

by 17 percent over the President's request. And in 1999 the Congress increased the level of spending over the President's request by 13 percent.

There is a pattern and a history and a commitment on the part of this Congress to see that the Federal Government honors the commitment that it has made to local school district across this country. So it is very important, I think, that this resolution expresses the will of the House that we will fully fund special ed and move in that direction.

The other thing I think is important with respect to this resolution is that whenever the Federal Government imposes mandates on local school districts and school boards, we take away and deprive them of critical decision-making authority.

I just mentioned that we have 12 people seeking the school board position for one position in the Sioux Falls School District. Using the resources that they have to fund the special ed mandate deprives them of using resources that could be allocated for other important things like building new schools, hiring new teachers, reducing class sizes, or buying more computers.

I will use my State of South Dakota as an example. If we were fully funding the mandate on special education today, we would be looking at an additional \$18 million coming into South Dakota. And if each State would look at their own statistics, I think they would find similar types of relationships between the current funding levels and where it should be if the Federal Government was living up to the mandate.

As I said earlier, there is no higher priority than providing quality education to children with disabilities and at the same time freeing up resources that local decision-makers can use to improve the quality of education for all of our students across this country.

And so I believe that the vote that we made today in the House is important, as we move down that direction and look at what we can do to further increase the funding level, to honor the commitment that the Federal Government has made to the local school boards across this country, to see that those Federal mandates that we impose upon local school boards are fully funded so that our school districts and those decision-makers at the local level have an opportunity to do what they do best, and that is try and give our children the very best education possible.

And I again would simply say that, as a matter of principle, I believe that this Republican Congress is committed to seeing that more of that decision-making authority is retained at the local level and that our parents, our teachers, our administrators and our school boards are those who are in the best position to make decisions about the quality and the funding of our children's education. And that frankly, in

my view, is where we ought to put the point of control.

And so the resolution that we acted upon today, I think, speaks loud and clear that this Congress will continue to move in the direction of seeing that the Federal mandate special education, which we have a responsibility for 40 percent of, that we continue to move in the direction, as we have here in the past few years in this Congress, to see that we honor that commitment to all of our students across this country and particularly to those who have disabilities.

I look forward to working toward that end and as we go through the appropriations process within the confines of a balanced budget agreement to see that that gets done.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 833, BANKRUPTCY REFORM ACT OF 1999

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-126) on the resolution (H. Res. 158) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 833) to amend title 11 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

(Mr. BAIRD 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 Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

COMMENDING OAK PARK, ILLINOIS, ON 150 YEARS OF TOWNSHIP GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 150 years ago in 1849, Oak Park, Illinois was just 10 years old, with a total population of less than 500 people.

There were no streets lined with Frank Lloyd Wright architecture. There was no elevated train system for rapid transit to the City of Chicago. There was no light bulb, no telephone or automobile. No one had heard of the computer, Internet, or e-mail.

□ 1945

In 1849, township as a local form of government was established in Illinois, and since then, voters in 85 of Illinois'

102 counties have benefited from this most intimate form of government.

Today, Oak Park is a thriving community of more than 53,000 people, known for its architectural heritage. Within its 4.5 square miles lives a diverse mix of people with different cultures, races and ethnicities, professions, lifestyles, religions, ages and incomes.

Primarily a residential community bordering the city of Chicago, Oak Park is the birthplace and childhood home of novelist Ernest Hemingway. An annual festival has traditionally been held to celebrate his July birth date.

Architect Frank Lloyd Wright lived in Oak Park from 1889 to 1909, and 25 buildings in the village were designed by him, including his first public building, Unity Temple, a Unitarian Universalist church. His restored home and studio is open for daily hours, and there are many architecturally significant homes ranging from Victorian to prairie style in the village's two historic districts.

Other famous Oak Parkers include Edgar Rice Burroughs, the creator of Tarzan; Dr. Percy B. Julian, an outstanding African American chemist whose research led to the development of cortisone; Joseph Kerwin, an astronaut on the first NASA Skylab team; Ray Kroc, the founder of McDonald's; and Marjorie Judith Vincent, the 1991 Miss America.

Oak Park is also home to former president of the Illinois Senate and recently appointed chairman of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the honorable Phillip Rock.

The Oak Park River Forest High School is recognized as one of the best public high schools in the Nation, Fenwick is an outstanding Catholic school, and the city is currently involved in the redevelopment of downtown Oak Park with new retail anchors and an intermodal transportation facility.

In 1968, the village board approved one of the Nation's first local fair housing ordinances outlawing discrimination. In 1973, the board approved its first Oak Park diversity statement; and, in 1976, Oak Park was designated an all-American city.

One thing that has not changed in Oak Park during the past 150 years is the person-to-person service provided by township officials and township government in Illinois. When Illinois voters chose township government, they chose the oldest form of government on the North American continent. The Pilgrims brought the concept of township government with them when they landed on the eastern seaboard in 1636. More than a century before the Revolutionary War, townships were giving communities a local and independent voice in matters of government and order.

