years ago when he initiated the first Elementary and Secondary Education Assistance Act, primarily designed to help poor school districts, poor children in poor school districts. This is a continuation of that, a reauthorization of it; but I think it has many elements which will move us forward. It has a lot of bipartisan agreement.

We have moved from a situation which existed about 8 years ago where one party was calling for the abolishment of the Department of Education, and I think the Contract with America set forth by Speaker Gingrich called for an end to the Federal role in coordinating education. We had a very intense year of debate on that; and we fought an attempt to cut school lunch programs, we fought an attempt to cut Head Start. It was the depths of bipartisan conflict on education.

Fortunately, the American people let their voices be heard, and they made it clear through the polls and through the focus groups that they considered education to be a high priority, and they wanted more Federal participation in education.

By 1996, in the process of reauthorizing or setting forth a new budget, the end of 1995, actually, the party in power here in the House, the new party in power, the Republican Party, saw the light, and suddenly they began to support the Federal role in education. The appropriation process I think indicated that when we got a big increase, a more than $4 billion increase in education as a result of the majority Republicans responding to the will of the people. It would have been very disastrous if they had not recognized it and stopped the call for the dismantling of the Department of Education.

So we are at a point now where the perception of the public, according to recent polls, is that Republicans and Democrats are pretty much the same in terms of their support for Federal involvement in education, in terms of their support for education. Whether I agree with that perception or not, that is the perception of the public. This bill shows that the two parties can reach agreement about the same thing, and it is a positive achievement. But in my opinion, it ought to be a second commencement.

Now we agree on the basic role, and now we set some basic new directions where I think one of the parties can certainly distinguish itself at this point by recognizing the great need for more resources. I hope it is my party.

I hope we wake up to the fact that all that we have done is important, and nobody should minimize the importance of the bill that will be on the floor, but the great flaw in the bill is that it lacks resources. It does not have the resources to do the job that has to be done.

Let us just stop for a moment and consider some of the activities that are taking place in this first year of the 107th Congress. We have a monumental challenge. September 11 certainly heightened and escalated the nature of the challenge, but we had a challenge already in terms of a faltering economy.

Things have been happening here which require some very difficult decisions to be made. In this democracy of ours, keeping the economy going, reacting to a new kind of threat, waging a new kind of war requires an educated population.

I think governance of any modern industrialized society, that is far more difficult than nuclear physics. The governance of a modern society requires first of all an educated population. The most important resource we can have is an educated population.

So the achievement of Congress, the two parties, in reaching the agreement that has been reached that will be on the floor here is not just a passing matter. Education is not just an ancillary kind of operation, off to the side, ancillary because, after all, the Constitution does specifically say that the Federal Government is not responsible for education, that it is the responsibility of the States and local governments. We have participated sort of as a stimulus and a catalyst to make things happen faster and better, but we are not really responsible. We do not understand it to be a major function of the Federal Government.

I thoroughly disagree with this, and I think that in our new commencement

of the Federal effort, commencement number two, in my opinion, that this bill could be, we ought to take hold of the fact that education is at the very heart of our effort to maintain our society and to move to the point where we can master the complexities of a society which is really moving toward kind of a cybercivilization, even if it did not have these threats that are very real, the organized terrorist threat that has clearly stated objectives.

''Mein Kampf'' was a statement of Hitler's objectives, and if folks had just taken Hitler more seriously earlier, perhaps things would not have reached the point, the destructive point, it reached, because he clearly said what he wanted to do today and was going to do.

If there was a terrorist power that says that our society is a modern society which is a decadent society which must be destroyed, and our policies with respect to assistance and aid to the democracy in Israel is unacceptable, but that is just only one thing that they find unacceptable, they find it unacceptable that our women do not have to cover themselves up, and we are too modern in allowing women to be equal to men in our decision-making, they do not particularly like democracy because they have kings and sheikhs and other kinds of people who make the decisions, and our whole way of life is threatened, that is very real and we have to rise to meet that threat and understand the seriousness of it when it is also backed by tremendous amounts of wealth, the oil money in the Middle East which finances the whole thing.

So we have a serious challenge, and in this session we should be rising to meet that challenge. September 11 in my home city of New York was a horror that no one could have ever imagined. Yet September 11 shows how vulnerable our society is, how complex it is, and how a strike at one nerve center could have a domino effect and impact on our entire Nation.

The recession was already in place, so we cannot blame September 11 for the continued downturn and the escalation of the economic downturn, but it certainly had a great impact on it. Communications were disrupted, the financial center of the United States and of the entire world was almost brought to its knees, and Wall Street really shut down for a few days.

So it is very real, and as we marshall our resources to meet this threat, let us not put education off to the side as being something that is nice to do, but really is not at the heart of it.

Our previous speaker spoke very eloquently and forcefully and intensively about the need for a ballistic missile system: Are you with us or are you against us? Are you for a ballistic missile system or are you not? That is going to save America, a blanket to protect us.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the terrorist enemies that we are up against, very clever enemies that we are up against, used airline passenger planes as weapons, and some fanatic out there has used envelopes in the mail as weapons.

I am more frightened of the anthrax scare than I am of a repeat of what happened on September 11 in terms of the hijacking of four planes on one day and the ability to use those planes as weapons. I do not think that will ever happen again in America.

But the anthrax threat and the ease with which somebody out there can threaten a whole system, shut down some offices in Congress, bring the postal service to a halt, that is very frightening.

□ 2200

And so we are going to need all the resources we can marshal.

