

In 1948, we replaced the old draft with the Universal Military Training and Service Act. A few years after that, we replaced it again with the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. At that time you were required 6 years' service between your active and reserve time.

Then came Vietnam. In 1967, we passed the Military Selective Service Act. That war had such controversy and had such venom throughout our Nation that we ended up with the discontinuation of the draft in 1973. Inductions were stopped, they were not renewed by Congress, and we favored an all-voluntary military force. However, registration was still required.

By 1975, we even suspended registration, so men who were only a few years younger than myself found themselves in an era of not even having to register. However, 5 short years later, Congress reinstated draft registration requirements for men between the ages of 18 and 26.

Our modern Selective Service System that we have today must be authorized by Congress to induct people and the President must order a return to the draft. The system today is for registration. We merely maintain the rolls. It is a lottery. It still would be used by drawing your name out of a hat based on your date of birth, and young men would be drafted with certain age groups.

Finally, local draft boards that are representative of the demographics and ethnic makeup of your community are those who can draft you. Many people, myself included, have served as a member of these local draft boards. We have done so in a standby cadre status because we do not draft anyone today.

Since Vietnam, we have been very fortunate concerning combat casualties, especially given the deadly nature of weapons employed on today's battlefields. However, should America find itself at war with a capable and determined foe, casualty rates will likely increase significantly and a mechanism that provides replacements in a timely manner will be necessary. The Selective Service System is that mechanism.

I urge all that have the opportunity to counsel America's young men, to register with Selective Service. It is an important responsibility of men between the age of 18 and 26.

The proponents of this amendment would have us believe that maintaining a Selective Service System is a waste of taxpayer resources. The cost of rebuilding the Selective Service System from scratch, in both dollars and time, far outweighs the costs associated with funding the current system.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to defeat this amendment. Rarely do we have unanimous support from the administration, Joint Chiefs, service secretaries, and veteran service organizations across the country for a program. They all agree that we need the Selective Service System should America ever require its capabilities. Vote no on this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 402 recognizes the 60th anniversary of the Selective Service System and the critical role it has played in protecting democracy. I urge its passage.

□ 1930

#### SOVEREIGN ENTITIES

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the President warns of the potential of a new age of civil wars. He is one of the progressive new center-left academics turned leader and a proponent of the view that he and his family of progressive thinkers can find the cause of wars and intervene with a cure.

It has been demonstrated time after time that the United States can be drawn into war after war, national conflicts within borders and across borders. American troops die and suffer for the policy formulations we are never informed of and without the specific congressional declaration and war powers that the Congress alone retains.

Since the United Nations was founded in 1945, America has not won a war but lost each and every conflict but one, depending on your view of the Persian Gulf War.

The Millennium Report recently issued by U.N. Secretary General Annan calls for "a strengthened Corps of Commanders in New York ready to organize and intervene with peace-keeping operations within a week or two."

There is little that I fear so much as U.S. troops being committed to such an international force that can intervene without requiring specific congressional approval.

Should this concept ever conclude where it is intended, a standing army with a stronger corps of commanders, we will see the development of a threat greater than ever in our recent past. Already we have seen the power of a few enormous multinational corporations grow to a size that exceeds all but the largest nations. Fifty-one corporations are presently larger than the bottom 100 nations.

We have seen the jurisdictional prerogatives of NATO enlarged and both our own CIA and NATO find in their mandates to now include protecting these same corporations' trade routes and corporate markets. How did they find that new information there? Globalization has created new sovereigns out of these paper entities. The United Nations would create a new standing army to protect these new sovereigns' interests.

There is much too much hope placed on globalization and the interdependence upon nations. The rhetoric only hides the reality of who really benefits and what the real consequences are

here at home. Wages in America are stagnant, and in the last 3 years there have been periods of decline.

Maybe wages are going up slightly in some countries, but this too can be explained by other than globalization's trade benefits: the present world economy is driven by speculation, not productivity; mergers and acquisitions, not growth and new entrepreneurship; workers shifting from one well-paying job to three less well-paid service jobs; wealth increased for the few investors, owners and profiteers while the standard of living drops again and again as every new dollar buys less goods for every family.

We are today proud of an economic boom that nobody would dare suggest can be sustained. When the inevitable downturn arrives, wages will be scuttled. Wages worldwide will return to the pre-speculative period. But the largest corporations will not feel the pain, as each merger, each acquisition grants to the parent firm unlimited opportunities to downsize further and eliminate more jobs.

Is there any question about what entities are really sovereign today?

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

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

#### KEY PRINCIPLES AND KEY ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I chair the positive education caucus in the Congress of the United States. This positive education caucus believes that it is easy to be critical but much more difficult to find solutions. That positive caucus is called the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the United States House of Representatives.

So I am pleased to join several of my colleagues in reviewing two things with the American people and with all who are watching; first, the seven key Republican principles on education; and second, the key education accomplishments we have made over the last 5 years.

Since we became a majority party in November of 1994, I have fought to include seven key principles in all education legislation that is passed through the Committee on Education and Workforce and the House.

