

They go to school to learn how to teach. They are dedicated and bring a personal passion to the job that is before them. Then they are thrown into a classroom situation where they are not treated like professionals, where they are asked to do more than teach children. They are asked to be social workers, guidance counselors, drug rehabilitators and, on occasion, substitute parents.

Many teachers rise to that occasion and they respond remarkably well. But I say this, if we really want to treat teachers like real professionals, I would suggest that we ought to create a system where they are allowed to become incredibly wealthy, that the value of a teacher is measured by their contribution to the organization. If they have a line of parents outside their door wanting their service, they ought to be treated like real professionals, like the doctor who has the same situation, like the lawyer who has clients waiting outside the door, like the insurance agent, the real estate agent, any professional that has people wanting their service ought to be able to be treated in a way that honors and respects the contributions that they make to their community, to their school and ultimately to the lives of children.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that if you listen very carefully to the debates that have taken place over the last couple weeks, if you want to define the essence, the difference between those of us who really care about improving the quality of schools in our country and those who want to preserve the centralized authority here in Washington, it all comes down to this, and I will conclude on this point. There are those in this Chamber on the other side of the aisle with a far different perspective who believe you measure fairness in education by the relationship between school buildings or different education bureaucracies.

We, on the other hand, believe you measure education fairness in America upon the relationship between children, no matter where they are, whether they are educated in the home, in a private school, in a public school or in any other setting. We focus on the fairness of children. That is what every one of our bills and initiatives here in Washington as a conservative Republican majority have entailed.

That is what we will continue to fight for day. After day. After day until at the end we can finally agree that we have restored the hope and the vision of our country as a society of well-educated citizens.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BOB SCHAFFER]. I knew his position on this matter. I know his heart.

Mr. Speaker, this subject commands such a commitment among the Members of the House that we have found ourselves this evening with an embarrassment of riches on the subject. We had the gentleman from Texas [Mr.

DELAY], who came in earlier, had to go out to another discussion. We had the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], who had to go off and will be back later to renew his discussions on this subject. We have the gentleman from Kentucky [Mrs. NORTHUP], who sat and waited until it became evident that the time would run out and she would not be able to participate this evening, but who has a commitment to this.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, we have my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], who still sits here and waits his turn as the clock runs down.

□ 1930

If I could close, Mr. Speaker, on this comment. DUKE CUNNINGHAM is a man who is devoted to these children. His wife is a professional educator. DUKE has himself been an educator among his many occupations in life. I have worked with him on the committee that deals with education. He has a great deal to offer and in fact has offered and given a great deal already. It is our loss that we did not have time for Mr. CUNNINGHAM to speak in this hour this evening, but I can tell you the blessing is that he will not quit, he will not go away, he will be back and when he returns to the subject, he says each child will be cared for.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM is so enthusiastic about speaking, he has just suggested, Mr. Speaker, that I ask unanimous consent that my special order be extended for 5 minutes so that indeed he can have an opportunity to speak.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALSH). The gentleman's request is not in order. The procedure is that a Member may not address the House for more than 1 hour in a special order.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the Speaker and I thank Mr. CUNNINGHAM for his devotion and dedication.

REQUEST FOR 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

IN THE MATTER OF CONTESTED ELECTION IN CALIFORNIA'S 46TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, earlier today we had a resolution on the floor that unfortunately did not achieve success but should have. Almost 6 months ago, the Los Angeles Times stated that, quote, it is time to wrap up the House inquiry, unquote, which, quote, has produced no evidence that Congresswoman SANCHEZ' victory, which was in the 46th District of California, was the result of electoral fraud. That is the Los Angeles Times of April 22 of this year.

Echoing this was a Washington Post editorial that noted that in the Dornan-Sanchez case, quote, no credible evidence has yet been offered that votes were affected in sufficient numbers to alter the outcome of the race. Washington Post, July 28 of this year.

Just recently, again the Los Angeles Times pointed out, quote, there has been no evidence yet that SANCHEZ benefited from fraudulent votes, and the next regularly scheduled election is only 14 months away. That was back on September 23, 1997.

