

local governments that go beyond the requirements of the Clean Water Act. It goes to those willing to mobilize local resources in order to protect and improve the overall health of our watersheds. The Dakota County Soil and Water Conservation District clearly fits this description.

Mr. Speaker, protecting and improving the nation's watersheds is important to me and my district. I share in the excitement of this award and am proud of the Dakota County Soil and Water Conservation District's achievement.

CONFIRMATION OF MIGUEL A. ESTRADA TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2003

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the nomination of Miguel A. Estrada of Virginia to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. This nomination has been pending before the Senate since May 9, 2001.

Miguel Estrada has experience, intelligence, character and bipartisan support. Mr. Estrada has argued 15 cases before the United States Supreme Court and has served in the Justice Department under presidents of both political parties as a federal prosecutor and as the Assistant to the Solicitor General. Mr. Estrada was born in Honduras and attended Harvard Law School where he served as Editor of the Harvard Law Review. He maintains the highest rating of "unanimously well qualified" from the American Bar Association. This rating is based on professional as well as personal evaluations of a nominee, and some Democratic leaders have referred to this rating as "the gold standard." As a result of Mr. Estrada's professional and personal accomplishments, he has received broad support among lawyers and judges associated with both political parties.

President Bush has voiced his concern for the current judicial emergency in America with a large number of seats at the appellate and district levels remaining unfilled. President Bush, as the Chief Executive to the Judiciary, has a constitutional right to name a qualified person to the Judiciary. Mr. Estrada's confirmation will not only place a well-qualified and respected lawyer on the United States Court of Civil Appeals, it will uphold one of the finest traditions of our country. Mr. Estrada has endured over a twenty month nomination process without the courtesy of a floor vote. I strongly support Miguel Estrada becoming the first hispanic judge to sit on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

TRIBUTE TO LOLA SPRADLEY

SPEECH OF

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 11, 2003

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize and congratulate Representative Lola Spradley. Rep. Spradley has recently become the first female Speaker of the Colorado House, a truly momentous accomplishment.

Growing up on a wheat ranch on the plains of Colorado, Lola learned to be a ready farm hand and could do everything from drive a tractor to milk a cow. Her experience growing up on a farm has helped Lola to have an excellent understanding of the rural district that she now represents. Now, Lola Spradley is a 56-year-old representative from southern Colorado. She and her husband, Dale, have four children and seven grandchildren. She lives on a 240-acre ranch with her horses and dogs, near Beulah, Colorado.

As a political leader, Rep. Spradley is proud of her beliefs. She stands firmly for the rights of Colorado's citizens on issues that are as diverse as Gun Control and Water Management. She is a strong conservative and a devoted student of government. Running under that banner "Lola Listens," Spradley won a decisive victory in the last election, and a unanimous election to the position of Speaker from the Colorado House Republicans. Colorado is proud to have her as its first female Speaker of the House.

Mr. Speaker, it is with honor that I recognize Rep. Lola Spradley before this body of Congress and this nation. She is a strong woman who cares about her district and her state, and she will continue to be an integral part of Colorado's leadership.

ABSTINENCE

HON. JOSEPH R. PITTS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2003

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the funding for abstinence-until-marriage education in this bill, and I thank the Chairman for his leadership on this important issue.

Today, the results of a landmark Zogby International survey assessing parental attitudes on sex education have been released to the public. The Zogby poll reveals strong parental approval for character-based, abstinence-until-marriage programs and proves that parents soundly reject the goals and content of so-called "comprehensive" sex education. The results are available online at www.whatparentsthink.com

According to the Zogby poll, 73.5 percent of parents approve or strongly approve of abstinence-centered sex education. 61.1 percent of parents disapprove or strongly disapprove of so-called "comprehensive" or "safe sex" education. 75.3 percent of parents disapprove or strongly disapprove of the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) sex education curriculum.

When parents are accurately informed about what "comprehensive" sex education actually entails, which includes distributing condoms in schools, they make it clear that they do not want their children to be inundated with "safesex" propaganda. Instead, parents want their children to be taught self-respect, self-control and abstinence-until-marriage.

This survey marks the first time parents have been polled using the exact language from comprehensive sex education guidelines. The major weaknesses of previous polls are their misleading questions and fuzzy interpretations. In this poll, Zogby used exact definitions and verbatim wording from the comprehensive sex education curricula developed and endorsed by such groups as the Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) and Planned Parenthood.