We are going to need a well-educated populace. We should not ever be in a situation again where the anthrax cleanup is so slow because there are not enough specialists around to do it, especially since anthrax has been a concern of ours since the Gulf War. We began to be concerned about anthrax since the Gulf War. We even vaccinated large numbers of American troops to deal with the possibility of an enemy who might use anthrax. So I was surprised when we discovered we had a problem here on Capitol Hill and there were so few people to deal with it rapidly, and they did not know how exactly to deal with it.

There were a number of blunders that were quite obvious from day-to-day on the television set which showed that we were not prepared. I would rather be prepared for that kind of warfare than to put all of our resources into a ballistic missile system and to make that the great test of whether we really care about protecting America or not. A ballistic missile system will cost billions and billions of dollars, and there is a doubt about how effective it would be. And even if it is very effective, and once it is put in place, can be expected to do what it is supposed to do, we are dealing with an enemy which can quickly see that the use of anthrax through the mail or the introduction of smallpox viruses in various ways into our society could accomplish far more havoc than a single missile can accomplish at any time, if it is done in a way which catches us off guard, if we do not have sufficient specialists and experts, and if we do not have sufficiently-staffed medical institutions that can detect and diagnose right away.

There are so many areas where we need more expertise, we need more people who can deal with these problems than we have. So September 11 is a wake-up call, a vary tragic kind of wake-up call, but we need to understand the war effort is just one more example of how this Nation will not survive unless it has a better educated population to deal with all of these problems, many of which cannot be predicted ahead of time.

What have we done here in the 107th Congress? In the first year of the 107th Congress, even with the war threat, I do not think we have rallied to meet the challenges that are before us. Day after day, and Christmas is just around the corner, the holiday season is upon us, and there is talk of us having to be here for the rest of the week and then come back next week just before Christmas. It looks like some kind of heroic effort is going on.

After all, there is a war, and so you can understand how the calendar cannot be followed in the manner it has been followed in previous years, but it is not the war, I assure you. It is the great mismanagement of resources here by the majority party.

We do not need to be here, and it is not a good use of taxpayers' resources to have us here. It is not a good use of our time and energy to have us separated from our constituents so much during this period. Many of the votes that we have taken this year, and I must say this because people are watching every Congressman all the time in relation to his voting record. And the voting record is a statistical thing. They do not really want to look into it very carefully, see the details, or what you were voting on, it is just 95 percent or 96 percent or 100 percent, 90 percent, and that is it. How many times you voted on the Journal is not considered, and how many times you took junk votes.

This majority party that we have in the House of Representatives is a master at a new product called junk votes, I call them. Votes that do not matter. Somebody invented the term ''junk bonds'' a long time ago. Junk votes are votes that are really not important at all and are distracting. I guess you cannot say that they are that harmful. A resolution to reaffirm that the golden rule is a good rule to follow. That is a resolution that we would all vote for. It is not going to do anybody any harm. A resolution that motherhood is a great thing. Those kinds of resolutions have been coming all the time this year. Our suspension calendar is full of items that are really quite trivial. We could really have been spending more time at home, we could have managed the serious votes in a manner which would allow us to be here just for serious votes and we could have more time on the floor for serious debate.

The most serious issues, the bills which have the most serious content are the ones we give the least amount of time. That is the way the majority operates here.

I am proud to report that finally we got the conference process back operating in a democratic mode again, and the conference process for H.R. 1, Leave No Child Behind, was a model of what this institution should be all about. The Senate and the House conferees met, they met in public, they negotiated, the staff carried the process through, all the Members were involved, and it was like we were back to old-fashioned democracy. Something

that has not happened much in the last 6 to 8 years since the Republican majority took over.

I know we are not supposed to talk about the other body that much, and that the Chair gave great liberties to two of my colleagues before finally reminding them of that, but let me praise the Members of the other body who worked with us on a conference committee. I think you can talk about a functioning, productive conference committee. We worked very well together and we produced a good piece of legislation. But, again, I am going to come back to its shortcomings. That legislation should be seen as a good beginning, and where we go from there is what I would like to discuss tonight.

But before I get to that, I just want to talk about the fact that an educated population also is a population that must be able to discern what facts are and combat and counteract the stretching of the truth.

I heard two of my colleagues on the Republican majority side earlier tonight talk about the achievements of this House, and they dared to say that we have taken steps to deal with the serious problem of unemployment, we have steps to take care of the needs of workers in an economy which is in a downturn, and that we have done our work. Where are the facts to support that? Where is there a response to the rapidly increasing unemployment? In none of the legislation that passed in this House will you find it.

In many of the proposals that the Democrats have proposed there was a clear effort to try to deal with the immediate problem of unemployment. We had proposals which stretched the number of weeks that you could receive unemployment payments. We had proposed to increase the amount of unemployment insurance the person could receive. We had proposals even to provide 6 months of health insurance for workers who lost their health insurance as a result of leaving. We had proposals for training. All those were rejected by the majority party, yet they stood here on the floor and said that they had taken care of business related to the intense problems faced by workers in an economy experiencing a downturn.

We need an educated population which can sort out those kinds of facts which are very close to home, and no one should be able to get away with distortions of that kind without being challenged by our constituents. It is a complex world. The complexities of the world demand that we have an educated population.

I think the definition of an adequate education probably in most State constitutions is similar to the definition we find in the New York State constitution. Probably not the same wording, but there is a basic assumption when the States took on the responsibility for education that they were talking about an adequate education. They do not mean providing people with some luxury education that will allow them to speak many languages and have their own set of computers and technology, et cetera. But a basic and adequate education, as defined in the New York State constitution, is an education which will allow students to become productive citizens capable of civic engagement and sustaining competitive employment. Capable of civic engagement and sustaining competitive employment.

