

those dollars to better educate their children.

My experience here in Washington, I have seen absolutely nothing, absolutely nothing that would lead me to believe that the people here in Washington are better able to determine how to best educate our kids, are better somehow than the people that are there in those local communities, in the Fox Valley where I spoke to this young lady this evening. I see nothing that would indicate to me that the parents and the teachers and the school boards and the other folks there in the Fox Valley in Wisconsin are not better prepared to make decisions on education that relate to their kids than the people here in Washington, D.C.

That is what this debate is about. It is not about more money or less money for education. Education is a very high priority. There are all kinds of government waste that we can eliminate so as to redirect more dollars to education. I support that.

To the extent that we are talking about allocating more of our Federal resources to education, I support that. But I also support making sure that it is our parents that are deciding where their kids go to school, what the kids are taught and how it is taught in those schools. We need to reempower our parents to be actively involved in the education process of our kids.

We found an interesting thing happens, when the parents are actively involved in the education process of the kids, we looked at a study of thousands of teenagers, what we found is that when the parents are more actively involved in the kids education, not only does the education get better, but we find that there is a decrease in crime rates, there is a decrease in drug use, decrease in teen pregnancy. So the bottom line in this whole education debate is not should there be more Federal dollars allocated to it or less. The debate is about who should decide how those dollars can best help educate our kids.

I keep coming down to, I have just seen absolutely nothing that would indicate to me that somehow, because we are here in Washington, we know what is best for educating our kids out in Wisconsin. I just do not buy into that. I think the right answer to this is go ahead and support reprioritizing the dollars toward education, but let us make sure that our parents and our teachers and our communities and our school boards are then deciding how to best use those additional resources to best improve the quality of education for our children.

CIA IGNORED CHARGES OF CONTRA DRUG DEALING

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, well, the CIA has finally admitted it and the New York Times

finally covered it. The Times ran the devastating story on Saturday, with the headline: CIA Said to Ignore Charges of Contra Drug Dealing in 80s.

In a remarkable reversal by the New York Times, the paper reported that the CIA knew about Contra drug dealing and they covered it up. The CIA let it go on for years during the height of their campaign against the Sandinista government.

Among other revelations in the article were that "the CIA's inspector general determined that the agency 'did not inform Congress of all allegations or information it received indicating that contra-related organizations or individuals were involved in drug trafficking.'"

The Times article continued pointing out "[d]uring the time the ban on [Contra] funds was in effect, the CIA informed Congress only about drug charges against two other contra-related people. [T]he agency failed to tell other executive branch agencies, including the Justice Department, about drug allegations against 11 contra-related individuals or entities."

The article continues stating "[the Report] makes clear that the agency did little or nothing to investigate most of the drug allegations that it heard about the contra and their supporters. In all, the inspector general's report found that the CIA has received allegations of drug involvement by 58 contras or others linked to the contra program. These included 14 pilots and two others tied to the contra program's CIA-backed air transportation operations."

The Times reported that "the report said that in at least six instances, the CIA knew about allegations regarding individuals or organizations but that knowledge did not deter it from continuing to employ them."

Several informed sources have told me that an appendix to this Report was removed at the instruction of the Department of Justice at the last minute. This appendix is reported to have information about a CIA officer, not agent or asset, but officer, based in the Los Angeles Station, who was in charge of Contra related activities. According to these sources, this individual was associated with running drugs to South Central Los Angeles, around 1988. Let me repeat that amazing omission. The recently released CIA Report Volume II contained an appendix, which was pulled by the Department of Justice, that reported a CIA officer in the LA Station was hooked into drug running in South Central Los Angeles.

I have not seen this appendix. But the sources are very reliable and well-informed. The Department of Justice must release that appendix immediately. If the Department of Justice chooses to withhold this clearly vital information, the outrage will be severe and widespread.

We have finally seen the CIA admit to have knowingly employed drug dealers associated with the Contra movement. I look forward to a comprehensive investigation into this matter by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, now that the underlying charges have finally been admitted by the CIA.

MORE ON EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor tonight to talk about education and to first raise my disappointment with Congress being unable to provide funding for America's children in terms of education.

However, I am hearing that perhaps an agreement has been made and that there will be funding available for some of the President's initiatives that he proposed back in January in the State of the Union address.

What I have here tonight is a pamphlet that describes what matters most, Teaching for America's Future, that I provided to every Member of Congress at the top of the year. As the only Member who serves on the National Commission on Teaching in America's Future, I wanted Congress to recognize persons across this Nation, from governors to state superintendents to school superintendents, principals, educators, teachers and parents, coming together to talk about the importance of qualified teachers.

This is why we embraced this, the President's initiative on 100,000 new teachers to provide for our students. We must reform the methodology of teaching in which we have begun to do, and we must expand professional development for teachers. We can ill afford to have weakened professional development, thinking that this will make teachers more qualified.

□ 2045

Teachers need a more frequent involvement in professional development, and there needs to be a whole methodology of teaching whereby computer literacy will be part of this new methodology of teaching.

After-school programs is another phase by which we need to embrace this initiative. If we are going to divert those 3 hours of mischievous time for students who come home to empty homes, latchkey children, we will then need to have after-school programs where this will be a positive setting for our students and our children whereby they can divert from the violence that has seemed to just permeate that block of time where children are not supervised.