Now, why did we do that? Why did we come up with these seven principles? Well, I sat here for 20 years in the minority where I was told over and over again, and I watched it happen, that all

we need to do is come up with one more program or another billion dollars or cover another 100,000 or half million children and we will solve all those problems. And for 20 years I watched one more program, one more billion dollars.

Nothing happened positively in relationship to closing the achievement gap between those who are fortunate enough to have someone at home who is their first and most important teacher and those that are not.

Well, these key seven principles are quality, better teaching, local control, accountability, dollars to the classroom, basic academics, parent involvement, and above all, responsibility. And so, we have said that in quality we seek quality effectiveness and results in all Federal education programs.

No one paid much attention about the quality during those 20 years. No one really paid much attention to the studies that were done. Because the studies would have told them that we had some real problems with Head Start, we had some real problems with Title I. We could have corrected those early on, but we did not.

So we seek quality, we seek better teaching. Nothing matters more in the classroom than having a competent, well-trained teacher who teaches the subject in which he or she was trained to instruct.

Local control. House Republicans believe in cutting Federal education regulations and providing more flexibility to States and local school districts for, in exchange, accountability. As we deregulate Federal education programs and provide more flexibility, we want to ensure that Federal education programs produce real accountable results.

In dollars to the classroom, we believe in spending more dollars directly in that classroom. Basic academics. We believe in emphasizing basic academics and proven education strategy, not just fads or self-esteem approaches. And parental involvement and responsibility is extremely important.

Those public charter schools that are working primarily are working because the parent is the enforcer. The parent agrees that they will enforce the homework regulation. The parent agrees that they will enforce the dress code. The parent agrees that they will enforce the discipline code.

Well, what does that do? That attracts the best teachers and the best administrators and the best supervisors to that kind of setting. Because every good educator wants to be able to teach, and that is what happens when the parents are enforcing what is required in all of those schools.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) who was much involved in education before he came here.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, when I first came here to Congress 8 years ago, I made improving our public schools a top priority.

When the Republicans came to power in 1974-1975, I knew that, under the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), we would have quality, better teaching, local control, and accountability.

I am pleased to report that significant progress has been made on all of these goals. The first step in improving our schools is to make sure that children enter the classroom ready to learn. This is especially true for children from disadvantaged families who often do not have the same family resources as middle-class children.

Republicans have been leading the way over the past few years with Head Start. As this graph shows, funding for this program has been increased 106 percent in the past 5 years. That has really helped thousands of children throughout America. We can see right here in this Head Start funding increases under the Republican Congress when we start from \$3 to \$7 essentially. And it was quite a spread over a decade, and we can take great accomplishment in that.

There is a lot more such as that.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, and in that increase we also insisted that quality was the name of the game.

For the last two reauthorizations, we were finally able to say, hey, if they get new money, do something about improving the quality of the program.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, and I think that is happening throughout the country.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, it has.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, Head Start should do what its name says it does, give a real head start to children growing up in disadvantaged families.

The Head Start amendments of 1998 ensure that local agencies are accountable for successfully preparing children to enter school and for making sure that they are ready to read. New education standards, teacher training measures, and quality standards have been included, as the chairman says. Head start now strikes the appropriate balance between quality and expansion.

The increased funding for quality ensures that the program has the time and the means to develop the capacity to provide higher quality services, creating a better future for the children and the families that it serves.

A major goal of Republican education policy has been to send more dollars to the classroom while maintaining local flexibility and accountability.

Mr. Speaker, we can all agree that a motivated, qualified teacher is a key factor in student achievement. Unfortunately, some of our teachers are underqualified, overwhelmed, or simply burnt out. This is understandable given the challenges they face. As a former professor, I can certainly see those challenges.

That is why I am so pleased with the Teacher Empowerment Act which the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chair-

man GOODLING) has nursed through his committee and the floor. This act is designed to provide teachers with the resources that they need while maintaining local flexibility. Funds are included to reduce class size, but this does not come at the expense of teacher quality.

This legislation provides \$2 billion annually for teacher training, which focuses on the high need areas of science and mathematics. We are way behind in that. This will help tremendously. However, under this legislation, local school districts have more choice in the teacher training programs that they utilize, allowing them to meet the unique needs of their students much more effectively.

Although Washington has an important obligation to the schoolchildren of this country, national programs administered from here are not a viable option.

A better approach is to provide the funds necessary to meet the students' needs and to let State and local level school officials spend those funds in the way that works best for their particular students. This principle is reflected in the Ed Flex bill that became law last year, in brief, education flexibility.

Too many things had been mandated by the Federal Government and they never kept their word on the money. Now they are. Under this legislation, local school districts are given increased flexibility in how they can spend Federal money.

□ 1945

It is those local school board members, principals, and teachers who know the unique strengths and needs of their students and their communities. They know that the most effective ways to use Federal funds is to do it at home and not in Washington. In exchange for this increased flexibility, school districts must demonstrate measurable academic achievement, and I think that is where we are all united in that.