That is what a sound basic education is according to the New York State constitution. That is no small item, I assure you. To be able to have students who become productive citizens capable of civic engagement and to be able to sustain competitive employment might have been far simpler 200 years ago, when the constitution of the State of New York was written, but in order to be able to sustain competitive employment, you need to know far more than just to read and write. Why not begin with reading. We have a problem just teaching reading.

But we need to understand that the education that citizens need in our democracy demands that they be able to do far more than that, and that is going to cost money. That is going to require a complex system which is accountable. And the other part of it, a productive citizen capable of civic engagement, our democracy will not survive if we do not have citizens capable of civic engagement, who understand what our decision-making process is all about and what it needs to do.

Now, it is to our credit that sometimes the public is way ahead of us. The public, the constituents out there, with the education that we have offered, we must be doing something right because they consistently insist that education should be a high priority of the government. The people of America, for the last 5 to 6 years, have placed education among the top three priorities. In the last 10 years it has been among the top five priorities. So there is something about our populace which makes them understand what the people they elect are quick to forget.

We trivialize education. We do not make it a high priority except in terms of rhetoric. The highest priority items receive the greatest portion of the budget. There is a correlation between appropriations and priorities in this Congress, and we are not in the same place that the American people are. They would like to have us do far more.

So capacity for civic engagement may be greater than we think and may be greater than we as decision-makers for those same people who are engaging in civic activity deserve. We deserve better action here to reflect that.

On the other hand, they do not understand the complexities of the world in terms of justice and peace and in terms of how our relations with foreign governments are necessary to protect us. Those things get short shrift until we have a September 11, and then we understand that we cannot go it alone; that we have to have coalitions; we have to have some standards; we have to answer the charge that we exploit the rest of the world; we have to answer the charge that our foreign policy is rampant with favoritism toward one nation or another.

Why should not our foreign policy lean in the direction of supporting democracies? There are a number of ways to answer that, but we have to be able to articulate that not just as a government but the people have to understand it too.

We need a population that is educated to understand the best utilization of taxpayer resources. Was it good for us to have voted millions of dollars for the airline bailout, the cash for the bailout and the long-term, low-cost, low-interest loans for the airline industry bailout? Is that industry really that critical in our economy? Well, from the looks of the tourist industry and the repercussions of the lack of airline industry functioning properly, perhaps it is. Those kinds of judgments people need to make.

Some are complaining quite a bit about that. Certainly I think they have a right to complain about the fact that if the airline industry is important, we should have taken steps to take care of the workers in the airline industry at the same time we helped the management and the owners of the airline industry. Those kinds of decisions and analyses of events are necessary.

There is an insurance subsidy we have now voted. Some of the things we have done here are new and monumental. The insurance subsidy is one of them. I think the airline industry bill, the same bill that bailed out the airline industry, had a compensation fund which is also breaking new ground where the Federal Government is going to provide compensation for all the survivors of the victims of the September 11 tragedy. I think it is a great step forward. We broke new ground there. Is that a good idea, really? And what is that really all about? Every citizen ought to be able to clearly understand.

We are not trying to enrich anybody at the expense of taxpayers, but that is the kind of thing that government should be doing. But we ought to really understand that for what it is worth.

Enron might seem like something totally unrelated to education, and why am I bringing up the Enron disaster? Most folks are not aware of the fact that Enron is a major economic disaster. Enron is the largest corporate bankruptcy ever experienced by America.

It reminds me of the savings and loans phenomenon of a couple of decades ago. Anything as big as Enron was deemed, any bank that had that kind of position in the economic structure, was deemed too big to fail.

□ 2215

The whole policy of the Congress was to step in and bail out the banks, and

we did. Billions of dollars of taxpayers' money went into bailing out banks. Citizens never quite understood that, and most Members of Congress did not understand how many billions of dollars were spent. It is estimated that the taxpayers spent at least $500 billion bailing out the savings and loan industry.

Is Enron something new that we are going to be confronted with? Are we going to bail out Enron? Will there be other energy companies that are too big to fail that we are going to come up with a set of legislative actions to undergird? Is that kind of swindle going to be perpetrated again?

An article appeared recently in the paper about the Pritzker family bank in Illinois. That bank went under as a result of shenanigans. The savings and loan swindle was basically a swindle where people were encouraged to put their money in, and they were given very high rates for their investment because that would attract deposits. Once their deposits were in, every $100,000 worth of deposits was insured by the Federal Government. So people did not mind going where the highest rate was offered. If a savings and loan offered 15 percent, people moved their money there because they knew if they put $100,000 in, it started out at $10,000, but Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal, we pushed it up to $100,000. So it became profitable for banks to call in the money. Everybody knew the money would be safe, and then those banks that gathered all of that money misused it in terms of the investments that the banks made. People stole in various ways. In the final analysis, the Federal Government was handed the bill.

Mr. Speaker, are we going to get into another swindle like that with energy companies? We need a very well-educated population to deal with these complexities. The governance of a modern, industrialized society is more difficult than nuclear physics; and education is not an ancillary function on the side, not for the Federal Government or any other branch of government.

I would like to return to the item that is on the agenda now tomorrow or the next day and talk in more detail about the final version of H.R. 1. It has gone through the conference process. I was fortunate enough to serve on the conference committee, and I think we did some useful things there, but my basic premise is that it is just a beginning. It is a good beginning, but it is a beginning. Now we need to go on to resources. To quote from an article that appeared in the Washington Post, many principles underlie the plan that we are going to be voting on were outlined by the President during his first week in office. He called the bill at that time his top domestic priority. It would expand the Federal Government's role in enforcement of educational standards requiring every public school student in the country to take state-administered reading and math tests in grades 3 through 8, and holding schools and educators accountable for the result.

