

Arkansas and California, and other places, can get up to \$120,000 a year, will get up to \$120,000 a year, and not have to farm? They do not have to farm at all. They do not get it for 1 year; they get it for 7 years. For 7 years. That is \$840,000 a farmer.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention something. In the State of Kansas, in western Kansas where the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture comes from, there will be payments to 85 percent of those big wheat farmers to the tune of the average of \$30,000 a year for the next 7 years.

FEDERAL BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS MUST BE REEVALUATED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, actions have consequences. It is about time that we as a Congress analyze how our congressional actions impact on America's future.

Mr. Speaker, in September, U.S. News & World Report put on its cover the issue of making English our official language. It was an absolutely eye-opening investigation into bilingual education, and I recommend it to every Member of Congress to read this portion of the magazine.

Mr. Speaker, the billion-dollar program of bilingual education reasons that children taught in their native language will somehow learn English more quickly. I would like to share some of the article's conclusions, as I found their analysis to be right on target.

Mr. Speaker, the first point and criticism that can be made of transitional bilingual education programs is that they are not really transitional. Too many students are held in these language maintenance programs, never acquiring enough English fluency to regain mainstream classroom capabilities. U.S. News pointed out a woman in New York who had a ninth grade daughter in the classroom of bilingual education for 9 years and this family had a very poor experience in that the youngster never did get into transitional English.

Mr. Speaker, all kinds of examples in the magazine, in U.S. News and World Report, point out that the family's experiences are all too common. For example, Ray Domanico, of the New York Public Education Association, says that bilingual education, "is becoming an institutionalized ghetto." Arthur Schlesinger in his book, "The Disuniting of America," points out that "bilingual education promotes segregation, nourishes racial antagonism, and shuts the door to students," all things that we do not want to happen in America.

Bilingual education also is all too often not actually bilingual, as the re-

port points out. The word "bilingual" implies that students in these programs receive equal amounts of instruction in two languages. This could not be further from the truth. Many students in bilingual education get as many as 30 minutes a day in English.

Mr. Speaker, how can anyone expect to pick up English quickly under these conditions? How can we expect the students to pick up English under these conditions? The answer is that they cannot.

Bilingual education does not help children learn English quickly and effectively, as Congress intended it to do, yet the program has flourished for at least three decades, going from a small pilot program 28 years ago to a \$10 billion business, spawning a bureaucracy bent on self-preservation. Some of the Government's worst bureaucratic excesses can be found in the administration of these programs.

The inertia of billion-dollar budgets drives bilingual education expansion. In many areas across the country, children are misplaced into these programs. In some cases they are put into bilingual education classrooms not because they do not understand English well, but because they cannot read English well. These children need remedial English classes; not history in Spanish or Mandarin Chinese.

Worst still, Mr. Speaker, some children are placed in these programs simply because they have ethnic surnames. In a complete perversion of the so-called multiculturalism, children with names like Ming or Martinez are red-flagged on school rolls and are placed, without their parents' consent or permission, into these programs.

In New York City recently, a number of families became so frustrated with the bilingual bureaucracy that they took the New York Board of Education to court in order to win the right to withdraw their children from bilingual educational programs.

In some ways, these children are the lucky ones. They had parents who had the strength and courage to stand up to the system. How many children are not so lucky? Mr. Speaker, I have heard horror stories of Haitian Creole-speaking children placed in Spanish classes because there are not enough of them to warrant their own instructor.

In other cases, desperate school superintendents struggling to meet State and Federal bilingual education guidelines are forced to recruit uncredentialed, unqualified, instructors from abroad, many of whom do not speak English. The result, Mr. Speaker, is that we have teachers who cannot speak English teaching children who do not speak English. It does not take an Ivy League-educated Education Department bureaucrat to conclude that under these conditions, children do not learn English quickly or effectively.

An entire generation of children has been forced to suffer through these public policies gone awry. The high school dropout rate in these areas is

exceedingly high; higher than any other rate. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to focus Congress' attention on what bilingual education is doing to our students.