Another significant piece of legislation passed by this Congress is H.R. 4055, the IDEA Full Funding Act, or known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. This Congress for the first time fully funded this law, which aids children in every town and city in our country. Under this law, States were required to provide a free and appropriate education to every child, including those with disabilities. The Federal Government committed to paying 40 percent of the cost of special education, but it never met the payment. The Federal Government has paid only about 13 percent instead of the 40 percent of the cost of special education specified in the disabilities law.

Special education is expensive. The Federal Government mandated that special students who have disabilities should be taught at local schools. Right now, school districts must pay for the mandate, already straining

their local budget. For the first time, H.R. 4055 authorizes funding to reach the Federal Government's goal of 40 percent. Those funds will help States and local school districts. Receiving full Federal funding for special education would free up local funds to help all students. Once this funding discrepancy is cleared up, school districts could use 27 percent of the funds now going to special ed on hiring more teachers, buying new computers or repairing classrooms, things that benefit all students without harming special education.

We passed this bill in June with overwhelming support. I am pleased with the broad bipartisan support that these pieces of legislation have received. We have demonstrated the ability to put aside partisan differences and work together to find common sense solutions to this country's educational challenges. Let us continue to do so. The future of our children and our Nation depend on it.

I want to again praise the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) for the leadership he has provided once we were freed up from the bureaucracies of Washington and we put the focus on those local individuals that know a lot more about the education in their area than we do 3,000 miles away. He deserves great appreciation from the whole House for bringing all these pieces together and providing flexibility, quality, and accountability.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the gentleman for his participation and recognize the gentleman from the committee from the great State of Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. ISAKSON. I thank the chairman for his introduction of me tonight and I thank the Speaker for allowing me to take a few minutes to talk about what has been a true renaissance in the approach to education at the Federal level and due in large measure to the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the approach that he has taken.

I want to address three specific areas of the reform and enhancement that has been done over the last 2 years by the House Committee on Education and the Workforce and try and delineate specifically why accountability and why flexibility, more parental involvement are so important in the improvement of education and how the laws that have been enacted by this House in education will go a long way towards bringing about true improvement and in particular the closure of the gap between those that perform so well and those that underperform.

Thirty years ago, the United States Congress decided to get in the business of assisting public education and entered that in what was known as the title I program to begin funding programs for our most disadvantaged students. Unfortunately, in 30 years, we have realized little or no improvement and, in fact, in some cases a decline. But during those 30 years, we have seen

the Federal Government enter into many other programs in public education.

So this year, the committee took a different approach. Why redo over and over again what for 30 years has not worked? Instead, let us do some new things. Number one, the straight A's bill. Under the leadership of the chairman, we passed in the House the straight A's bill which takes on this approach: instead of Washington being the CEO of your local school district, it ought to be the investor in your local school district. A CEO gives orders. An investor looks for results, which is the gentleman from Pennsylvania's approach to accountability. Under the straight A's bill, we allow a State to enter into a contract with the U.S. Department of Education. That contract is a 5-year agreement, and the premise of that contract is that State will lower the gap between the best students and the lowest-performing students.

In return for that agreement, that State receives a great deal of flexibility in the use of Federal funds directed towards the area it believes is best to address the problems of its lowest performing students. The straight A's bill demands accountability, it demands a contract, and it demands a return on the investment which our taxpayers deserve to have. The straight A's bill, in my opinion, is the inception this year of what will spread across this country in terms of the Federal Government's involvement.

A lot of people do not realize this about Federal involvement in public education. It is mountains of paperwork, but it is small molehills of money. I was chairman of the State board of education in Georgia before being elected to the Congress. Seven percent of Georgia's funds for public education come from the Federal Government. Ninety-three percent come from the State government and the local government. Yet more often than not, the paperwork comes from the Federal Government. In fact, I used to use an analogy. In Georgia, the average kindergarten kid is 36 inches tall when they enter kindergarten and that teacher fills out 42 inches of paperwork before that child leaves kindergarten. All to say, we spent the money the way Washington said we should.

Instead, straight A's takes the approach, we want the accountability of results. We want to make an investment in our children's future. We trust the local boards, and we trust the State system to make the right decision in the use of those funds.

Secondly, for just a minute in the spirit of flexibility, which was addressed so well by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), I want to talk about transferability. For those States that elect not to participate in straight A's, but would like the flexibility in Federal funds to make a meaningful difference, we approved the ability for Federal funds to be transferred in a

way that was directed best by the local board of education towards the improvement of students.

Transferability just simply takes this premise, and I will use my State of Georgia. In rural Georgia, in an area where many migrant workers speaking many different languages, their primary language other than English, enter and pass through the public schools and that is the major crisis in the achievement gap, does it not make sense for that local system to be able to move money to the speakers of other languages to bring about better literacy of those immigrants so as to address the ability of them to improve their achievement compared to those who speak English as their primary language?