The Zogby organization also found that: All demographic groupings strongly disapprove of comprehensive sex education—especially non-white minorities (Hispanics and Asians). And, 70 percent of parents strongly disapprove of their teens getting contraceptives without their approval.

Mr. Speaker, America's parents have spoken. They want abstinence-until-marriage education. This bill ensures that the values many American parents hold dear—the values of abstinence and marital faithfulness are not determined by taxpayer-funded "safe-sex" propaganda in schools.

I encourage my colleagues to join America's parents in supporting this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

COALITION FOR ADOLESCENT SEXUAL HEALTH—SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

BACKGROUND

Zogby International conducted the survey on behalf of the Coalition for Adolescent Sexual Health, an ad hoc association formed exclusively for the purpose of conducting the poll.

Private foundations that wish to remain anonymous paid for the cost of the survey.

The random sample survey was conducted January 11 to 15. A total of 1,245 adult parents of children ages 5 to 18 were interviewed with an over-sampling of African Americans. The margins of error were: Total MOA = +/- 2.8 percent; Whites MOA = +/- 3.3 percent; All non-whites MOA = +/- 5.5 percent; Blacks MOA = +/- 6.3 percent; Born again Christians = +/- 5.6%.

The total sample was approximately evenly split among fathers of children in grades K-6, fathers of children in grades 7-12, mothers of children in grades K-6 and mothers of children in grades 7-12.

NEED FOR ZOGBY SURVEY

Previous surveys by groups such as Alan Guttmacher Institute, Planned Parenthood, Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS), and Advocates for Youth have had serious flaws: Biased sample selection; Leading questions; Deceptive questions; Biased interpretation of results.

Such surveys have been used to claim that parents support comprehensive sex education (also known as "safer-sex" or "abstinence-first" sex education) and that parents oppose character-based, abstinence-until-marriage sex education.

Such surveys describe comprehensive sex education using innocuous, vague, euphemistic, and almost compassionate wording designed to convince parents that such education is needed for their children's health and well being.

HOW THE QUESTIONS IN THE ZOGBY POLL WERE DEVELOPED

Five types of questions were included in the Zogby survey. All 29 questions in the survey were developed to introduce a minimum level of bias.

Fourteen questions asked parents their level of approval for comprehensive sex education. The questions asked verbatim components of the Guidelines for Comprehensive Sexuality Education. These guidelines, developed in 1990 by the Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (in conjunction with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], the National School Boards Association, Planned Parenthood and others) represent the foundation of comprehensive or abstinence-first sex education. In short, these guidelines detail what comprehensive sex education wants children and adolescents to learn. When organizations such as Planned Parenthood, SIECUS, the Alan Guttmacher Institute, and Advocates for Youth lobby Congress, state legislatures and school boards on behalf of comprehensive sex education, it is these guidelines that they have in mind. (See questions 7 through 20.)

Six questions asked parents their level of approval for character-based, abstinence-until-marriage sex education. These questions asked verbatim portions from the National Guidelines for Sexuality and Character Education. These guidelines, developed in 1996 by the Medical Institute for Sexual Health, are considered by many abstinence groups to represent the foundation for abstinence education. (See questions 1 through 6.)

Four questions asked parents their level of approval for comprehensive sex education curricula promoted for years by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The questions paraphrased teaching material from these curricula. (See questions 25 through 28.)

Four questions reflect different aspects of comprehensive sex education not specifically covered by other questions. (See questions 21, 23, 24 and 29.)

One question asked parents their level of approval for comprehensive sex education using the type of vague, innocuous wording typically used in the past by groups attempting to show parental approval for comprehensive sex education. This question was included for benchmark purposes. (See question 22.)

MAJOR FINDING

Parents overwhelmingly reject comprehensive sex education when they are asked questions that deal specifically with the topics included in comprehensive sex education.

	Percent of parents who approve or strongly approve	Percent of parents who disapprove or strongly disapprove
Comprehensive or abstinence-first sex education guidelines	25.0	61.1
Character-based, abstinence-sex education guidelines	73.5	16.3
CDC-promoted comprehensive sex education curricula	13.9	75.3
Misc. aspects of comprehensive sex education	22.4	68.1

By a 4.6 to 1 margin, parents approve or strongly approve of abstinence sex education. By a 2.4 to 1 margin, parents disapprove or strongly disapprove of comprehensive sex education. By a 5.3 to 1 margin, parents disapprove or strongly disapprove of the information contained in comprehensive sex education curricula that have been promoted by the CDC.