Mr. Speaker, the high school dropout rate for Hispanic students, one of the telling indicators bilingual education was supposed to change, has not budged since the programs began. Tellingly, it remains the highest of any ethnic group—four times higher than that of most other groups and another example from U.S. News, three times higher than that of Afro-Americans.

Mr. Speaker, for most of our Nation's history, America gave the children of immigrants a precious gift—an education in the English language. As each new wave of immigrants arrived on these shores, our public school system taught their sons and daughters English so they could claim their piece of the American dream.

What are we doing for these new Americans today? Instead of a first-rate education in English, our bilingual education programs are consigning an entire generation of new Americans—unable to speak, understand, and use English effectively—to a second-class future.

This tragedy has human faces. Let me tell you about two people's experiences which will illustrate the impact of our failed bilingual education programs. I have never heard the problems with bilingual education more poignantly put than in the words of Ernesto Ortiz, a foreman on a south Texas ranch who said: "My children learn Spanish in school so they can become busboys and waiters. I teach them English at home so they can become doctors and lawyers." Ernesto understands that English is the language of opportunity in this country. He understands that denying his children a good education in English will doom them to a limited—as opposed to limitless—future.

Bilga Abramova also understands this simple truth. Bilga is a 35-year-old Russian refugee who has entered a church lottery 3 times in an attempt to win 1 of 50 coveted spaces in a free, intensive English class offered by her local parish. Her pleas in Russian speak volumes about the plight of all too many immigrants: "I need to win," she said. "Without English, I cannot begin a new life."

The ultimate paradox about our commitment to bilingual education in this country is that Bilga and others like her all across the country sit on waiting lists for intensive English classes while we spend \$8 billion a year teaching children in their native language.

You have heard from parents like Ernesto Ortiz and how they feel about bilingual education. Even teachers oppose these programs. A recent survey of 1,000 elementary and secondary teachers found that 64 percent of them disapproved of bilingual education programs and favored intensive English instruction instead.

Even longtime defenders of these programs are starting to change their tune. The California Board of Education approved a new policy recently in which they abandoned their preference for bilingual education programs.

This year marks the 28th year of bilingual education programs. For more and more people, that is 28 years too long. It is time to take a fresh look at this problem. Bilingual education has had 28 years and billions of dollars to prove that it accomplished what it said it would do in 1968: teach children English

quickly and effectively. Too many people lose sight of the fact that the real issue here is how to help children and newcomers who do not know English and who need to assimilate.

Let us not forget Ernesto Ortiz and his children, Bilga Abramova and other new Americans like them. Mr. Speaker, this is not just an abstract public policy issue; bilingual education and our national language policies have real world consequences. When our policies fail, the failures have names and faces attached to them. When our policies serve to divide rather than unite us, the rips appear in the very fabric of the American Nation.

The following description of bilingual education comes from US News and World Report: "along with crumbling classrooms and violence in the hallways, bilingual education has emerged as one of the dark spots on the grim tableau of American public education. Today, the program has mushroomed into a \$10 billion-a-year bureaucracy that not only cannot promise that students will learn English but may actually do some children more harm than good."

Mr. Speaker, this should be bilingual education's epitaph. I urge all of my colleagues to see the writing on the wall. Bilingual education has had its time to prove its effectiveness; 28 years is long enough to see if this approach works. These programs were created with good intentions, I am sure. However, after almost three decades and billions of dollars, we must recognize the painful truth that bilingual education does not work.

CONGRESS PLAYING POLITICAL CHICKEN WITH NATION'S CREDIT RATING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor to speak about something else, but I ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] to stay, because I was very fascinated by what he was saying, and he only had the 5 minutes. The gentleman is saying that his committee is going to mark up this megabill that is going to cost billions of dollars, and really it is going to be basically for the fat-cat farmers?

Mr. VOLKMER. If the gentlewoman will yield, yes, basically the wealthy, the farmer with a lot of acreage producing a lot of crops will benefit from it.