And is it not in the metropolitan Atlanta area where you have a disparity of affluent and inner city systems for their needs to be markedly different and for the money to be transferred in such a way to address the need of the specific constituency in that school system?

But being the responsible leader that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is, he also remembered that the way the Federal Government and the reason it entered public education was for title I and for our most disadvantaged kids. So the one restriction in transferability was, you could not transfer any money out of title I, but you could transfer Federal money into title I. When you take a school or a school system that in some cases can approach three-quarters free and reduced lunch, three-quarters level of poverty students, then it may be that every other dollar in Federal money designed for other programs that comes should be transferred into title I to even further enhance the Federal Government's investment in schools.

Flexibility and transferability are absolutely essential. Many times in Georgia when we approved the State budget, when it came to the Federal portion, we could not approve a single change of a comma, a semicolon or even the tense of a sentence all because the Federal Government with the money sent the regulations and the rules and the restrictions on its use to the extent that in some cases you turned it down because you could not use it where you really needed it.

Lastly for just a second, I want to talk about technology. There is a graph which I would like for the staff to put up so the people of this country can see. You hear a lot of times that Republicans do not make an investment in education. You hear a lot of times that our interest is not in education. The gentleman from Pennsylvania's leadership has demonstrated that that is not true. But if you look at that graph, that shows the investment in technology made by the Congress of the United States and its increase from 1993 to the fiscal year 2001 budget. It is a 1,761 percent increase in Federal funding in 8 years, an increase in what

I believe will be the solution to some of America's greatest problems in the delivery of quality public education.

First of all, under the chairman's leadership, we decided that it is wrong to say the Federal Department of Education controls 40 percent of the technology money and directs it when it is going to be used at the local level. So we said, 95 percent goes to the local level. The U.S. Department of Education controls 5. Secondly, we had a myriad of technology programs all designed for a narrow focus on technology, all well intended but just enough money to start something, not enough money to finish it. So we rolled all those programs into one \$760 million grant program, a competitive grant program to develop the best practices for the delivery of education through the use of technology, the Internet, and the World Wide Web.

By way of example, this past June I attended the National Education Computing Conference in Atlanta where public schools from around the country that have received technology grants in Federal programs are beginning to demonstrate how technology can be used to solve what we believe to be the insoluble. Just two quick examples. First, it is difficult in rural America to get advanced placement teachers for our brightest children but by use of the Internet and the World Wide Web, the increases in broad-band delivery and the merger of audio, telephony, and digital all to the school, we can now take the Nation's best AP teachers and get them in the Nation's poorest most rural systems via the Internet and its use to bring advanced placement education to any American child regardless of the resources of their system.

The Institute for a Sustainable Future in Massachusetts had a grant that was awarded to a Cobb County school system, my home, where they have embedded in the curriculum K-12 many basic principles in terms of sustaining our future economically and environmentally and real-life practices through the use of technology to demonstrate those models to teachers throughout that school system. What we will do with this \$760 million over the next few years is find the best practices that work in classrooms, distribute them around the country and use the modern marvel, the Internet, to break through barriers we thought were insoluble.

In essence, I close, Mr. Speaker, by saying really three things. My dad always wanted me to make straight A's, and I think I did one year in third grade; and that was about the only year I made straight A's. But my dad always gave me the flexibility to try harder, and I did the best I could, and he challenged me. He challenged me to do my best. Through the gentleman from Pennsylvania's leadership, we are now for the first time in 30 years allowing local school systems to do their best. We are trusting them to say, if you will sign a contract that says you

will lower the gap and close the gap, then we will give you the flexibility to use the money to do that intended purpose. A rising tide lifts all boats, and we owe it to every child in America regardless of their circumstance, regardless of their poverty, to be uplifted, and flexibility does that. Transferability allows us to direct funds and target them in an area that has a specific need. Never to the expense of title I, but even to its enhancement should the local system decide to do that.

Finally, there is no one in this country that knows more than those of us here in this Congress how technology has revolutionized the production of the American worker and expanded our great recovery economically in this country. It will do the same in public education. And because of your leadership and because this Republican Congress made a 1,761 percent increased investment over 8 years in the use of technology, then our children will be better off, our school systems will have more flexibility, more responsibility and more accountability, and our children will be better educated.

The last 2 years for me, my first 2 years in Congress, have been very rewarding because what I came from with frustration, and that was public education that was constrained by Federal bureaucracy, has now been unleashed through your leadership to respond as it thought it was intending to 30 years ago; and the end result is going to be improved achievement, closing of the gap between our best and our poorest students, and a renaissance in public education in the United States of America. I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to speak tonight.

□ 2000

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) for his participation. The President gave a long list when he spoke to us here in this very Chamber, many things that we agreed with. We, however, did not agree with his approach, because it was a one-size-fits-all Washington, D.C. approach.