All demographic groupings strongly disapprove of comprehensive sex education, although the strongest opposition was found

among non-white minority parents (Hispanics and Asians) and among parents who identified themselves as born-again Christians.

All demographic groups disapprove of comprehensive sex education curricula that have been promoted by the CDC.

FINDINGS ON SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

By a 4.4 to 1 margin, parents disapprove or strongly disapprove of teaching young people that homosexual love relationships can be as satisfying as are heterosexual relationships. (See question 14.)

It appears that parents have a more mixed opinion on the matter of having children taught factual or biological information (see questions 13, 18 and 19, for example). However, opposition from parents seems to increase substantially if a connection is perceived between their children and sexual activity.

When it comes to allowing teens to obtain contraception without parental approval, parents much more strongly disapprove when their own children are involved. About 46 percent of parents either strongly disapprove or disapprove of the idea that teens could obtain contraception without the permission of a parent. (See question 27.) However, when this question was personalized, about 70 percent of parents either strongly disapprove or disapprove of their child being able to obtain contraception without their knowledge or approval. (See question 29.)

CONGRATULATING SENATOR MIKE BISHOP

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2003

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Michigan State Senator Mike Bishop on earning the 2003 Credit Union National Association's National Desjardins Youth Financial Education Award. His dedication and desire to work for the improvement of our state is a model for all state legislators.

Senator Bishop is a 1989 graduate of the University of Michigan and a 1993 graduate of the Detroit College of Law. He is a practicing attorney for Booth & Patterson, P.C., a licensed real estate broker and president/owner of Freedom Realty, Inc., and Pro Management, Inc.

Senator Bishop served two terms in the Michigan House of Representatives, and now serves as Assistant Majority Leader while representing Michigan's 12th district in the Michigan State Senate.

The National Desjardins Youth Financial Education Award was bestowed upon Senator Bishop for his sponsorship of HB 5327, a bill designed to promote financial education in grades K-12. With hard work and determination, then-Representative Bishop promoted this bill in such a way that it was passed by both the House and the Senate, with only one dissenting vote in the House and none in the Senate. Senator Bishop's legislation, now law, will help ensure that children will be educated in financial responsibility, and as a result will be better prepared for life.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Bishop's record of service and the fruits of his labor speak for themselves. He has served the state of Michigan well, and has done much to provide for its

future. This award is a well-deserved token of the respect that is due him for his efforts. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join with me in thanking him for his commitment to excellence and his desire to benefit others through public service. I would also like to ask my colleagues to join me in wishing him good fortune in his new role as a State Senator.

INTRODUCTION OF FULL FUNDING FOR IDEA NOW ACT OF 2003

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2003

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill that will put an end to the embarrassing legacy that the federal government has created for itself in failing to fully fund our children's education and saddling the states with tens of billions in unfunded mandates. I refer of course to the failure of the federal government to provide for mandatory full funding for the special education program—or IDEA.

Currently, the federal government does not meet the financial obligations for special education it committed to in 1975 when the "Education for all Handicapped Children Act" (renamed Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 1990) was first passed by Congress. This shortfall places an onerous financial burden on local communities who must find alternate resources, such as higher property taxes, to fund special education.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is a civil rights statute that provides funding to states and helps states fulfill their constitutional obligation to provide a public education for all children with disabilities. IDEA serves more than six and a half million children today. Underlying IDEA is the basic principle that states and school districts must make available a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) to children with disabilities between the ages of 3 and 21, and must be educated with children who are not disabled "to the maximum extent appropriate."

Since 1975, Congress has authorized a federal commitment to special education funding at a level of 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure (APPE) on special education services. However, Congress has only appropriated funds to meet between 5 and 16 percent of the APPE, with FY2002 appropriations setting a record at 16.5 percent, or about \$7.5 billion. But that is still only little more than a third of the so far embarrassingly unfulfilled, Federal commitment to our children. This has resulted in great burdens being placed on our school districts. For example, in the 2001-02 school year, the last completed school year, the town of Berlin, Connecticut spent \$4,721,372 on special education, with all but \$361,543 locally funded. This is outrageously short of the oft-stated goal of 40 percent federal financing. One can only begin to imagine the burden IDEA requirements, in the absence of federal funding, impose on our local school districts. We are literally forcing our schools to rob from Peter's education to pay for Paul's when we should fully fund both.

And now with passage of the Omnibus Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2003, funding will go up about \$1.4 billion. There will be a