The bill also requires States to establish a minimum level of proficiency on the exams, and to make steady progress in bringing all students up to that level that they establish within 12 years. In addition, the measure would require States to report progress toward the goal by several student subgroups defined by race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status and other factors. A statistically representative sample of students in each State would take the National Assessment of Educational Progress, a highly regarded Federal test, to set a benchmark for the State exams. The school that fails to meet the improvement timetables would be subject to escalating assistance and sanctions, and parents of students attending failing schools would be given new educational options.

In various ways the spotlight would be thrown on the people who have the primary responsibility for education, the State and the local education agencies, a spotlight which is standardized. There would be a spotlight in each State which does not vary from State to State as a way to judge progress, to make each State accountable in accordance with a set of national standards. That is the most important feature of the bill. If it does nothing else but to force out into the open the accountability process whereby States have to let it be known what they are doing, the public will know, and we will see step by step what happens.

The bill would provide nearly $1 billion for a program aimed at having all children reading by the third grade. That is a good feature of the bill, an emphasis on reading. We found that reading is basic to education. You cannot have education without a certain level of reading competence, forget about math and going forward with history and anything else. If a student cannot clear the first hurdle of being able to read adequately, and yet we found in colleges where teachers are trained, there is no specialized training in most colleges as to how to teach reading. Very few people were given special instruction in reading who became teachers of reading.

There are some good features in terms of what we did not do also. The President must be given credit for throwing overboard what had been a major planking in the Republican majority's platform before, insisting that vouchers, that the Federal Government get into the business of providing money to parents so parents can have vouchers to go off and purchase the education from private schools, whether private or parochial. Of course that never was a very sound proposal because the Federal Government would only be able to give the amount of money allocated for title I children which never reached more than $1,400; and no school anywhere in the country is able to function with a tuition of $1,400.

Poor parents would have to make up the difference which sort of was a contradiction. If you are poor, how are you going to raise the difference between $1,400 and $4,000 or $5,000 for tuition. That was taken off the table, and I congratulate the President for doing that.

The President also insisted that we go back to the original purpose of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and concentrate the funds that are available on the poorest children. Concentrate the funds available on the children with disabilities. The two functions of the Federal Government which must be given the highest priority for assistance in education are the poor and those who have disabilities and need special education. We are back to where we should have been, and President Bush should be given credit for pushing aside all of the temptations of our majority party in this House certainly to take what education funds were available and try to spread them as much as possible regardless of how much wealth a district had already.

Members wanted to take something home to their district for education, and we had a great deal of pressure to take the title I funds and sort of dismantle them. President Bush has brought a halt to that and deserves credit for refocusing the resources of the Federal Government on the worst problems as the highest priority.

We did have a big discussion about the need for the Federal Government to live up to its commitment which was made 25 years ago to provide 40 percent of the cost of special education funds. We passed a bill more than 25 years ago which said that we would cover 40 percent of the expenditure of each State for special education, which is called IDEA. At this point 25 years later, we are only providing 10 percent of the cost, and we wanted to move and there was a great debate in the conference committee, we wanted to move from the 10 percent to a full 40 percent funding over the next 10 years; and we were unable to get that provision accepted by the Republican majority in the House.

That is still unfinished business, but that is very much consistent with my message for tonight, and that is if we had taken on the responsibility of 40 percent funding for special education, it would be a great jump forward in terms of more resources for each local education agency because it would free up the funds that they are now spending for special education. They are required by the Constitution according to the Supreme Court interpretation to provide an education for all children regardless of their disabilities. So they must spend the money regardless of whether the Federal Government gives them a portion of it or not. If the Federal Government were to meet its promise and give them 40 percent of their expenditure, that is 40 percent

that they do not have to budget for in their own budget for that purpose. They could use that for some other education purpose.

The bill increases Federal funding despite the fact that it does not increase the funding for special education; it still increases Federal funding by $3.7 billion. And funding for title I for the poorest children would double over the next 5 years. These are positives, and it is a good beginning and we need more. We need more to deal with the fact that we are not providing the kind of education that our complex civilization requires to enough children, to enough people, to keep pace with the need.

In other words, our cyber-civilization requires a tremendous amount of brain power, and the production of that brain power takes place in our school system. Since we have 83 million children in public school, that is where most of the brain power education is taking place. If we fail to produce the brain power needs of a cyber-civilization, we are going to crumble. We are going to fall. We need enough brain power to fill the positions in our government, in our military, in our technical areas, in our school system. Right through and through there is a demand for more and more and better brain power.

I am going to read some excerpts from a speech I made at the Yale Political Union on Monday, November 26.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD my speech in its entirety. It is entitled, ''Congress Should Spend More to Reform Public Education.''

CONGRESS SHOULD SPEND MORE TO REFORM PUBLIC EDUCATION

(By: Congressman Major R. Owens: Yale Political Union—Monday, November 26, 2001)

There are a number of interesting appropriation dollar figures and funding facts which might serve as a useful skeleton for this discussion:

The highest per pupil cost is paid by the American taxpayers supporting a public institution to educate a student at West Point. The per pupil cost is about three times the cost of educating a student at Yale.

There are about sixteen thousand school districts in America. Among the diverse school districts in New York State the cost per pupil ranges from seven thousand to twenty-six thousand dollars.

The gross expenditure for education in America is more than 370 billion dollars; federal dollars are only seven percent of this amount. The national governments of all of the other industrial nations are far more deeply involved.

