can see the funding filter that takes place between taxpayer and tax recipient.

A voucher removes a lot of these steps, but it still involves, when it comes right down to it, your cash being confiscated as taxes, going to the government, and the government giving those dollars back in the form of a voucher to a child with certain strings and conditions attached. Again, that is better than what we have today in American education, but it still has its weaknesses in that politicians and governments define the use of these dollars, define the terms of quality, define the terms of cost and so on, as opposed to a marketplace.

But education tax credits really cut government out altogether and begin to regard the education professionals as legitimate professionals. Today they are really not treated that way in a government-run system. They are all paid the same. You can go to almost any school, government-owned school district in America, and the worst teacher is paid typically the same as the best teacher in the district, and it is just a function of how long they have been there and how many degrees they were able to add to their resume. If they manage to not hurt anyone or not be too terribly incompetent, they will stay there and continue to get pay raises, regardless of whether they leave when the bell rings at 3 o'clock or whether they stay until 6 o 'clock doing additional work. This reality is the leading cause of burnout among teachers in America. They last, the average time period, this has been studied with respect to burnout, somewhere between 3 and 4 years.

But creating an academic marketplace begins to regard teachers as real professionals and education managers as professionals as well, because, rather than being, as the gentleman from Michigan said, beggars of government in the State of Michigan, he called that ''beggars to Lansing,'' they become reconnected with the community instead.

I want to elaborate on that for a moment, because it is really true. When funding only flows through this process, each of these agencies develop their own internal language between them. The grants that school districts apply for, that our States apply for back up this chain, are stated in terms that are written by other bureaucrats at these other levels of government. So you have got all kinds of acronyms and all kinds of programs and departments and a whole language that only people in that system understand.

I have been at lots of meetings about this. Every Member of Congress has sat through meetings where people come from their districts back home, and maybe a principal of a school district will come to our offices here in Washington and talk about a specific grant they are applying for at the Federal level, and they have the State coordinator who is cooperating in this and the Federal person they need to reach.

It is like alphabet soup. We need you to apply for an ABC grant that goes to the DEF agency that is going to be evaluated by the XYZ person in agency whatever. You get the picture. It becomes a whole internal language that these people understand, and they become kind of comfortable with it. And, if they do a good job at it, I suppose they become pretty comfortable in achieving these objectives.

But this is not the language of the neighborhood. This is not the language of a community. When we allow our school board members and superintendents to only be proficient beggars of government, because that is the only place the money comes from, then we cause them to speak in a language that is just not understood by the parents, who are only interested in one thing, and that is their children. An education tax credit really allows us to break out of that old bureaucratic model because it gives parents choices and corporations choices, I might add, in the proposal we are piecing together right now.

Imagine a school board member, if you would, or a superintendent, who creates an innovative program for a school, for maybe a specific target cohort of children, and instead of coming to Washington to try to describe why this would help children, they would instead go to the Rotary Club in their hometown, or maybe to a charitable foundation in their community. Maybe at this point they will start using the names of the kids, maybe showing them pictures, and the people sitting at the other end of the table might actually recognize them as children they go to church with or see at the baseball field or maybe even recognize from their own child's school.

The conversation becomes very different. Rather than ABC program, DEF agency, XYZ administrator, we start talking about the children. If you just invest your dollars in my program at my school, we are going to reach out to Johnny. He has a name. And after you invest, I would invite you to come into the school so you can see the computers that you have purchased. And after you have seen the computers that you have purchased, maybe we can show you the evaluations of the program and show you how it actually helped Johnny.

It really does not happen today to a great extent, and providing a change in the Tax Code to ease the ability, to make it easier for individuals to contribute to schools of this nature, we will see these kinds of funds, these enrichment funds, these opportunity funds crop up all across the country.

They already exist in all 50 States today, specifically targeted for low income and underserved children. But if we just look at the examples of States that have established State tax credits, we realize that we are going to see lots of them, tens of thousands of them, I believe.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Arizona, upon creating its tax credit, saw these student tuition organizations just emerge in great quantity, about 70 or 80 of them almost immediately. I think they have more than that today. But it is an exciting proposal, and it is one that I want to underscore with the greatest emphasis here in Congress.

I am especially inspired and encouraged by the commitment of the President to see a tax credit plan pass this year and by the commitment of our Speaker and our leaders here in the House to bring this tax credit proposal about which we speak tonight to this floor during this session, and I am hopeful that the people of America who care about their own children, and care about others as well, will find a way to rally around this exciting tax credit proposal that will create a massive tax infusion in America's education system and help create an academic marketplace where children matter more than institutions.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GREEN of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of attending a funeral in the district.

Mr. MASCARA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. CRANE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and May 2 on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GIBBONS, for 5 minutes, May 7.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 2, 2002, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

6525. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's