Today, as we prepare to move into the 21st century, government in Illinois still thrives. More than 8 million

Illinoisans are served by the 1,433 townships in the State. This year, on April 3rd, townships held their annual meetings, which is unique to this form of government, where any citizen can step up to the plate and voice any concern that they have about the government. In this regard, townships are truly the government closest to the people they govern as they continue to provide functions and services which are vitally important.

I take this moment after 150 years to commend and congratulate the people of Oak Park, Illinois, for demonstrating that democracy can be made real and that township government can in fact and does in fact work.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be given the time of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) and that he be given my time on the list so that I can resume my place in the chair following the 5-minute special order.

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

There was no objection.

AIR FORCE BOONDOGGLES COST TAXPAYERS BILLIONS

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, last week it was reported by the Associated Press that an Air Force communications satellite worth \$800 million had ended up in the wrong orbit. This was the third failure in a row for the Air Force Titan IV program, at a total loss to the taxpayers of over \$3 billion. This latest satellite not only ended up in the wrong orbit, it ended up in a lopsided orbit thousands of miles below its intended orbit.

I have taken the floor many times over the years to point out examples of wasteful or exorbitant Federal spending. John Martin has for several years had a segment called It's Your Money on the ABC national television news, pointing out almost every week some example of horrible Federal waste. He has performed a great service to this Nation in bringing this series to the attention of the American people.

The examples, unfortunately, are far too easy to find. Examples of ridiculously wasteful Federal spending are everywhere. It has made me wonder if the Federal Government can do any-

thing in an efficient or economical way.

But this Titan IV program really takes the cake. Three failures at a cost of \$3 billion; \$3 billion down the drain.

What really adds insult to injury, Mr. Speaker, is that, because this is the Federal Government, no one will really be held accountable for this. In the private sector if a company had three major failures like this, heads would roll in a big way. Of course, in the private sector, no company could afford \$3 billion in failures unless possibly it was a big-time Federal contractor subsidized by the taxpayer.

The Appropriation Committees of the House and Senate should demand accountability here. They should not stand for \$3 billion from three failed launches.

But the easiest thing in the world, Mr. Speaker, is to spend other people's money. So what are we going to do? Thursday we are going to give big increases in pay and pensions and funding for the same Air Force that has sat around and allowed this \$3 billion in failures to occur.

Federal employees are great at rationalizing or justifying even ridiculous losses. I am sure that the Air Force will have some great excuses, and everyone connected with this will be able to explain why it was not their fault. Well, somebody is at fault and probably several people, and they should lose their jobs over this.

Even though we talk about a billion dollars up here like it was very little, \$3 billion is still an awful lot of money. This satellite, as I said earlier, cost \$800 million. Last Friday's mission alone cost \$1.23 billion. Just think how much good could have been done with the total \$3 billion in losses in this Titan IV Air Force program.

Now, I favor a strong military and I believe we should have a strong Air Force, but I do not believe we should just sit back and allow any part of the military to throw away \$3 billion. We should not just cavalierly accept this.

Several years ago, Edward Rendell, the Democratic Mayor of Philadelphia, said at a congressional hearing, "Government does not work because it was not designed to. There is no incentive for people to work hard so many do not. There is no incentive for people to save money so much of it is squandered."

How true this statement was and is. This is why it has been proven over and over and over again all over this world that the more money that can be left in the private sector, the better off everyone is; the lower prices are, the more jobs that are created, the better the economy is.

Competitive pressures force the private sector to spend money wisely, to spend it in economical, efficient, conservative, productive ways. Private companies do not have the luxury the government has of being able to waste billions with almost no meaningful repercussions.

The Air Force should publicly apologize for dropping this \$3 billion down this Titan IV rat hole. The Congress should be assured that nothing like this will ever happen again.

It is really sad, Mr. Speaker, to take \$3 billion from the families and children of this country, many of whom are barely getting by, to give to highly paid bureaucrats and Air Force officers to just blow in this way. What would be even sadder would be if the Air Force and everyone associated with these failures is not deeply embarrassed and ashamed.

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

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

CRISIS IN KOSOVO

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, last week we had a historic symbolic vote on the war. This House voted against ground troops. We also voted against, in a tie vote, a resolution to support the air war. This week we have the real vote. Are we going to fund the war? Are we just talk or are we going to actually cut off the funds for the war?

There are three goals that have consistently been stated by NATO and by our government. One is to degrade the military forces or sufficiently degrade the military forces of the Yugoslav government so that we can move hundreds of thousands of refugees back, and then manage it with a peacekeeping force. I would put forth that anybody who has listened to any of the military briefings we have had, who have listened to the public reports, understand fundamentally that this is an unachievable goal. Milosevic understands that. When are the American people going to be told the truth, that our fundamental goals are unachievable?

First off, the military has been saying all the way along, this cannot be accomplished just by an air war. They are hopeful that they can bring him to the table, but what do they mean when they say this cannot be accomplished just by an air war?

He has dug in, he is fighting in mountainous terrain, he has supplies that are going to last him an extended period of time, and we read just last week that our military says that after 30 days of bombing, we have a net degradation of his military forces of zero. That does not mean that we have not impacted his long-term ability to wage war, we have blown up a lot of factories so he cannot reproduce, we have reduced some of the supply of gasoline