There are 4,070 higher education institutions in America; 1,688 of these are public institutions. In the year 2001, about 1.2 million higher education students received Bachelor Degrees; the projection for the year 2005 is 1.25 million graduates.

There are 83 million students attending the public schools of America; the total enrollment for four year higher education institutions in 2001 was 9.4 million students.

The new job openings projected by the U.S. Department of Labor for the period between now and the year 2008 for the following occupations are: 1.6 million teachers; 1 million registered nurses and health technicians; 1.3 million police, detective and other law enforcement and security personnel.

Dan Goldin, the retiring Administrator of NASA predicts a ''technological sunomi'' requiring 2 million additional scientists and engineers over the next 20 years.

H.R. 1, President Bush's high priority education initiative, presently being negotiated by a House-Senate Conference Committee, authorizes increases that, if appropriated, would raise the overall federal share in education expenditures from 7 percent to 8 percent within five years.

This set of relevant and revealing observations could launch us on many diverse and interesting course. However, it would be more profitable if we could focus this brief dialogue on the hypothesis that the survival of the nation is inextricably interwoven with the collective initiative to reform public education. When we contend that ''Congress Should Spend More Money to Reform Public Education'', we are really insisting that Congress should spend more money on education in order to guarantee the survival of the nation. I am making this assertion at the outset, in order to make it clear that this is not a ''mickey-mouse'' session about adding a few dollars here or there to get higher public school student test scores.

In addition to providing vital cement for our civic, social and economic infrastructure, our defense, safety, security; basic national physical survival is directly dependent on the amount and levels of the education of our population. If it fails to maintain its brainpower production, its public education system, in syncopation with its enormous brainpower needs, this great American cyber-civilization will fall with a momentum more rapid than the fall of the Roman Empire.

The recent monumental management and communications blunders of the CIA and the FBI; the absence of translators to translate important information gathered through our multi-billion dollar world-wide electronic surveillance system; the failure of the FAA to implement decades-old proposals for the securing of airplane cockpits; the increasing amount of sloveliness or ''human error'' related to the execution of routine but critical tasks; these are examples of escalating brainpower deficits directly related to our immediate safety and security.

When the most recent super-aircraft carrier was launched, it had dozens of unfilled positions because it could not find within the Navy's ranks, persons who could operate the high-tech equipment being utilized. The National Aeronautical and Space Administrator, Dan Goldin, recently announced that at NASA there are twice as many engineers over sixty than there are under thirty. Goldin predicts that two million additional scientists and engineers will be needed over the next twenty years when we be experiencing a ''technological sunomi''

From our routine and less visionary sources such as the U.S. Department of Labor are projected occupational shortages which indicate the deficits will extend far beyond science and technology: The projected number of job openings due to growth and net replacements between now and the year 2008 is 1.6 million teachers; 1 million registered nurses and medical technicans; 1.3 million law enforcement and security personnel. The Information Technology Association estimates that two million information technology professionals will be needed. When you add this same degree of need for more doctors, geneticists, pharmaceutical engineers, lawyers and MBA's; there should be considerable fear aroused among national decision-makers when we consider the fact that the number of college graduates from our 4,000 degree granting institutions will hover at only 1.2 million per year during this seven-year period.

At the mouth of America's great educational funnel from Head Start and kindergarten through elementary and secondary education to our colleges and universities; at this source of our raw material there are 83 million students attending public schools. The challenges of public education reform stated in simple arithmetic is a matter of developing far more than 1.2 million college graduates per year from a base of 83 million. In addition to doubling and tripling the number of college graduates, the public eduation system must prepare millions of better educated technicians, mechanics, craftsmen and operators. The performance of the mechanic servicing an airplane is as critical as the performance of the pilot of the plane. At every occupational level, the pursuit of better quality is as important as the need to produce greater numbers.

Education adds value to all who are engaged. Even the worst student exist from an education experience with some degree of improvement. The system must be designed to add as much value to every pupil as possible. Society requires increasing levels of competence from an increasing number of performers who can be produced only from a more effective ''churning'' process at the mouth of the funnel. Excellence or even basic competence is guaranteed only when there is a merit driven process continuously pushing new expertise upward to replace the burned out and to challenge smugness or stagnation.

Our inability to more effectively transform the raw material represented by the 83 million public school students has brought us to a critical point where an explosion in need for more brainpower is overwhelming our processes for the production of the necessary brainpower. At other similar pivotal points in its history, sometimes by fortunate accident, and sometimes through the vision of geniuses, this nation has adopted sound practices and innovative initiatives in education. By fortunate accident the majority of the states and localities embraced the concept of public schools. As a result of the vision of Thomas Jefferson, the University of Virginia became a model emphasizing publicly supported higher education beyond the liberal arts to embrace practical science, engineering and agricultural production.

Another genius, Congressman Morrill, inspired by Jefferson's model, initiated federal support for land grant colleges and universities in all of the states. Following World War II, the GI federal education subsidies provided a massive boost in brainpower pools at a time when more sophisticated mechanization and automation were creating demands for new and better brainpower.

Extraordinary federal support for the higher education which qualified participants for immediate professional jobs has provided a great incentive for the expansion and improvement of the elementary and secondary public education system. Preparing students for college is the first priority of most local school districts. A more automated and digitalized commercial and industrial sector with demands for better educated high school graduates has provided an even greater and broader incentive. Despite the present drift into recession, these incentives and rewards for more and better education are firmly in place. Certainly it is possible to move a greater portion of the 83 million public school attendees into education streams that will allow them to meet the mushrooming needs of our cybercivilization.