And so we said we are going to stick to our seven principles, because we want to make sure that no child is left behind, and so as I indicated, and as my colleagues have indicated, we have had many successes. We have a long way to go. If my colleagues look on the next chart that we have, my colleagues will see some of those successes that were mentioned and some others that were not: Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Amendments of 1997, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Full Funding Resolution, Full Funding Act, Reading Excellence Act, Charter School Expansion Act in 1998, Head Start Amendments of 1998, Prohibiting New Federal Tests.

As I indicated, the President over and over again, it is a great idea, but, first of all, we have to determine what the new higher standards are. Then

after we know what they are, we have to determine whether the teachers are equipped to teach to the new higher standards. After the teacher is equipped to teach the new higher standards, then we test the teacher to see whether they are equipped. Then she or he teaches for a year, then we test the child.

Prior to that, of course, I am afraid what we do is primarily is tell 50 percent of the children one more time I am not doing very well.

Dollars to the Classroom Act, believing that that is where the money can best be used. Education Flexibility Partnership Act. I fought and fought and fought for that as I sat in the minority, and finally I got a bone thrown to me. I think the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) probably helped me more than anybody else, and they said well, we will give you six States; that is a little trial here. It looked like maybe there was some value to that, so then the next time we said we will give you 12 States.

We can thank Texas and we can thank Maryland and a few other States, but particularly those two, and particularly Texas, because they said okay, we will take the responsibility to prove to you that we can improve the academic achievement of all of our students, if you give us an opportunity to commingle funds.

As you know, even though the funds may have been worthless, may have been so small with so many programs, if they ever commingled one penny, the auditor was there, they did not care whether there was a quality program, whether it was working or not, the only thing they wanted to make sure is you did not commingle any pennies. And we said, well, why not all 50 States?

In Texas, at the present time, of course, they can show that their Hispanic and their black population is achieving at a greater level overall on their tests than the overall average of all of the students, because they took seriously that challenge that we gave them: we will give you the flexibility, you have to accept the accountability, and you have to show that every child can improve academically.

We improved the Vocational Technical Educational Act by making sure we are in the 21st century, a very, very difficult century; and I sympathize with Voc Ed teachers because I always say when they go to bed at midnight they think they have a great lesson planned, and when they woke up the next morning, technology increased so dramatically that they are back in the Dark Ages again. And they have to plan all over again. It is not easy. I do understand that.

The Teacher Empowerment Act is mentioned, we want quality teachers. We want to give them the opportunity to be quality teachers. If they cannot get the kind of in-service that they need that is being supplied, they can go out on their own with vouchers and get

that kind of improvement that they need to make sure that they are up to snuff and up to the 21st century in their teaching.

Student Results Act, again, saying that we want to see results, and the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) I see I touched a nerve somewhere.

Mr. HORN. The gentleman has touched a nerve, because this is wonderful; and this means better prepared students for colleges. And we have a governor who is really committed to college. Governor Bush, who is running for the Presidency, said every child has a chance to go to college and make it; and I agree with him completely, having been a university president for 18 years.

And what the gentleman's committee and what this Congress have done has been to get a Pell grant up further than it ever has been for students in need, money called the Pell grant, and college work study and all of the loans and so forth, but looking at the ones for the grants, any student can go to college and get a degree. And we thank the gentleman for that.

Mr. GOODLING. As I indicated, there is nothing that substitutes for a quality teacher in a classroom. My first 4 years in a one-room school, thank God for Ms. Yost, because she was an outstanding teacher and she taught all subjects, and she did all of the other work that goes into running a one-room school and she was just outstanding, but there is no substitute for that quality teacher.

We have the Academic Achievement for All Act, the Education Savings Accounts to make sure that parents are in a position to help the child go on to some form of higher education. We have the Impact Aid Reauthorization Act, and in some districts that is extremely important because they are impacted by Federal installations in that particular area who have children who come to their public schools without, of course, the people paying taxes for that purpose.

Literacy Involves Families Together Act is, of course, one that I hold near and dear. It took us so long to understand it. If you do not deal with the entire family, you cannot break the cycle. I do not know how it took us so long to understand that. And, of course, that is what we were doing in Head Start, we were just dealing with the child. Well, of course, somebody, some adult in that family has to be the child's first and most important teacher; and, of course, that is the whole idea of our Literacy Involves Families Together Act, to make sure that we are giving the parent the tools that they need and at the same time helping the child become reading for school.

I am very proud of the Child Nutrition Act. We made real changes that I think gives youngsters an opportunity who do not have that opportunity to have a balanced meal, because it is pretty difficult to sit there and try to listen to what the professor is saying

about mathematics or Latin or English or whatever on a very empty rumbling stomach.

And I see another colleague from the committee, who another college professor who knows a little bit about math and science, much more than I do, as a matter of fact, the gentleman from Michigan, (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding to me, and I saw the gentleman on C-SPAN and rushed straight down here because I think this is one of the more important, if not the most important, discussion we will have in Special Orders this week or, perhaps, this month.

First of all, I want to commend the gentleman for what you have done. When we look at that list, it is the gentleman's initiative that developed it and carried it as far as it has come. And there are some outstanding things on there, and I will comment on a few of those later on.