To give another example, down in cotton country, in west Texas and New Mexico and other places where upland cotton is grown, if they gave a good year, and it looks like next year is going to be a good year, if they follow the programs, they could make, say, half a million dollars in selling their cotton. At the same time, a father and two sons, or a father with his two brothers, as long as they have three entities, they can get \$40,000 each. They will get that whether they farm or not.

If they make half a million dollars, they are still going to get \$120,000 from the Government. If they do not farm at all, they decide, "Well, we are going to

quit farming, we are going to let the land stay idle. Let us go down south for a while," they get \$120,000. That is right. They do not have to farm at all.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is absolutely astounding. They get paid whether they decide to work or not?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is correct.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, this is a welfare program that makes welfare look tough.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would continue to yield, it makes AFDC and food stamps and everything so little and so pike. And yet they on that side made a big to-do on how we have to save all of this money, getting back to kids eating, to school lunches, and then giving big farmers, many of which have their own airplanes and their own big cars and Mercedes and make hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, they are going to give them money.

Like I said before, in the chairman's own district, it has been estimated that in the chairman's own district in western Kansas, he has 85 percent of his wheat farmers in the program. So they will, each one of them will get on the average, estimated on the average, \$30,000 a year, even if they do not farm. If they do, and next year wheat prices are looking real good, and they make a \$100,000, they still are going to make that \$30,000.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. They do not have to give it back?

Mr. VOLKMER. No, no, it is guaranteed.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for staying. I know the gentleman is very busy.

Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman is saying is classic about what is going on around here. This place is basically shut down. They throw out a bill, and we find out all of these special interests here in it. Here we are, playing political chicken with the credit rating of this Nation. This is outrageous.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, it is the same thing that happened in the 100 days. Remember, if we were on the committee, we got the bill that morning. Guess what, I got the final version of their bill this morning, and we are going to mark it up at 2 o'clock.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri. He is obviously a speed reader, if he got through it that fast, and the rest of us will never see it.

Mr. Speaker, it will be like the committee that I am on that came to the floor last week. The Committee on National Security got notice that there were two copies of the bill, and we could go in the morning and could go to the room where the two copies of the bill were located. We could spend our time reading the bill, of course, this thick. Get a clue.

So I must say, this is really very troubling as to what is going on here

and how stuff is ramrodded through, and we are getting paid, but we are doing nothing. We are becoming like the farmers, I guess. We get paid whether we legislate or not or whether we do anything realistic or not. Here we are, this is great. I guess we are changing our programs so that everybody else gets to be like Members of Congress.

This is a light month; February, we are hardly here. But the tragedy is, this is a very serious month. This is the month when the birthdays of Washington and Lincoln come up. I wonder what they must be thinking that we are celebrating their birthday in February by pushing this country to the brink of shoving its credit rating right off the side.

Mr. Speaker, I think of every American family sitting around their kitchen table, and one of the things they are terribly worried about is obviously their credit rating. In America, if one's credit rating goes sour, they are going to have a very tough life. If our country's credit rating goes sour, we are going to look like fools on this planet.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is really time that we all come and have some debates about those issues. We owe that to the people sitting around the kitchen table dealing with those issues in their own family budgets. For crying out loud, we are paid to deal with this Nation's budget. We are now 5 months into the fiscal year, and we have not done it. It is about time we get on with it.

OPPOSE FRANCE'S NUCLEAR TESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I urge your support for a letter which will be delivered to French President Jacques Chirac when he arrives in Washington this week.

Our letter expresses our support for France's decision to end its recent series of nuclear testing, as well as our concern about the long-term damage caused by the tests in the first place.

Our letter is simple and to the point: while we oppose France's series of nuclear tests that began this past September, we ask that the French Government permanently close its testing facilities and immediately begin a comprehensive cleanup operation.

France's decision to conduct a series of tests prior to enacting a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty is hypocritical and lacks the sound judgment of a country that aspires to world leadership.

By continuing with these unlawful tests, France undermined its credibility in the world community. We are now forced to question the French Government's reliability in what they say is their commitment to eliminate nuclear weapons.