In this 107th Congress, the critical question is will a great leap forward be taken to funnel 20 or 25 percent (instead of the present 12 percent) of the 83 million upward to higher levels of competence and expertise. The good news is that the Bush proposal presently in

conference does propose some small steps forward:

HR 1 will authorize almost one billion dollars for a new reading program.

The bill proposes to double Title I funds from 8 billion dollars to nearly 16 billion dollars over a five year period.

The Senate conferees are insisting that the bill greatly increase funding for children with disabilities.

The bad news is that this is authorization legislation and there are clear indications of resistance to these increases by the appropriators. President Bush is also insisting on a degree of regimentation and testing that poisons the relationship between the federal, state and local education policy makers. We may move from a 7 percent federal share to an 8 percent share; however, the heavy handed oversight offers the appearance of a federal bully instead of a federal partner.

The worst news is that even if a full appropriation is achieved for the amounts authorized, this presidential initiative, which is probably all that we can hope for in the next four years will constitute only an incremental increase in funding at a time when states and localities are being forced to reduce funding for schools:

The critical need for smaller class sizes and more qualified teachers requires increased funding.

The infrastructure of school physical facilities needs about 300 billion dollars nationwide and this problem is not addressed at all.

Computers and other technology which may hold the key to breakthroughs in the education of those most difficult to reach are not encouraged sufficiently.

Appropriations for children with disabilities (IDEA) which moves in DC toward the current already authorized 40 percent of total cost is being proposed by the Senate but opposed by the President. The federal increase would free local funds for greater application toward the needs cited above.

In summary, the Bush initiative, even if improved by current Senate proposals, falls far short of the significant leap forward in federal funding which the present pivotal moment in the nation's development demands. Through four administrations, from Reagan through Bush to Clinton and now another Bush, I have strongly recommended and will continue to recommend that we establish new parameters for federal assistance to education:

In order to re-position the present primitive, almost freakish, insistence that the least amount of federal funding for elementary and secondary education is highly desirable, we must learn from the examples of some of the other industrialized nations. Greater federal support which moves from 7 percent toward 25 percent of the overall national education expenditure would not constitute an over-centralized takeover of education; instead, it would represent a logical mean between the extremes of nationalized education ministries and 16,000 uncoordinated independent school districts in fifty states.

Immediate significant federal funding initiatives should focus on large, non-recurring capital expenditures for physical facilities and equipment. States and localities would not become dependent on Washington for their operating expenses; however, necessary overwhelming one time improvements could be realized.

Priority for federal funding should continue to go to assist in the education of those most difficult to educate—the poor and children with disabilities.

Special federal funding must be made available to validate, certify and promote education innovations that work. The best programs and practices must be assisted in establishing critical masses throughout the nation.

Without bullying states and localities, the Congress should continue to promote higher standards for student achievement and for opportunities-to-learn.

Funding to systematically expand support for Research, Development and Dissemination must be greatly increased. It must be recognized that this is an activity almost totally neglected by states and localities.

My final word is that society's fullest possible support of public education should not be viewed as a noble gesture, or a governmental philanthropic virtue, or the mere provision of a ''safety net'' for those too poor to pay for their children's education. The far wiser and more productive public policy viewpoint must assume that public education is a necessity vital for the functioning of our very complex cyber-civilization. This nation literally will not be able to survive without an adequate and continually updated public education system.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to comment and read a few excerpts from the speech. I started by saying that there are a number of interesting appropriation dollar figures and a number of interesting funding facts that might serve as a useful skeleton for the discussion of a topic that we were faced with. My topic was Congress should spend more to reform public education. There were debaters on the other side who opposed this later on, and it was an interesting evening at Yale University.

Number one, we should look at the following figures and funding facts. The highest per-pupil cost is paid by the American taxpayer when we support the institution which educates the student at West Point. The highest per-pupil cost is paid to educate a West Point student. The per-pupil cost of education at West Point is at least three times the cost of educating a student at Yale or Harvard. I did get the facts about 8 years ago when we had a friendly chairman of the Committee on Armed Services who twisted the arms of the people at West Point, and they got me the facts and figures. At that time the cost per student at West Point was $120,000. That did not include the field training using artillery and all of the capital expenditure for that. Just the kind of academic training that they received was estimated to cost $120,000 per student.

□ 2230

At that time Harvard and Yale were about 30 to $35,000 per student. So we do believe in spending money to educate the best when we think it is necessary. We set a high priority on our military leadership. The very best is supposed to come from West Point so we spend a tremendous amount of money.

Another fact. There are about 16,000 school districts across America. Among the diverse school districts in just one State, New York, the cost per pupil ranges from $7,000 per pupil to $26,000 in an upstate school district and most of the school districts within New York State are spending above $15,000 per pupil. $7,000 is about the lowest in the State, in New York City.

Fact number three. The gross expenditure for education in America is more than $370 billion. But Federal dollars are only 7 percent of this amount. The national governments of all of the other industrialized nations are far more deeply involved in the education of their population. We have a decentralized system which also takes away the responsibility and allows the Federal Government not to be responsible for what is probably the most important task it has, and, that is, maintaining the education of the population. We only put 7 percent into the total expenditure pot for education.

Point number four. H.R. 1, President Bush's high priority education initiative presently being negotiated, which is almost about to come to the floor, if every part is appropriated would maybe take us to 8 percent instead of 7 percent. This is far too little in terms of the Federal share for education expenditures.