Smaller classrooms. We as former teachers and administrators recognize the importance of smaller classrooms, eighteen in a class, that is the best, more manageable classroom whereby students will get individualized training. We must ensure that qualified teaching and qualified learning be part of the structure of a reduced class size.

School construction. There is no way that dilapidated schools where roofs are falling, wiring is seen outside of the plastic, plaster is falling from the ceiling, there is no way that is an environment that is conducive to learning.

This Congress must make sure that the infrastructure of education become a priority just like the infrastructure in transportation became a priority in the T-21 bill. We must provide that infrastructure of education so that we

can build the bridges of learning for our students to cross over this bridge to the 21st Century like we are building infrastructures, roads, and bridges in our towns and in our cities.

Yes, the President's initiative is one that we embrace, members and commissioners on the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, a think tank that speaks to education, because we want to make sure that our children do have the quality of qualified teachers, reduce class sizes where there will be more individualized training, after-school programs where they can further this training and also enhance their knowledge, and, yes, school construction.

Children must have an environment that is conducive to learning. Our children deserve no less, and our Nation has no recourse if we are to prepare our future leaders for this global workplace.

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. FURSE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FURSE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

ISSUES YET TO BE SOLVED IN THE DO-NOTHING CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend the hour this evening with some of my Democratic colleagues basically reiterating what we have been saying the last few days or the last few weeks; and that is that, because of the Republican leadership's inattention, if you will, to the budget and to the needs of the American people, and because of their unwillingness to reach out and deal with some of the most pressing issues that the public is really crying out for this Congress to address, we are now faced here with another day and another continuing resolution because there is no budget because the Republican leadership has not passed a budget and is basically trying to get out of town, have this Congress adjourn, without addressing some of the major concerns that we as Democrats feel should have been addressed and still could be addressed if the Republican leadership would only take them up. I just mention a few like HMO reform, education initiatives, the need to address concerns about Social Security.

I just wanted to point out that, due to excessive partisanship, we have seen the Republican leadership waste time on a very extremist agenda in this Congress and not deal with the issues that really should be dealt with.

I just wanted to mention two tonight before I introduce and yield time to some of my colleagues. One is this raid on the Social Security Trust Fund to pay for tax breaks, if you will, primarily for the wealthy, and the second is school vouchers.

What we saw just a few weeks ago was really the most alarming of the extremist proposals passed by the Republican Congress, and that was H.R. 4579, the GOP tax break bill. This raided the Social Security Trust Fund to pay for an \$80 billion election year tax break. The House Republicans passed their tax, their tax cut bill on September 26 by a vote of 229 to 195, and they said they were using the surplus for tax cuts.

But what the Republicans failed to point out was that, without the Social Security Trust Fund, there was no surplus. Indeed, 98 percent of the surplus from fiscal year 1999 through fiscal year 2008 comes from the surplus in the Social Security Trust Fund.

That is virtually all the surplus reflects, anticipated buildup in the Social Security Trust Fund to pay future Social Security benefits. To spend this Social Security surplus on tax cuts is to endanger the future benefits of Social Security recipients, our senior citizens and future senior citizens.

Democrats have proposed saving Social Security first, preserving every

penny of the surplus until the Social Security Trust Fund is strengthened through the 21st Century.

But the Republicans did not want to deal with that. They did not want to deal with Social Security. They did not care about Social Security. They just wanted to get some quick tax breaks, again primarily for the wealthy.

The second thing I wanted to mention tonight, and I know that most of my colleagues are going to talk about, the Democrats education initiative, the school modernization program, the proposal to add 100,000 teachers to bring class size down.

These are really the two issues that we insist must be addressed before this Congress adjourns. But what I wanted to point out very briefly is that, not only did the Republican leadership not address these important education initiatives, but they spent a tremendous amount of time this last year trying to take away money from public schools and give it to private schools in the form of vouchers.

I consider this one of the most extreme parts of the GOP agenda, this anti-public education agenda they have been pursuing over the last 2 years. Even the conservative Washington Times acknowledges, and I just want to quote, "that the ground breaking school voucher provision is the first step in a larger Republican effort to shift Federal aid away from public schools while making it easier for parents to send their children to private schools. School vouchers use scarce taxpayer dollars to subsidize attendance of private and religious schools rather than improving the public schools."

I am going to use a quote from one of my colleagues, a Republican, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) because some of the Republicans on the other side share the Democratic view on this, although the leadership was clearly against us.

The gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) said, and I quote, "ultimately these school vouchers will result in gutting the public school system. Because vouchers will be sending more and more of our scarce financial resources out of the public system and into the private system."

Mr. Speaker, this is just the beginning of what the far right wants to do to destroy public education. They wanted to eliminate the Department of Education, and they want to take money from the public schools and give it to the private schools.

Just an example of a couple of expressions that have been made by some of the far right proponents, if you will, who are advocates of this. This is a quote from Pat Robertson, founder of the Christian coalition. He says, "the public education movement has always been an antiChristian movement." Can you imagine suggesting that somehow public schools are antiChristian?

Another quote from Jerry Falwell, founder of the Moral Majority, and I