It is also with some regret that I looked at the list and realized that most of this should be passed into law; a good deal is, but not all of it. And the part that is not passed into law is primarily because of game playing or threatened game playing by the minorities to attach meaningless or killer amendments or other strange amendments to this in both the House and the Senate, and that has prevented further action on it.

My experience, as the gentleman mentioned a moment ago, is in science; I received a doctorate in nuclear physics. I have taught for 22 years at the college and university level, but during that time I became heavily involved with elementary school science and to a certain extent the secondarily school science, including teaching some summer institutes sponsored by the National Science Foundation.

I would just like to make a few comments on some of the issues. First of all, the nonscience areas, when the report "A Nation At Risk" first came out over a decade and a half ago, I was struck by one thing. A Nation At Risk they talked about everything that was going wrong and what should be done; and in my mind they left out the most important factor and that was the parents. Because in my experience and in working in schools at all levels, the most important single factor in the success of the student is an interested and involved parent. And if you do not have that, you have got a long ways to go to resolve it.

And one thing I especially appreciate about the gentleman from Pennsylvania, about the list there, is the bill that we just passed in the House last week, which the gentleman has fought arduously for for some time, the Literacy Involves Family Together Act, or LIFT Act. I think that is extremely important, because it is not only trying to instill literacy in children, but it is saying if the parents are illiterate, the children are not likely to learn how

to read; and, therefore, we have to teach the parents how to read and become literate if we want the children to become literate.

I think that is a very important act. I hope it gets enacted and takes effect, because I think this is a real step towards improving literacy in this country. I have worked on literacy projects in my home district with adults, but the ideal is to have the children and the adults working together, and that is precisely what this act does, and I commend the gentleman for it.

We have, as I said, many successes as the Republican Party, but let me comment on what is needed beyond an interested and involved parent, that is the most important. But the second and very, very close to it is a competent teacher. I think the teachers in this Nation have had unfair criticism. Everyone blames the teachers for the failings of the schools; and in my book, that is not the place to start.

In my working with the schools, most of the teachers are very dedicated, very anxious to do a good job; but they are hampered by lack of money in some cases, lack of facilities in other cases, lack of support from administrators aboard and other cases, and above all, frequently a lack of training. As the gentleman mentioned earlier, frequently teachers are trained to teach well, but times have changed and they need more training. They need professional development.

I am pleased that the Federal Government has been able to help in that score by providing some funds for professional development, but much more needs to be done; and I think the schools have to step up to bat on that one too and provide more funding for professional development, either through summers or through in-service.

Secondly, in terms of training, we need better training in the colleges and universities. I think the biggest problem there in terms of my experience has been the fact that the academic departments which teach the academic subjects do not communicate well with the schools of education and vice versa. Not only that, much to my regret when I was at both Berkeley and at Calvin College, there was a considerable amount of disdain of the academicians of the school of education professors and vice versa; and with that atmosphere, it was impossible to develop good cooperation.

I am pleased to see that being changed. For example, Arizona State University has done a tremendous job in the physics department to break down that barrier, and they have a superb program going. Just last week I met with a professor from the University of Washington, he has done the same with high school teachers and is training high school teachers working with educators on that. So the barriers are breaking down, but they have to break down much faster if we are going to meet the needs of our Nation.

I hope that we can do all we can to help improve the initial training of teachers and also improve the professional development of teachers. In my experience, as I say, teachers are eager to do a good job. They are eager to be properly trained, and they are very frustrated if they do not get the support of their board, of their administration, and, in fact, of their Nation from the work that we do here.

My final comments are about science and math education, which I have spent a lot of time in during my professional career and also here in the Congress. Most people do not realize that the economy of this Nation and, particularly the economic growth of this wonderful boom we are having now, is primarily due to advancement in science and technology; Alan Greenspan will be the first one to say that.

The estimates are that at least a third of our economic development now comes from information technology developments, and very likely another third of the economic growth comes from other developments in science and technology. Yet we are not producing students out of our schools who can take advantage of that. That is where the jobs are, but we are not graduating students in enough science, math, technology, and engineering to take advantage of it.

I visited Silicon Valley a few months ago. In that area alone, they have 100,000 job openings for scientific, engineering, technical people, unfilled jobs because they literally cannot find the people to take the jobs.

We have every year before the Congress requests to grant H1-B visas, to grant visas to foreigners to come in and work as scientists, engineers, technologists, mathematicians, computer specialists; and we this current year are allowing 155,000 of them to come in as immigrants because we are not producing enough. The request for next year is 350,000; we may grant 200,000.

Another indication of trouble in this Nation, if you go to graduate schools of science and engineering, over half of the graduate students are from other countries. Our students are not competing; they cannot compete with the students from other nations.

□ 2015

They are not getting the grounding in math and science that they need. Another indication, the TIMMS Study and other studies comparing us to other developed countries, the United States is either at the bottom or near the bottom in every ranking of our high school graduates compared to those from other developed countries. We need to improve, and I think it is very, very important that we improve science and math education in our schools.

Now this should not be at the expense of other subjects. I know that the chairman of the committee has spent a lot of time on improving reading in this Nation. That is absolutely essen-

tial. One has to be able to read. That is number one. But these days one has to be able to understand science and math as well. So it is reading, writing, arithmetic, the three R's, but do not forget that S on there, and that is science.

The three Rs include science.

Mr. GOODLING. Three Rs and an S.

Mr. EHLERS. So we have some initiatives before the Congress on this issue. I have sponsored three bills. There are similar bills in the Senate, and they are being worked on. There may or may not be enough time this year to get them through, but I hope we can continue to pursue that because it is badly needed. If I had my druthers, I would start at pre-school; but I am willing to start at least in first grade or kindergarten. An interesting result of doing it properly, and that relates to the chairman's emphasis on reading. If science is taught early and properly, it improves success with reading, because the learning of science and mathematics develops parts of the brain that otherwise lie fallow, and those parts of the brain are very important in developing the visual skills that are necessary to develop good reading skills.

So it all goes together: Science, math, reading, that is what we need in the elementary schools. We have to develop programs that will do that. We have to develop teachers who will teach that well; and I hope with that we will be ready for the revolution in the next century, in fact the next decade, of where the jobs are actually going to be and we will produce Americans who will have those jobs and not have to import individuals from foreign nations to take those jobs.

Mr. GOODLING. When we had the literacy bill on the floor, I made the statement that we have pretty close to 100 million people who are performing either on the first or second level of literacy. The first level gets them nowhere in the 21st century. The second level, it will be very, very difficult, and that is why it is so important. It was so sad that we lost as many years as we lost, Head Start, well meaning all of those programs, well meaning but no one was out there to make sure there was quality, so we ended up many times with people who were heading the programs who really needed the programs themselves, and that is a tragedy.

In one largest school district in this country, 55 percent of all their Title I money was used to hire teachers aides. One says, that may not be bad if they are well educated. Fifty percent of them did not even have a GED, did not have a high school diploma, did not even have a GED; but worse than that they were teaching and they were teaching unsupervised. So we can see how those children who needed the very best teacher, a disadvantaged child, did not have a chance because, of course, as I indicated, there were close to 100 million, 40 to 44 million demonstrate the lowest basic literacy skills, and 50 million adults have skills

on the next higher level. As the gentleman mentioned, we are going to bring in probably another 200,000 a year for the next 3 years from some other country to fill our \$40,000, \$50,000, \$60,000 jobs. What happens to all of these people? So that is why we said we are going to adopt these seven principles. We are going to make very, very sure that we are just not going to have another program and another program and another billion dollars thrown at the program. We are going to make sure that there are quality programs.

Now someone will say well, this is not our job on the Federal level. Functional illiteracy and illiteracy surely is. We cannot survive. We cannot survive as a leading nation if, as a matter of fact, we cannot do something about this. That is why I said from the beginning we not only can be critical but we have to come up and see whether as a matter of fact we cannot find some solutions to the problem.

So I just want to repeat again what those seven principles are that have been driving our committee since the Republicans have taken over, and those principles are quality.

When we unveiled my portrait recently, I told them that when Chairman Perkins was here, he had a whistle in his speech. Now when we are marking up legislation in that room and the wind blows, those windows just whistle. We always say that is the old man either happy or unhappy with what we are doing, and I said I hope that as a matter of fact my lips move on that portrait every time they are marking up legislation and the lips say quality, not quantity; results, not process. My colleagues have heard that over and over and over again, and I just hope those lips will say it. Maybe somebody can put a tape or something there behind the picture and do it.

But, again, we believe that if we are really going to make a difference these are the seven key principles, quality, better teaching, local control, accountability, dollars to the classroom, basic academics and parental involvement and, as I said, responsibility.

Again, I want to repeat, in a public charter school that is successful, that last word on here is the key, parental responsibility. If we go two blocks from the Capitol, we will see that it is the parent who gets the child there; it is the parent who takes the child home; it is the parent who enforces the discipline code; it is the parent who enforces the dress code; it is the parent who enforces the homework code; it is that parent assuming the responsibility. They want their children to succeed and they are willing to make those sacrifices and so there is a waiting list a mile long. As I said earlier, who is attracted to a setting like that? The very best teacher, the very best administrator. We have to get in center city America and real rural America the very best teachers. That is where they are needed. That is where those role models are needed or we cannot turn this around.

So hopefully with these seven key principles as our guiding light and our guiding force, we can turn things around and not talk about one more program or one more billion dollars or one more this or one more that. Quality, quality, quality; results not process.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to follow up with a postscript to that very fine statement. During the recent presidential campaign, I have become very annoyed reading in the papers time after time that George Bush has latched on to education; that it has never been a Republican issue, it is always a Democratic issue; he has latched on to it in trying to win. That is just utter nonsense.

Look at the gentleman's record here in the Congress and what he has accomplished in his career here, and look at what the committee has done the last few years with the Republicans in charge of it. It has done so much better when we look at the funding and recognize that the Republicans have provided more funding from the Federal Government than the Democrats have during the time we have been in charge here. If we want to find out who is really for education and who has really done a better job and not just thrown money at it but required things such as accountability and quality, if we look at who has really contributed to the improvement of education in this country it is the Republicans. I hope the news media wakes up to that and stops saying George Bush is just doing this to win the election. That is the nonsense.

Look at what he did in Texas. The Democrats ran that State for many years; and George Bush came along. In the short time that he has been there, he has raised the scores, especially of minority students, more than they have been raised in many years under Democratic control. So I just wanted to add that.

I hate to be that partisan about it but that is the facts and we have to set the news media straight on it. We have to set the record straight, make sure people understand we are committed to education. We are committed to doing it right, but we are going to do it right. We are going to be accountable. We are going to have quality. We are going to have results. We are not just going to hand out money and say, here, do what you like.

Mr. GOODLING. Well, I latched on to GW; he did not latch on to me. And I latched on to him primarily because of his ability to lead a Democrat house and a Democrat senate in the State of Texas to bring about the best education reform probably anywhere. I was just reading over the weekend that Oklahoma is crying the blues because they lost teacher after teacher, Kansas did and several other States, because

they are going where there are higher salaries and where there is a better opportunity, and, of course, one of the places they were going was Texas because with his leadership and his house and his senate they raised those teacher salaries but demanded excellence and quality at the same time.

So, again, here are seven key principles. We think that they have been the important principles to move us ahead and to make sure that no child is left behind.

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUGS FOR ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULSHOF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this evening, as I have so many times, I would like to talk about the need for a Medicare prescription drug program. I have to say that I will be partisan this evening. I know some of my Democratic colleagues will be joining me, because I believe very strongly that the only reason that we do not have a Medicare prescription drug plan is because of the opposition of the Republican leadership.

I have to say that I have been very disturbed to see that the Republican presidential candidate, George W. Bush, Governor Bush, has now come up with a proposal to deal with the problem that seniors face with prescription drugs, but it is really no different than the same plan that we have been hearing over and over again by the Republican leadership in this House that does not provide a prescription drug benefit under Medicare but rather simply tries to provide some sort of government subsidy, primarily for low-income people, that I believe will never succeed because essentially it is not practical. It is not under the rubric of Medicare because the Republicans traditionally and now have opposed Medicare and do not want to see it expanded to include a prescription drug benefit.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. In short, we have been there and done that in this House, have not we? We have already had a vote on that very proposal which was really a plan not to help the seniors of this country but to help the insurance companies to reach out and touch someone, but in this case it was to touch and subsidize insurance companies and assist them but to leave out the vast majority of what we might call the working-class or middle-class seniors that worked to build this into the greatest country in the world, but they just have been left out of the Republican plan. Is not that correct?

Mr. PALLONE. Absolutely. And the thing that disturbs me most about it, and I know that the gentleman is very

knowledgeable about this, is that the fact of the matter is that every time the Republicans have come up with a proposal to deal with the prescription drug issue it has always been defensive. In the case of the House of Representatives, because the Democrats were out there with our proposal to bring prescription drugs under the rubric of Medicare and we had a proposal out there that was a very good one, and they tried to avoid it by coming up with this plan that essentially did not help anybody.

Mr. DOGGETT. Is not it true, in fact, that what they did was to have a focus group or they got some high-powered, expensive political consultant to tell them what going by any meeting of the American Association of Retired Persons or retired teachers or many of our retired veterans could have told them for free, and that is that the Republicans are perceived here in the House and around the country as having done absolutely nothing to help seniors when it comes to the outrageous price of prescription drugs? They have sat on their hands. They have been here in charge now for right at 6 years, and they have done absolutely nothing. So after they got that input from this high-powered consultant, it only took a few days and then they were out in our Committee on Ways and Means with a proposal to subsidize insurance companies and make it appear that they were finally getting around to doing something.

Mr. PALLONE. The irony of it is that the insurance companies testified before your Committee on Ways and Means and before my Committee on Commerce and said that they would not sell the policies. They were not interested in it.

Mr. DOGGETT. I believe that their famous comment on that of one of the insurance folks was that it would be like insurance for haircuts being proposed.

Mr. PALLONE. Exactly.

Mr. DOGGETT. And even though they were going to get a general subsidy, they did not know whether they could ever provide the policies.

□ 2030

I believe though Texas, unfortunately, has been way behind on doing anything to assist our seniors, there have been some States that have tried this approach that the Republicans have advanced, and what has been their experience?

Mr. PALLONE. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have the perfect example in Nevada which, I believe around March or so of this year, passed a plan that is almost exactly the same as what the Republicans in the House proposed. The insurance industry told the Nevada legislature it was not going to work and there was not a single insurance company that wanted to sell a policy that would meet the specifications of what the Nevada legislature passed. So it has been a total failure in Nevada.