We could take quite a bit of time to discuss just those four interesting facts, but it would be more profitable if we could focus this brief dialogue on the hypothesis that the survival of the Nation is inextricably interwoven with the collective initiative to reform public education. When we contend that Congress should spend more money to reform public education, we are really insisting that Congress should spend more money on education in order to guarantee the survival of the Nation. I am making this assertion at the outset in order to make it clear that this is not a Mickey Mouse session about adding a few dollars here or there to get higher public school student test scores. It is more than that.

In addition to providing vital cement for our civic, social and economic infrastructure, our defense, safety, security, our basic national physical survival is directly dependent on the amount and levels of the education of our population. If it fails to maintain its brainpower production, its public education system, in syncopation with its enormous brainpower needs, this great America cybercivilization will fall with a momentum more rapid than the fall of the Roman Empire. Do not be smug. We saw the Soviet empire fall because it turned its back on certain realities. The great American empire can fall, too.

The recent monumental mismanagement and communication blunders of the CIA and the FBI, and I do think some of those blunders led to September 11, the absence of translators to translate important information gathered through our multi-billion-dollar worldwide electronic surveillance system, the failure of the FAA to implement decades-old proposals for the securing of airplane cockpits, the increased amount of slovenliness or human error related to the execution of routine but critical tasks, these are

examples of escalating brainpower deficits directly related to our immediate safety and security.

When the most recent super aircraft carrier was launched, less than 2 years ago, it had dozens of unfilled positions because it could not find within the Navy's ranks persons who could operate the high tech equipment being utilized. National Aeronautics and Space Administrator Dan Goldin, who just retired recently, announced that at NASA there are twice as many engineers over 60 than there are under 30. Goldin predicts that 2 million additional scientists and engineers will be needed over the next 20 years when we will be experiencing what he calls a ''technological tsunami.'' A tsunami is greater than a tidal wave, a hurricane or a tornado all put together.

From more routine and less visionary sources such as the United States Department of Labor, we can find projections of occupational shortages which indicate that the deficits will extend far beyond science and technology. The projected number of job openings due to growth and net replacements between now and the year 2008 is about 1.6 million teachers, 1 million registered nurses and medical technicians and 1.3 million law enforcement and security personnel. The Information Technology Association estimates that 2 million information technology professionals will be needed. When you add this same degree of need for more doctors, geneticists, pharmaceutical engineers, lawyers and MBAs, there should be considerable fear aroused among national decisionmakers when we consider the fact that the number of college graduates, although we have 4,000 degree-granting institutions in America, the number of college students who graduate each year hovers at 1.2 million per year. Over this 7-year period where we project all those needs for new people who are highly trained, we will be graduating only 1.2 million students per year.

At the mouth of America's great educational funnel, if you look at an upward funnel, a funnel where down at the bottom is all these 83 million public school students and as you go through the education process they funnel up into our higher education institutions and sometimes into 2-year colleges or sometimes into technical institutes, et cetera, from the mouth, this source of 83 million students, we should get a better return than 1.2 million graduates from college. We should double that instead. In addition to public education, students who will go to college, we should also understand that there are a great number of people who are needed as educated technicians, mechanics, craftsmen and operators. The performance of the mechanic servicing an airplane is as critical as the performance of the pilot of that same plane. We know that large amounts of money are spent to train pilots, but we should also know that at every occupational level, the pursuit of better quality is as important as the need to produce greater numbers.

Education adds value to all who are engaged in education. Even the worst student exits from an education experience with some degree of improvement. The system must be designed to add as much value to every student as possible. Society requires increasing levels of competence from an increasing number of performers who can be produced only from a more effective education churning process at the mouth of that funnel which funnels them upward.

Our inability to more effectively transform the raw material represented by the 83 million public school students in America has brought us to a critical point where an explosion in need for more brainpower is overwhelming our process for the production of the necessary brainpower. At other similar pivotal points in its history, sometimes by fortunate accident and sometimes through the vision of geniuses, this Nation has adopted sound practices and innovative initiatives in education. By fortunate accident, the majority of the States and localities very early in the history of the Nation embraced the concept of public schools. As a result of the vision of Thomas Jefferson, the University of Virginia became a model emphasizing publicly supported higher education beyond the liberal arts, publicly supported higher education which embraced practical science, engineering and agricultural production.

Another genius following in the footsteps of Thomas Jefferson, Congressman Morrill, after the Civil War, he was inspired by Jefferson's model, he initiated the Federal support for land grant colleges and universities in all the States. Later on following World War II, the GI Federal education subsidies provided a massive boost in the brainpower pools in America at a time when more sophisticated mechanization and automation were creating demands for new and better brainpower. Senator WARNER of Virginia at our last meeting of the House-Senate conference committee made a very moving speech about the fact that he was educated as a result of the GI subsidies. He got 7 years of education subsidized by the Federal Government. That made all the difference in his life.

Extraordinary Federal support for the higher education which qualified participants for immediate professional jobs, the Federal Government did support higher education very early and that started a system which provided incentives for students to go up and there was a clear pattern that if you got a decent education at the lower levels, you could go on to get a professional education in the colleges. Preparing students for college is the first priority that most local school districts see. That is what they are there for. A more automated and digitalized commercial and industrialized sector now demands better educated high school graduates who will not necessarily go to college. They provide incentives for them. You can go into a Microsoft program even if you are not a college graduate and take certain levels of exams and reach a point where you are making a very decent salary with opportunities for advancement as you educate yourself more. This is outside the formal education structure. Despite the present drift into recession, these incentives and rewards for more and better education are firmly in place. Our economy is going to recover. Our cybercivilization is going to continue. It is going to have greater and greater needs. It is possible to move a greater portion of the 83 million base of students that we started with into the education streams which will produce the kind of people we need. We cannot do that unless we have greater resources.