Yet despite all of these independent statements by all of these newspapers who are looking at the facts and circumstances as they have unfolded since the election took place last November, the fact of the matter is that Republicans continue to drag out this process. They have done so with hundreds of thousands of dollars in taxpayer moneys having been spent, and yet no clear and convincing evidence, no preponderance of evidence, no evidence beyond a reasonable doubt being presented to substantiate that Congresswoman SANCHEZ' election should not be upheld.

It is clear to many of us why Republicans continue to pursue this matter. This is an all-out effort to intimidate and harass new citizens and those with foreign surnames and stop them from voting. This is plain from the fact that Republicans are not checking the citizenship of voters in any other close election across the country. As the President of the nonpartisan League of Women Voters has noted, the committee investigation is, quote, being carried out in ways that may intimidate future voters. Limiting access to the voting booth has been the plan all along.

Just after the election, the Los Angeles Times reported that, quote, Dornan has said his Republican colleagues are seeking a case to use in challenging voter registration procedures nationwide. In targeting this election, Republicans have selected a seat where Hispanic voting played a vital role in the outcome of the election. Republicans have every reason to hope that Hispanic and other minority voters stay

home at election time, and that is because in 1996 Hispanic Americans voted in larger numbers than ever before, with the number of Latino registered voters increasing nearly 30 percent from 1992 to 1996 to more than 6.6 million nationwide. They supported Democrats by a significant margin in 1996. So there is a reason, a good founded reason why the Republican Party seeks to intimidate and suppress that vote.

Voter fraud allegations must be vigorously pursued and prosecuted, but is not the U.S. attorney, who is investigating the matter, are the State officials and local officials who are already on the case not more than enough to investigate it? Are all the use of taxpayer dollars in all of those separate investigations in and of itself not enough to vigorously pursue and prosecute the case?

Unfortunately, these actions in the House are consistent with a history of Republican Party efforts at the polls to intimidate voters in minority districts. For example, Republicans have an 8-year history in southern California of intimidating Latino voters at the polls. The Republican Party paid approximately \$600,000 to settle two voting intimidation cases, one stemming from 1988 and 1989 in which the Orange County Republican Party placed security guards and signs at the voting polls designed to scare Latino voters. Because of this track record of voter harassment, in 1992 the Justice Department had to monitor elections because again there were complaints of Republican voter intimidation. Those are not the only places in the Nation, but particularly as it relates to the question of the election in the 46th District of California, it is relevant because there is a history as it relates to Orange County and the Republican Party's attempts to suppress the voters.

But even though we agree that we have got to try to pursue and root out voter fraud, the bottom line is what has been the procedure? And speaking to Members of the minority who serve on the committee, the fact is they have a list of procedural outrages that have taken place by the majority. From the outset, the majority has disregarded the rights of the minority on the committee. It has made decisions for the task force without notifying or consulting the minority. The majority has failed to provide motions and other filings to the minority. The majority denied the minority access to materials provided by the INS and the Orange County registrar. The majority reviewed materials produced to the committee under seal without notifying the minority. The majority's handling of the discovery process has been unfair to Congresswoman SANCHEZ. The majority's decision to give Mr. Dornan subpoena authority again is unprecedented under the Contested Elections Act. Yet the majority permitted Mr. Dornan to issue subpoenas for more than 2 months after his discovery period expired and then cut off discovery

for Ms. SANCHEZ without having notified her that her discovery period ever began. So we give the proponent of the election contest two months more than he was legally entitled to, but we never tell the subject of the election contest that her discovery period ever began and then we cut it off.

The majority has made repeated unilateral demands for information from the INS. The majority provided information to the INS, but concealed it from the minority. What is this INS information that keeps being used to create the aura, to create the cloud, to suggest that there is fraud that should be pursued? What is being done, for our colleagues to understand, is that they have taken all of the voters whose surnames appear and compared it to lists provided by the INS. Now, the problems with lists provided by the INS is that the Immigration and Naturalization Service has all of these names in which the surnames may appear a series of times. And even surnames and first names. And even surnames and first names with exactly the same birth dates. In one case, that appeared, the same name, the same birth date, the same address, over 18 times. What does the list prove? Not very much, because the only way truly of proving the question as to whether someone is a legal voter or not when the allegation is that that voter is allegedly not a citizen of the United States or was not a citizen at the time that they registered to vote is to produce proof of their citizenship. In this country, there are only two ways to prove your citizenship. One is your birth certificate. The other is, if you became a naturalized citizen through the Immigration and Naturalization Service, to produce your naturalization certificate. The lists that the INS provided, of course, have no basis for birth certificates, because it is not within their purview. Yet it does have the names of individuals who, like myself, was born in the United States and who may have claimed a family member at some time from abroad and because they simply filed that appropriate petition to claim that family member from abroad under our immigration and naturalization laws is put on this list. However, the INS cannot prove that that individual is a citizen or not because they do not in fact have what in my case would be the birth certificate. That is not their document. They have naturalization certificates. So this list is promulgated not having a basis by which you can ever make a determination. The majority on the Committee on House Oversight knows that the only way, which they simply do not want to do, and I understand why they do not want to do it, is to take the list of those who they challenge as voters and be able to pursue those voters by having each and every single individual address and prove to them whether or not they are a citizen by birth, which means a birth certificate, or a citizen by naturalization,

which means a naturalization certificate.

□ 1945

Since they are unwilling to do that, and since they know the outrage that would be generated by people with the door on their home being knocked at and saying, "By the way, we want proof of your citizenship," and I am sure they would equally go and visit a Smith or a Thomas or a Dornan as they would a Sanchez or a Suarez or some other Hispanic name. People would be outraged that they would be approached and their citizenship would be questioned.

This constant number that is thrown out there and these lists, which can never suffice to prove or disprove the issue at hand, 300 names we heard today in the debate were clearly now in question. Yet of those 300 names that are promoted by the Secretary of State, we heard our colleague, Congresswoman SANCHEZ, get up on the floor and say that she and people who had investigated the names found out that about 25 percent of them were proved, and they stopped there, proved that they were, in fact, voters.

It is interesting to note the article from the Los Angeles Times dated October 8, 1997. The headline says "Four of targeted voters prove themselves. They show they were citizens, when they registered, and denounced Dornan for falsely accusing them."

I want to read from the article. It says, "Four voters who were apparently targeted in a congressional investigation of election fraud stepped forward Tuesday with proof that they were U.S. citizens when they registered to vote and denounced former Representative Robert Dornan in his 11-month quest to regain his seat. 'It really hurt me deep inside when I found out my name was on that list of alleged illegal voters,' said Maria Jimenez, a nurse's aide and mother of three who was born in Orange County 24 years ago. 'I don't think it is fair for Bob Dornan to do this to me.'"

Continuing in the article, "Another voter was Ramon Mascorro, a 15-year California resident and a citizen since June of 1996. He registered to vote two weeks after taking the oath."

He said, "My major desire in becoming a citizen was to have the right to vote," said Mascorro, who owns an electronic business in Santa Ana and wore a tiny U.S. flag in the lapel of his suit jacket."

Then it goes on to talk about one of the volunteers who went through these alleged illegal voters, who said, "I personally checked over 75 and I didn't find anybody who voted illegally," said Consuelo Smith, one of the volunteers. "I found people who were born here, people who were citizens for over 20 years, but they were all citizens when they voted."

Or Virginia Ochos, age 70, who has lived in California since 1958, raised 11 children, and became a citizen last

June. Her oldest son served in Vietnam and she said, "I feel very bad when they said I made a fraud. This is what hurts me the most."

Or Toribio Chacon, a factory worker from Santa Ana said he became a citizen in March 1996 after taking classes. His brother-in-law, who took the oath a month earlier, also is a target of the probe. "I am under investigation and I want to know why," he said. "I didn't do anything wrong."

The article states, "All four said that they had not yet been contacted by investigators, congressional staff members, although their names, along with photos of their naturalization certificates and birth certificates were forwarded to the investigating Congressional committee last April."

So the fact of the matter is, and there are many other articles like this, there is proof time and time again of individuals who were born in the United States, whose children have served in the armed forces of the United States, who are veterans of the United States, and yet constantly their citizenship can be questioned.

I want to read some of the comments of some of these other people involved, what they said. These are U.S. citizens, what they said about how they are being treated.

"The right-wingers cannot have it both ways. On the one hand they complain that the IRS has wrongfully targeted many citizens for tax investigations, and, on the other hand, they take advantage of instances when the INS and other officials have wrongly targeted naturalized citizens in the exercise of our voting rights," said Ramon Mascorro, who is an Orange County resident targeted in the Dornan investigation, someone who is a legal citizen.

"I have worked hard, played by the rules, and become a citizen. Yet I am still investigated because of faulty data collected by the INS and used by the right-wingers to serve their political purpose," stated Virginia Ochoa.

So, the fact of the matter is that we have a double standard.

Now, what did we attempt to do in the resolution today? Very simple: We said put up or shut up. If you have the proof, proof positive, after nearly a year after the election took place, then bring it to the House floor for all of the Members to consider and to make a judgment on.

We did not get that. We would like to see every name and every address, and, if it is available, every phone number of every alleged noncitizen who voted in the 46th Congressional race in November of 1996. Let us see it. What are you hiding? What is the problem?

If you bring it forth, then it will be subject to being reviewed to determine whether or not, one, they are a citizen or not, and if they are proven to be, like all of these people who came forth, well, then, it is obvious that, in fact, there are going to be many people with egg on their face, because all of these

people continue to come forward as citizens, continue to come forward as people who were born in the United States.

Of all of those names that have come forth, we will review them all. Let us find out who is and who is not, and then we will see what the bottom line is. But why are you hiding the names? Why hide the names, unless, of course, you do not have enough names to substantiate what you would like to do, which is to steal the election from Congresswoman SANCHEZ.

That is what we sought to do in the resolution today. Now, in that debate, it is interesting to note that there were other races at the same time that Congresswoman SANCHEZ got elected. There were two State assembly seats won by Republicans. We are not questioning the validity of their elections, even though one won by only 93 votes. Congresswoman SANCHEZ won by over 900 votes. We are questioning her election, but the Republican assembly person who got elected by 93 votes, we are not questioning them.

We are not questioning the City Council races that took place in three major cities. We are not questioning any of those people who got elected, even though the same voters cast their votes at the same time. We are not questioning all of the judges who ran in that race, even though the judges were up for election at the same time in the same election and the same voters voted in that race.

We are not questioning the school board races that took place at the time, even though all those school board members ran and got elected and had the election at the same time in the same election with the same voters.

We are not questioning the initiatives that might be at stake in California that were on the ballot at the same time in the same election with the same voters. So none of those things that Republicans were successful on do they seek to question.

Now, the fact of the matter is that we heard a lot about our responsibility. And, yes, we have a responsibility. We have a responsibility to make sure that individuals who are elected to this House are elected in free and fair elections. But we also have a responsibility to do it in a timely fashion.

All we heard today from the majority is if there are enough voters to overturn it, and if there are enough questions of citizenship, and as one of our colleagues from Texas said, if we find out some day that, in fact, there were not enough votes to overturn the election, then we can clearly confirm Ms. SANCHEZ.

Well, that is a lot of if's. And if this House can permit itself that simply claiming fraud is sufficient to have a Member hang out there for over a year, without being able to have finality, as well as for the voters of their district to have finality, that this is the person who is representing them without ques-

tion, simply by the allegation of fraud, then this institution is in serious trouble, because what you will see in the next cycle of elections come next year is that someone who loses and wants to contest the election, oh, just raise fraud. Whether or not you can prove it, as they have been unable to prove it in this case, that is another matter. But just raise fraud.

I want to yield at this time to a distinguished colleague of mine from Maryland, who is an attorney and I know has been pursuing the interest in this case and the questions that surround it, the gentleman from Maryland, for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. WYNN. Thank you very much. I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding and also take this opportunity to commend him for his outstanding work on this issue.

It is not easy to carry the banner sometimes, and I have observed his diligence and his conscientiousness in working on this issue to champion the cause of justice. He has done an exemplary job and I commend him for it.

I came down this evening to add my voice to those of us who were quite frankly outraged at what is going on in this chamber. We are outraged, first, at the waste of taxpayer money. This investigation has taken over one year. There has been lots of opportunities, plenty of opportunities, ample opportunities, for the Republicans and their allies to make their case. They have investigated individuals ad nauseam. They have subpoenaed individuals ad nauseam. They have allowed Mr. Dornan, a former Member of Congress, to seek subpoenas, to bring people in, to ask questions, to conduct a thorough investigation.

At every step of the way, those of us on this side of the aisle have attempted to cooperate. Notwithstanding the fact there has been a consistent lack of communication from their side, a lack of cooperation, we recognized that Congress does have a role in looking into these matters. We believe that properly an investigation can proceed.

But, there comes a point in time when reasonable men must conclude that the investigation has run its course, that those persons seeking to prove that there was some sort of fraud have had a fair and reasonable opportunity to make their case. There comes a time when we must say the business of Congress must move forward, the harassment of this new Member, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, must cease, and we must go on.

But the Republican Party is not willing to do that. The opponents of LORETTA SANCHEZ are not willing to do that. They have a clever strategy of trying to soften her up, of trying to wear her out with endless rounds of investigations, subpoenas, and inquiries, accusations and innuendo.

Constantly going over the same turf, but never producing the evidence, producing the proof, that would be necessary to overturn this election.

The American people need to know as they watch this witch hunt play out in the halls of Congress, the American people need to know that the Secretary of State for the State of California examined this question and has certified that LORETTA SANCHEZ is the winner. The Republican opponents of LORETTA SANCHEZ have had a year to marshal their evidence, and armed with all of the tools of the American legal justice system, have failed to do so.

It is time to move on.

□ 2000

Let me mention something that particularly offends me, the fact that this investigation was conducted primarily based on the use of Hispanic surnames. I find that very offensive. I also find it quite ironic. The party that is quick to say we ought not to have affirmative action, the party that is quick to say there should be no race or ethnic consciousness in our country, that we are colorblind and ethnically blind, when it becomes time to conduct an investigation, that is the party that wants to conduct the investigation based on Hispanic surnames. They want to call in all sorts of people based on their names.

Mr. Speaker, the point is, there has been ample time to conduct this investigation. Those persons whose citizenship was in question, who happened to have Hispanic surnames, were reviewed. Those cases were reviewed. My question now becomes, where is the proof? But I do find it offensive that they would take this tactic.

Having taken this tactic, however, having had the opportunity to pursue this distasteful course of action, again, we have no proof. What we have is a request on their part to continue this activity. I find that unacceptable. I find it a harassment of the gentlewoman from California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, I find it a harassment of Hispanic voters, and I think our Republican colleagues will suffer the consequences of this unwarranted harassment.

This Congress has much important business to take care of. We do not have much time left. We cannot afford these endless rounds of investigation, this endless procrastination, this failure to communicate, and then attempts at the last minute to say, well, we need to work together. There have been plenty of opportunities to work together; there have been plenty of opportunities to investigate. On both counts, my colleagues on the other side have failed miserably to make a case. I think it is time we bring this matter to a close.

We had a vote today. Unfortunately, we did not win. We said, look, produce your evidence by next week or let us close the door. They are not willing to do that. We are going to continue to press the case before the American people, to say that if they do not have the evidence, quit harassing the Hispanic community, quit harassing the gentlewoman from California, Ms. LORETTA

SANCHEZ, and let us move forward with the people's business.

Again, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] for his efforts in this cause.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his participation and for his position. It is always a great situation when Members who are not directly involved, in terms of being from California or being Americans of Hispanic descent, are willing to come out and speak for justice in this process. I appreciate the gentleman's being here with us.

Mr. WYNN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, in this regard, let me just say, I know there are those, including someone who called my office and said, watching the debate, he said, this is not about ethnicity, it is about fraud. My problem with that statement is, yes, it is about fraud, alleged fraud which is not proven after a year, and hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money. But it is about ethnicity when you target exclusively those with surnames that are either Hispanic or Asian. Those are the groups whose names are being pursued.

Is that not amazing, that those are the individuals who are being pursued? Yet, if we do not want to face up to that hard reality, that of all of the registered voters that could exist and of all of those who did vote, that the only names that they pursue are those who are overwhelmingly Hispanic or Asian, the fact of the matter is that it certainly gives rise that you are pursuing a suspect class of individuals who you are pursuing simply because of their surname. That is the reality.

That is why people across the country, even those not Americans of Hispanic descent, are disturbed, because today it is about a certain ethnic group, and tomorrow it could be about a certain religious group or it could be about some other ethnic group, or some other form of determining a class of individuals who we now want to seek to suppress.

The Republicans know that this is a problem for them. Just recently the Republican National Committee has created a new majority council to highlight Republican issues that would be popular with the Hispanic community. House Speaker NEWT GINGRICH, Senate Majority Leader TRENT LOTT, and 31 other Republicans have signed on to the effort.

But even a local newspaper here on Capitol Hill called "The Hill" said the following in its editorial:

But when it comes to Hispanic voters, the GOP has a huge monkey on its back. Its efforts to oust Representative Loretta Sanchez, the California Democrat who defeated Bob Dornan, the eccentric Republican who claims she stole the election, Dornan provides a weak foundation on which to base a political campaign.

It goes on to say:

House Republicans should follow the lead of their Senate counterparts, who dropped

their effort to oust Senator Mary Landrieu, whose Republican opponent claimed she stole the election. House Republicans should cut their losses and see their standing in the Hispanic community dramatically improve.

But they have chosen not only not to do that, but they have not chosen to bring I think the type of decency and honesty to the process that could give those people credibility in believing, well, it is taking longer than it should, but at the end of the road we believe in the process. It cannot when you deny the minority opportunities, and it cannot when we heard the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] talk about the many times she has been denied information, as one of the contestants in this issue. It cannot when we only see that Hispanic and Asian surnames are being pursued.

If it is all right to ask someone named Sanchez or Gutierrez or some other Hispanic surname to prove their citizenship, why do not Republicans go and seek to ask other individuals their citizenship, as well? The bottom line is, that is not what they are doing.

I have many, many new immigrants to my congressional district whose surnames are from European nations. We do not question those surnames as to whether or not that individual is a citizen or not. So the fact of the matter is when some people say you are talking and trying to create a question of ethnicity, we are not trying to create that, that has been created by the Republican majority of the committee, how they have pursued this, the procedures that they have followed, the fact that the only names being pursued are those of Hispanic and Asian descent, and overwhelmingly so.

So it is no question that the Hispanic community nationwide is looking at the 40 Republican Members of Congress who have over 10 percent of their voting population in their districts, who are from the Hispanic community, and saying, how are these people representing my interests? How are they standing up for me as an American of a certain ethnic group?

Certainly today, after today's vote, they are concerned. That is what we heard in phone calls subsequent to this vote today. I think that as the next 2 weeks approach, we are going to find ourselves with another opportunity. I would hope that our colleagues would understand that the precedent being set here today about the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) is a precedent that can easily be applied to someone else.

If simply the allegation of fraud a year later, without the proof of fraud sufficient to overturn the results of the election, can keep a Member dangling, and the congressional district that they represent in terms of those voters wondering whether or not this person is their Representative by the mere allegation of fraud, and no proof, hundreds of thousands of dollars later, and ultimately, if you can seek to nullify their votes by taking that person's seat

away, then the message that will be sent is a very chilling one for the community, and it is also a very chilling one for every Member of this House. Because in next year's election cycle, when individuals, and there have been many individuals here who have won by much less than 900 votes, and their challenger simply claims fraud, and that is sufficient to go ahead and keep them out there for that whole period of time without proof of fraud sufficient to overturn the election, it becomes a dangerous precedent, not only for this institution, for the Members, but more importantly, for our democratic process. We have a right to a speedy determination of whether or not an individual has been duly elected.

Yes, we should take the time to make sure that that person is duly elected, but one year and several hundreds of thousands of dollars later, and with a process that is flawed and that continues to be flawed, where the minority is deprived of rights and where one of the contestants is deprived of rights and information, as we witnessed here today, and heard from her here today, that is an outrage. That outrage will be felt across the land over the next 2 weeks.

THE CONTESTED ELECTION IN CALIFORNIA'S 46TH DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the last gentleman who spoke in the well states his own opinions as fact. The gentleman is factually challenged. Let me go with some specifics.

First of all, it is a fact that every voter was looked at, not by surname, but every single voter. I am of Irish descent, but I would want to make sure that every voter that voted, whether they are Irish or of any ethnic background, had a legal right to do that. That is the issue.

They cannot win over the majority based on issues. They want bigger government, they want higher taxes, they want big government control. They do not want a balanced budget. They do not want tax relief. They want a centralized Federal Government. So what do they do? They try to scare up the minorities to think the Republicans are going after them. Every single voter was looked at, not by surname. That is incorrect.

Second, for 7 months, 7 months, they refused to comply with subpoenas both from an individual, Mr. Dornan, which the Supreme Court held up, or from the committee. So now they are even bucking the Supreme Court decision to comply with the subpoenas.

What were the subpoenas for? To find out the information, to find out the facts. Seven months, and it went into 8 months, and now they are saying a year is too long. Yes, it is too long. If

we would have been able to get the facts, then it would have been over by now.

The rights of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ), her rights have not been violated. She is a sitting member of this committee and of this House. But until we find out the facts, and from the facts that have been found, there was fraud. That is fact. It is documented. It is documented over and over and over again. The amount of fraud is the question. We have facts and we have figures that were delivered to the minority and to the committee. All we are asking before we go forward is to make sure that the State verifies the facts. We will live with those facts if they are verified, or not. That is the question.

But yet the gentleman over there, they cannot win, so what do they want to do? They want to scare people with surnames, to think that the Republicans are bad people, so they can take over a majority. Well, it is not going to work, because they are smarter than that, Mr. Speaker. I resent, I resent the racist implication. I resent the other side of the aisle making this a racist issue.

The issue is that every single American, as few of them that show up at the polls, want to know that their vote counts, that it is not being canceled out by someone that is not qualified to vote. That is the issue. It is not just in California, it is in Texas, it is in Arizona, it is in every State of the Union. This is bigger than Dornan and bigger than Sanchez.

This is that the American people want to know that their rights count, and that it is not going to be taken away by someone that is fraudulently voting. They do not want that. They want to win at any means, whether it is the DNC taking money from Charlie Huang and Trie and Riady and Chinese money, or the Vice President doing Buddhist monk fund-raisers and the money going to DNC, or whether it is from illegal contributions from the Teamsters, who two people have already pled guilty of laundering money to the DNC for campaigns for the Democrats. They do not want us to know that.

All we are doing is asking, when people go to vote, they want to know that the campaign laws are upheld and not violated, and that someone that wants to vote, their vote counts. I do not care if it is an Irish American that is voting that should not be, or someone from Ireland that is a citizen, that vote should not count and that individual should be taken a look at.

Another fact, the State—the alleged fraud, where the gentleman said, show us the fraud, we have. There is fraud. One liberal group alone had over 300 votes verified, documented by the State. That is why we are asking for these others. The other thousands of votes and fraudulent, allegedly fraudulent votes, we are asking the State to verify that. That is fair, Mr. Speaker.

There is nothing racist about that. Guess what, they are not by surname. They are not by any surname. They are looking at every single vote.

□ 2015

But yet my colleague on the other side would like you to think, so he can get the support of certain minorities in his own election and other Democrat elections so they can retake the majority. But yet they will not support a balanced budget, they will not support tax reform. They will not support welfare reform. They cannot win on the issues, so they will play the "R" word, and I resent that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I had not planned on speaking about that. I was going to speak with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] on education, which I will continue to do. But I cannot sit here and let facts be disillusioned before this body, the challenged facts go uncontested, because they are wrong and they are incorrect.

REPUBLICAN VISION FOR AMERICAN EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I would be more than willing to engage the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], but only on one condition. The gentleman has got to get the name right. It is not "HOCK-STRA" it is "Hoekstra." If the gentleman wants to start tonight and talk a little bit about education, that would be fine with me if he would like to go first.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to, first of all, thank the gentleman, who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight. I think it is fair to take a look at the education programs to see if they are good or they are not. A good example is the President wanted a \$3 billion new literacy program. We failed, were last of the industrial nations in literacy here in the United States of America. The President wanted a \$3 billion literacy program. It sounds good. But there are 14 literacy programs within the Federal Government. Title I is one of those. I would think it would be fair to look and say which of the 14 are good? Can we take one or two, get rid of all the bureaucracies, all the pay for all of those staffs and all of those buildings and focus and say, that is wasted money? Let us put the money in the one or two programs that really work.

Mr. Speaker, if it is title I, fund it. But do it fully instead of just halfway doing it. And the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] are doing that. They are going through the over 760 programs, now, and identifying which are correct