In the 107th Congress, the critical question is will a great leap forward be taken similar to the great leap forward of our forefathers who were wise enough to establish a public education system, again similar to the great leap forward taken by Thomas Jefferson when he created the University of Virginia or the great leap forward that was taken by Morrill when he established the land grant colleges. Or the great leap forward that was taken more recently in the GI education programs. Can we rise to meet the challenge so that instead of getting 12 percent of our students, of the 83 million, to the college graduate level, we can double that to maybe 25 percent. The good news is that the legislation that will be on the floor takes some important steps forward. I have already mentioned that. Those steps are very important.

The bad news is that what our legislation does is authorize. Tomorrow or the next day we will be voting on a bill that authorizes legislation. Each year the appropriation will have to match those authorizations if we are going to really move forward. Authorization has a problem without support from the appropriation. We may move from 7 percent to 8 percent only if the appropriation is full over the next 5 to 10 years. The worst news that we are confronted with is that we do not have the amounts of resources that we really need. The critical need for smaller class sizes has not been met. The critical need for more qualified teachers has not been met. The infrastructure of school physical facilities is totally ignored. We do not have any money that address the problem of the need for more funding for school infrastructure, for the building of buildings, repairing of buildings or the funding of technology, the installation of new technologies, et cetera. Computers and other technology which may hold the key to breakthroughs in the education of those most difficult to reach are not encouraged sufficiently in this legislation. Again, we do not appropriate the additional money which we felt was required for children with disabilities

which would have been a great step forward.

Through four administrations, from Reagan through Bush to Clinton, and now another Bush, I have strongly recommended and will continue to recommend that we establish new parameters for Federal assistance to education.

In order to reposition the present primitive, almost freakish insistence that the least amount of Federal funding for elementary and secondary education is highly desirable, we must learn from the examples of some of the other industrialized nations. Greater Federal support which moves from 7 percent toward 25 percent of the overall national educational expenditure would not constitute an overcentralized takeover of education. Instead, it would represent a logical need between the extremes of nationalized education ministries and the present 16,000 uncoordinated independent school districts in 50 States in America. In other words, we are in an extreme position. We are at the lower end of support for our school systems, 7 percent of the total education bill, versus some countries which are at the other extreme where the education is totally run by the national government and they get some bad results as a result of that. But let us not remain at that extreme. We should move toward greater Federal participation.

Immediate significant Federal funding initiatives should focus on large nonrecurring capital expenditures like the ones that I have just mentioned in terms of the physical infrastructure.

□ 2245

Priority Federal funding should continue to go to educate the poor and children with disabilities. Special Federal funding must be made available to validate, certify and promote education innovations that work. The best programs and practices must be assisted in establishing some kind of critical mass throughout the Nation, and Federal money is necessary to allow them to do that.

Without bullying states and localities, Congress should continue to promote higher standards for student achievement and for opportunities to learn. Funding to systematically expand support for research, development and dissemination of information must be greatly increased, because none of the states are engaged in that kind of very important activity.

My final word is that society's fullest possible support of public education should not be viewed as a noble gesture or a governmental philanthropic virtue or the mere provision of a safety net for those too poor to pay for their children's education. The far wiser and more productive public policy viewpoint must assume that public education is a necessity vital for the functioning of our very complex cyber-civilization.

This Nation, our great American Nation, literally will not be able to survive without an adequate and continually updated public education system. Brain power is our best protection for the future.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 7 a.m.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 7 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4801. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Full Approval of Operating Permit Program; District of Columbia [DC–T5–2001–01a; FRL– 7112–3] received November 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4802. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Full Approval of Operating Permit Program; Virginia [VA–T5–2001–01a; FRL–7112–5] received November 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4803. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Full Approval of the Operating Permits Program; State of Hawaii [HI062–OPP; FRL–7111–5] received November 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4804. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Final Full Approval of 40 CFR Part 70 Operating Permits Program; Minnesota [FRL–7111–7] received November 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4805. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Final Full Approval of Operation Permit Program; Wisconsin [FRL–7111–8] received November 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4806. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Final Full Approval of 40 CFR Part 70 Operating Permits Program; Indiana [IN003; FRL–7111–9] received November 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4807. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Final Full Approval of 40 CFR Part 70 Operating Permits Program; Illinois [FRL–7112–1] received November 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4808. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Final Full Approval of Operating Permit Program; Michigan [FRL–7111–6] received November 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4809. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule— Minnesota; Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program [FRL–7110–8] received November 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4810. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Final Approval of Operating Permits Program; State of Vermont [VT–021–1224a; A–1–FRL–7110–2] received November 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4811. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Full Approval of the Operating Permits Program for the Pinal County Air Quality Control District, Arizona [AZ060–OPP; FRL–7112–8] received November 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4812. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Full Approval of Operating Permits Program in Alaska [FRL–7113–9] received December 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4813. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Final Full Approval of Operating Permits Program; State of New York [NY002; FRL–7113–3] received December 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4814. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Final Full Approval of Operating Permit Program; New Jersey [NJ002; FRL–7113–1] received December 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4815. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Full Approval of Operating Permits Program; State of Oklahoma [OK–FRL–7113–7] received December 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4816. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Full Approval of Operating Permits Program; State of Texas [TX–002; FRL–7113–6] received December 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4817. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Full Approval of the Operating Permits Program; Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Maricopa County Environmental Services Department, Pima County Department of Environmental Quality, Arizona [AZ062–OPP; FRL–7113–4] received December 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4818. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental