

frankly, we do not see them. We have had so much change that these new developments are coming faster than we can really understand. But on the cutting edge of technology today, we have two or three different things that are going on.

In the first place, we have all seen the plummeting prices and the decrease in the size of computer equipment. That is going on at an increasing rate. And we are going to see a time within the next year or so when you can take a little small computer that has all the power of a major computer and it will operate off of radio frequency and it will do so at a very rapid rate, so that every kid in the world in the next 4 or 5 years is going to have the opportunity to be educated at a very high level.

I would like to think that in the next few years we will see a time when we will have advertisements instead of send \$15 to feed a child for a month, we will see ads to send \$15 to educate a child for a month and every child in the world will have the opportunity to get a post-doctoral education off the Internet. That is partly because of the devices that are coming onto the market.

In addition to those devices, we have this great new technology with radio frequency and the ability to communicate a signal sometimes through multiple repeaters, so that we should be able to take satellite signals and get those down to every child and every person on Earth; and that certainly includes everyone in rural America.

And finally, we are seeing terrific growth in the ability to compress data so that we can do much, much more with a smaller band width.

So, for instance, in my State of Utah, Emery County, a little rural county in the State of Utah, every person in that county, because of the foresight of the local telecommunications company, now has access to DSL broad band telecommunications. That DSL is going to be a big enough pipeline to do almost anything that anyone could imagine they would want to do. And that takes the jobs into rural Utah and raises the life-style there.

Now, I would just like to wrap up by talking about the difference in perspective here. We have a battle going on. It is a cultural war. We see that battle going on with the Boy Scouts of America and the attempt to revoke their charter. We see that battle in many other places. But the battle really comes down to a battle between urban America and rural America.

The Democrats have taken a very clear position. The Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), in referring to the 2000 elections, said on June 21, 1999, as reported in the Providence Journal, "We have written off the rural areas." "We have written off the rural areas."

Now, the following day the minority leader said he did not mean to say

that. He did not say he did not mean what he said. He said he did not mean to say that. Because that gave away the strategy of the Democratic party. And it was probably unthoughtful. But it has never been recanted, as far as I know, by any leader of the Democratic National party. No one has said, we are actually going to court the rural vote.

And in fact, everything they have done has been shown to be a movement away from rural. They tax rural people the same they do everywhere else, but they move the programs into the urban areas under the Democratic regime. That is not right.

There is a digital divide today and that digital divide can be healed and overcome between rural and urban America if we let the free market work. But if we tax everyone in America and move that money to the urban areas, then we lose the opportunity to bring back to the rural areas the basis for jobs and economic growth that make the rural part of America so great.

#### EDUCATION IS AT THE CENTER OF AMERICA'S FUTURE

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, before I proceed to the remarks that I had intended to make tonight, as a Member of this House who represents rural America, or at least a significantly rural district, I would simply note a few facts.

In 1979, the last year of the Carter administration, agriculture programs cost the taxpayer less than \$4 billion in direct payments to farmers and prices paid to farmers at the marketplace were considerably higher than they are today.

This year, under Freedom to Farm, better known in rural America as freedom to fail at farming, which was rammed through this House by the Republican leadership a number of years ago, the cost to taxpayers has risen to well above \$20 billion a year, almost 30 if we count all costs, and the prices paid to farmers have fallen through the floor.

I think most farmers, at least in my area, recognize that rural America cannot thrive unless family farmers get a decent price for their product and until the so-called Freedom to Farm Act is radically changed, rural America will continue to decay. Both parties need to face up to that fact. Major elements of my party have begun to. I wish I could say the same for major elements on the part of the other party.

But who knows, time may produce miracles. I hope that they will realize that they must undo what they did if farmers are to really have a decent shot at making a decent living through the marketplace.

Having said that, I would now like to turn to the subject that I wanted to talk about tonight, which is education. Because more than any other subject, education and what we do about it and what this entire country does about it lies at the center of the question of how well we will prepare for our country's future.

This is going to be a fairly dull speech. It will be filled with exactly what political consultants say we should not have in our speeches. It will be filled with numbers and facts. It will not be exciting. It is not meant to be. It is meant simply to state in a clear way who has tried to do what to education over the last 5 years.

We will undoubtedly hear in the Presidential debates tomorrow night; and we will have certainly seen across the Nation, Republican candidates giving speeches and running ads pretending to be friends of education. Those speeches fly in the face of the historical record of the past 6 years. That record demonstrates that education has been one of the central targets of House Republican efforts to cut Federal investments in programs essential for building America's future in order to provide large tax cuts that they have been promising their constituents for years.

Six years ago, in their drive to take control of the House of Representatives, the Republican leaders, then led by Newt Gingrich, produced the so-called Contract with America, which they claimed would balance the budget while at the same time making room for huge tax cuts.

They indicated that one of the ways that they would do so was by abolishing four departments. Eliminating the Department of Education was their new number one goal. They also wanted to eliminate the Departments of Energy, Commerce and HUD.

Immediately upon taking over the Congress in 1995, they proposed cuts below existing appropriations, not just below the President's request, but below previous appropriations in a rescission bill H.R. 1158. That bill passed the House on March 16, 1995, reducing Federal expenditures by nearly \$12 billion.

Education programs accounted for only 1.6 percent of the Federal expenditures in fiscal year 1995. But they made up 14 percent of the spending reductions in the House Republican package. That package was adopted with all but six House Republicans voting in favor of cuts totaling \$1.8 billion.

Next, H.R. 1883 was introduced, which called for "eliminating the Department of Education and redefining Federal role in education."

The legislation was cosponsored by more than half of all House Republicans, including as original cosponsors the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the current Speaker; the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader; and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip.

The desire to eliminate the Department of Education was stated explicitly in both the report that accompanied the Republican budget resolution passed by the House and in the conference report on the budget that accompanied the final product agreed to by both the House and Senate Republicans.

That conference report, a sized-up copy of which I have here, for House Concurrent Resolution 76, the fiscal year 1996 budget resolution, states flatly: "In the area of education, the House assumes the termination of the Department of Education."

That is what they voted for. The fiscal 1996 budget resolution not only proposed the adoption of legislation to terminate the Department organizationally, but it put in place a spending plan to eliminate funding for a major portion of the Department's activities and programs in hopes of partially achieving the goal of elimination even if the President refused to sign a formal termination for the Department.

The conference agreement adopted on June 29 proposed cuts in funding for Function 500, the area of the budget containing all Federal education programs, of \$17.6 billion, or 30 percent below the amount needed to keep pace with inflation over the 6-year period starting in fiscal 1996.

The House passed resolution had proposed even larger cuts. Every House Republican but one voted for both the House resolution and the conference report.

Then the budget resolution established a framework for passage of the 13 appropriations bills. The Labor, HHS education appropriation bill, which contained the vast majority of funds that go to local school districts, was the hardest hit by that resolution.

□ 2115

The fiscal 1996 appropriations bill for Labor, Health and Education was adopted by the House on August 4 of 1995. It slashed funding from the \$25 billion level that had been originally approved for the Department in fiscal 1995 to \$20.8 billion for the coming year. That \$4.2 billion, or 17 percent cut below the prior year's levels, was even larger when inflation was considered and was passed in the face of information indicating that total school enrollment in the United States was increasing by about three-quarters of a million students a year.

The programs affected by those cuts included: title I for disadvantaged children, reduced by \$1.1 billion below the prior year; teacher training reduced by \$251 million; vocational education reduced by \$273 million; safe and drug-free schools cut by \$241 million; and Goals 2000 to raise student performance reduced by \$361 million. Republicans in this House voted in favor of that bill 213-18. The bill was opposed by virtually every national organization representing parents, teachers, school administrators, and local school boards.

The Republican leadership of the House was so determined to force the President to sign the legislation and other similar appropriations that they were willing to see the government shut down twice to, in the words of one Republican leader, "force the President to his knees." Speaker Gingrich said, "On October 1 if we don't appropriate, there is no money. You can veto whatever you want to but as of October 1, there is no government. We're going to go over the liberal Democratic part of the government and say to them, we could last 60 days, 90 days, 120 days, 5 years, a century. There's a lot of stuff we don't care if it's ever funded."

It is clear that the Labor, Health and Education bill and the education funding in particular in that bill was at the heart of the controversy that resulted in those government shutdowns. Cutting education was an issue that Republicans felt so strongly about that they literally were willing to see the government shut down in an attempt to achieve this goal. Speaker Gingrich said, "I don't care what the price is, I don't care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 60 days, not this time."

House Republican whip Mr. DeLay said, "We are going to fund only those programs we want to fund. We're in charge. We don't have to negotiate with the Senate. We don't have to negotiate with the Democrats."

When the government shut down, the public reacted strongly against the Republican House leadership's hardheadedness and that led to the eventual signing of the conference agreement on Labor, Health and Education funding as part of an omnibus appropriations package on April 26, 1996, more than halfway through the fiscal year. That action came after nine continuing resolutions and those two government shutdowns. That agreement restored about half of the cuts below prior year's funding that had been pushed through by the Republican majority, raising the original House Republican figure of \$20.8 billion for education to \$22.8 billion.

So on that occasion, as you can see, pressure from the Democratic side of the aisle forced restoration of about \$2 billion in education spending.

Later in 1996, the Republican House caucus organized another attempt to cut education funding below prior year's levels in the fiscal 1997 Labor-Health-Education bill. On July 12, 1996, the House adopted the bill with the Republicans voting 209-22 in favor of passage. Incidentally, I will not read it into the record at this point but my submitted remarks will cite all of the rollcalls, dates and pages if anyone wants to check them. The bill cut education by \$54 million below the levels agreed to for fiscal 1996 and \$2.8 billion below the President's request. During the debate on that bill, Republicans also voted 227-2 to kill an amendment specifically aimed at restoring \$1.2 billion in education funding.

As the fall and election of 1996 began to approach, the Republican commitment to cut education began to be overshadowed by their desire to adjourn Congress and go home to campaign. As a result, the President and Democrats in Congress forced them to accept an education package that was more than \$3.6 billion above House-passed levels.

1997 brought a 1-year respite from Republican efforts to squeeze education. For 1 year a welcomed bipartisan approach was followed and the appropriation that passed the House and the final conference agreement were extremely close to the amounts requested by the President and the Department of Education.

Conflict between the two parties over education funding erupted again in 1998 when the President requested \$31.2 billion for the Department for fiscal 1999. In July, the House Appropriations Committee reported on a party line vote a Labor-Health-Education bill that cut the President's education budget by more than \$600 million; but the bill remained in legislative limbo after the beginning of the next fiscal year. Then on October 2, 1998, the Republicans voted with only six dissenting votes to bring the bill to the floor. The leadership then reversed itself on its desire to call up the bill and refused to bring it to the floor. The House Republican leadership finally grudgingly agreed to negotiate higher levels for education so they could return home and campaign. The White House and the Democrats in Congress had been able to force them to accept a funding level for education that was \$2.6 billion above their original House bill.

Last year, in 1999, the House Republican leaders again directed their appropriators to report a Labor-Health-Education appropriation bill that cut education spending below the President's request and below the level of the prior year. The fiscal 2000 bill reported to the Committee on Appropriations on a straight party line vote funded education programs at nearly \$200 million below the 1999 level. The bill was almost \$1.4 billion below the President's request.

Included in the cuts below requested levels were reductions in title I grants to local school districts for education of disadvantaged students, \$264 million below; after-school programs were taken \$300 million below the President's request; education reform and accountability efforts, \$491 million below; and improvement of education technology resources, \$301 million below. Because inadequate funding threatened their ability to pass the bill, House Republican leaders never brought it to the House floor. After weeks of pressure from House Democrats, they ordered a separate bill that had been agreed to with Senate Republican leaders to be brought to the House floor. That bill contained significantly more education funding than

the original House bill but still cut the President's request for class size reduction by \$200 million, after-school programs cut by \$300 million, title I by almost \$200 million, and teacher quality programs by \$35 million.

The bill was opposed by the Committee for Education Funding which represents 97 national organizations interested in education, including parent and teacher groups, school boards and school administrators. It was adopted by a vote of 218-211 with House Republicans voting 214-7 in favor. After further negotiations, they agreed on November 18 to add nearly \$700 million more, which we were requesting, to those education programs.

Now, this year. This year the President proposed a \$4.5 billion increase for education programs in the fiscal 2001 budget. The bill reported by House Republicans cut the President's request by \$2.9 billion. Cuts below the budget request included \$400 million cut from title I, \$400 million from after-school programs, \$1 billion for improving teacher quality and \$1.3 billion for repair of dilapidated school buildings. It was adopted by a vote of 217-214 with House Republicans voting 213-7 in favor. When the fiscal 2001 Labor, Health and Education bill was sent to conference, a motion to instruct the conferees to go to the higher Senate levels for education and other programs was offered. It also instructed conferees to permit language ensuring that funds provided for reduced class size and repairing school buildings was used for those purposes. It was defeated 207-212 with Republicans voting 208-4 in opposition.

In summary, and I will supply tables for the record, the record clearly shows that over the past 6 years, House Republicans set the elimination of the Department of Education as the primary goal. Failing that, they attempted to reduce education funding to the maximum extent possible. Failing that, they attempted to reduce education funding to the maximum extent possible. In every year since they have had control of the House, they have attempted to cut the President's request for education funding.

Appropriation bills passed by House Republicans would have cut a total of \$14.6 billion from presidential requests for education funding. I repeat. Appropriation bills passed by House Republicans would have cut a total of \$14.6 billion from presidential requests for education funding. In 3 of the 6 years that they have controlled the House, they have actually attempted to cut education funding below prior year levels despite steady increases in school enrollment, in the annual increase in cost to local school districts of providing quality classroom instruction.

Now, these education budget cuts have not been directed at Washington bureaucrats as some Republicans have tried to argue but mainly at programs that send money directly to local school districts to hire teachers and

improve curriculum. Programs such as title I, after-school, safe and drug-free schools, class size reduction, educational technology assistance, all send well over 95 percent of their funds directly to local school districts. While zealots in the Republican conference drove much of this agenda, it is clear that they could not have succeeded without the repeated assistance from dozens of Republican moderates who attempt now to portray themselves as friends of education. They may have been in their hearts, but they were not when the votes came.

The one redeeming aspect of the Republican record on education over the last 6 years is that in most of those years, they failed to achieve the cuts that they spent most of the year fighting to impose. When a coalition between Democrats in Congress and in some cases members of the Republican Party in the Senate and Democrats in the Senate, when a coalition between them and the Democrats in this House and the President made it clear that the bills containing those cuts would be vetoed and that House Republicans by themselves could not override the vetoes, legislation that was far more favorable to education was finally adopted. For Republican Members now to attempt to take credit for that fact is in effect bragging about their own political ineptitude.

The question that concerned Americans must ask is this: What will happen if the Republicans find a future opportunity to deliver on their 6-year agenda for education? They may eventually become more skillful in their efforts to cut education. They may at some point have a larger majority in one or both houses, or they may serve under a President who will be more amenable to their education agenda. All of those prospects should be very troubling to those who feel that local school districts cannot do the job that the country needs without greater assistance from the Federal Government.

Now, this is not an issue of local versus Federal control. Almost 93 percent of the money spent for elementary and secondary education at the local level is spent in accordance with the wishes of State and local governments. But there are national implications to failing schools in any part of the country. The Federal Government has an obligation to try to help disseminate information about what does and does not work in educating children, and it has an obligation to respond to critical needs by defining and focusing on national priorities. That is what the other 7 percent of educational funding in this country does. Education is indeed primarily a local responsibility, but it must be a top priority at all levels, Federal, State and local; or we will not get the job done.

In summary, as the tables will show in the remarks that I am making tonight, the House Republican candidates now shout loudly that they can be trusted to support education, but their

record over the last 6 years speaks louder than their words.

□ 2130

The records show that in 3 of the last 6 years, House Republicans tried to cut education \$5.5 billion below previous levels and \$13 billion below Presidential requests, \$14.5 billion if you count their first rescission effort in 1995. It shows that more than \$15.6 billion that has been restored came only after Democrats in the Congress and in the White House demanded restoration.

That is the record that must be understood by those concerned about education's future, and that is the record that will be demonstrated by the three charts that I am inserting in the RECORD at this point.

#### THE HISTORY OF HOUSE REPUBLICAN EFFORTS TO ATTACK EDUCATION—1994 THROUGH 2000

Across the nation Republican Congressional Candidates are giving speeches and running ads pretending to be friends of education. Those speeches and ads fly in the face of the historical record of the past six years. That record demonstrates that education has been one of the central targets of House Republican efforts to cut federal investments in programs essential for building America's future in order to provide large tax cuts they have been promising their constituents.

Six years ago in their drive to take control of the House of Representatives, the Republican Leaders led by Newt Gingrich produced a so-called "Contract with America" which they claimed would balance the budget while at the same time making room for huge tax cuts. They indicated that one of the ways they would do so was by abolishing four departments of the federal government. Eliminating the U.S. Department of Education was their number one goal. They also wanted they said to eliminate the Departments of Energy, Commerce and HUD.

Immediately upon taking over the Congress in 1995 they proposed cuts below existing appropriations in a rescission bill, HR 1158. That bill passed the House on March 16, 1995 reducing federal expenditures by nearly \$12 billion. Education programs accounted for \$1.7 billion of the total. While the budget of the Department of Education totaled only 1.6% of federal expenditures in fiscal 1995, it contributed 14% to the spending reductions in the House Republican package. The package was adopted with all but six House Republicans voting in favor. (See Roll Call #251 for the 104th Congress, 1st session—Congressional Record, March 16, 1995, page H3302)

Next, legislation (HR 1883) was introduced which called for "eliminating the Department of Education and redefining the federal role in education." The legislation was cosponsored by more than half of all House Republicans including as original cosponsors, current Speaker Dennis Hastert, Majority Leader Dick Armey, and Majority Whip Tom Delay. (See Attachment A)

The desire to eliminate the Department of Education was stated explicitly in both the Report that accompanied the Republican Budget Resolution passed by the House and in the Conference Report on the Budget that accompanied the final product agreed to by both House and Senate Republicans. The Conference Report for H. Con. Res. 76 (the FY 1996 Budget Resolution) states flatly, "In the area of education, the House assumes the termination of the Department of Education."

That FY96 Budget Resolution not only proposed the adoption of legislation to terminate the Department organizationally, but

put in place a spending plan to eliminate funding for a major portion of the Department's activities and programs in hopes of partially achieving the goal of elimination even if the President refused to sign a formal termination for the Department. The Conference Agreement adopted on June 29, 1995 proposed cuts in funding for Function 500, the area of the budget containing all federal education programs or \$17.6 billion or 34% below the amount needed to keep even with inflation over the six-year period starting in Fiscal 1996. The House passed Resolution had proposed even larger cuts. Every House Republican except one voted for both the House Resolution and the Conference Report. (See Roll Calls #345 and 458 for the 104th Congress, 1st session—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 18, 1995, page H5309 and June 29, 1995, page H6594)

That Budget Resolution established a framework for passage of the 13 appropriation bills. The Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill, which contains the vast majority of funds that go to local school districts, was the hardest hit by that resolution. The Fiscal 1996 appropriations bill for labor, health, and education was adopted by the House on August 4th 1995. It slashed funding from the \$25 billion level that had been originally approved for the Department in fiscal 1995 to \$20.8 billion for the coming year. This \$4.2 billion or 17% cut below prior year levels was even larger when inflation was considered and was passed in the face of information indicating that total school enrollment in the United States was increasing by about three quarters of a million students a year. The programs affected by these cuts included Title I for disadvantaged children (reduced by \$1.1 billion below the prior year,) teacher training, (reduced by \$251 million,) vocational education (reduced by \$273 million,) Safe and Drug Free Schools (reduced by \$241,) and Goals 2000 to raise student performance (reduced by \$361 million). Republicans voted in favor of the bill, 213 to 18. (See Roll Call #626 for the 104th Congress, 1st session—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 4, 1995, page H8420) The bill was opposed by virtually every national organization representing parents, teachers, school administrators, and local school boards.

The Republican Leadership of the House was so determined to force the President to sign that legislation and other similar appropriations that they were willing to see the government shut down twice to, in the words of one Republican Leader, "force the President to his knees." Speaker Gingrich said, "On October 1, if we don't appropriate, there is no money. . . . You can veto whatever you want to. But as of October 1, there is no government. . . . We're going to go over the liberal Democratic part of the government and then say to them: 'We could last 60 days, 90 days, 120 days, five years, a century.' There's a lot of stuff we don't care if it's ever funded." (Rocky Mountain News, June 3, 1995) It is clear that the Labor-HHS-Education bill, and education funding in particular, was at the heart of the controversy that resulted in those government shutdowns. Cutting education was an issue that Republicans felt so strongly about that they literally were willing to see the government shut down in an attempt to achieve this goal. Speaker Gingrich said, "I don't care what the price is. I don't care if we have no executive offices, and no bonds for 60 days—not this time." (Washington Post, September 22, 1995) House Republican Whip Tom DeLay said, "We are going to fund only those programs we want to fund. . . . We're in charge. We don't have to negotiate with the Senate; we don't have to negotiate with the Democrats." (Baltimore Sun, January 8, 1996)

When the government shut down, the public reacted strongly against Republican

House Leadership hard-headedness and that led to the eventual signing of the Conference Agreement on Labor-HHS-Education funding as part of an omnibus appropriations package on April 26 of 1996, more than halfway through the fiscal year. That action came after 9 continuing resolutions and those two government shutdowns. That agreement restored about half of the cuts below prior year funding that had been pushed through by the Republican Majority, raising the original House Republican figure of \$20.8 billion for education to \$22.8 billion.

Later in 1996 the Republican House Caucus organized another attempt to cut education funding below prior year levels in the fiscal 1997 Labor-HHS-Education bill. On July 12, 1996 the House adopted the bill with Republicans voting 209 to 22 in favor or passage (See Roll Call #313, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 11, 1996, page H7373.) The bill cut Education by \$54 million below the levels agreed to for fiscal 1996 and \$2.8 billion below the President's request. During the debate on that bill Republicans also voted (227-2) to kill an amendment specifically aimed at restoring \$1.2 billion in education funding (See Roll Call #303, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 11, 1996, page H7330).

As the fall and election of 1996 began to approach, the Republican commitment to cut education began to be overshadowed by their desire to adjourn Congress and go home to campaign. As a result, the President and Democrats in Congress forced them to accept an education package that was more than \$3.6 billion above House passed levels.

1997 brought a one-year respite from Republican efforts to squeeze education. For one year, a welcome bipartisan approach was followed and the appropriation that passed the House and the final conference agreement were extremely close to the amounts requested by the President and the Department of Education.

Conflict between the two parties over education funding erupted again in 1998 when the President requested \$31.2 billion for the Department for fiscal 1999. In July, the House Appropriations Committee reported on a party line vote a Labor-HHS-Education bill that cut the President's education budget by more than \$660 million. But the bill remained in legislative limbo until after the beginning of the next fiscal year. Then on October 2, 1998 Republicans voted with only six dissenting votes to bring the bill to the floor. (See Roll Call #476, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 2, 1998, page H9314.) The leadership then reversed itself on its desire to call up the bill and refused to bring it to the floor. The House Republican Leadership finally grudgingly agreed to negotiate higher levels for education so they could return home and campaign. The White House and Democrats in Congress were able to force them to accept a funding level for education that was \$2.6 billion above the House bill.

Last year, in 1999, House Republican Leaders again directed their Appropriators to report a Labor-HHS-Education Appropriation bill that cut education spending below the President's request and below the level of the prior year. The FY2000 bill reported by the Appropriations Committee on a straight party line vote funded education programs at nearly \$200 million below the FY 1999 level. The bill was almost \$1.4 billion below the President's request. Included in the cuts below requested levels were reductions in Title I grants to local school districts for education of disadvantaged students (\$264 million,) after school programs (\$300 million,) education reform and accountability efforts (\$491 million) and improvement of educational technology resources (\$301 million.) Because inadequate funding threatened their ability to pass the bill, House Repub-

lican Leaders never brought it to the House floor. After weeks of pressure from House Democrats they ordered a separate bill that had been agreed to with Senate Republican Leaders to be brought to the House floor. The bill contained significantly more education funding than the original House bill but still cut the President's request for class size reduction by \$200 million, after-school programs by \$300 million, title I by almost \$200 million and teacher quality programs by \$35 million. The bill was opposed by the Committee for Education Funding which represents 97 national organizations interested in education including parent and teacher groups, school boards, and school administrators. It was adopted by a vote of 218 to 211 with House Republicans voting 214 to 7 in favor. (See Roll Call 549, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 28, 1999, page H11120) It was also promptly vetoed by the President. After further negotiations, they agreed on November 18th to add nearly \$700 million more, which we were requesting to educational programs.

This year the President proposed a \$4.5 billion increase for education programs in the FY2001 budget. The bill reported by House Republicans cut the President's request by \$2.9 billion. Cuts below the request included \$400 million from Title I, \$400 million from after school programs, \$1 billion for improving teacher quality and \$1.3 billion for repair of dilapidated school buildings. It was adopted by a vote of 217-214 with House Republicans voting 213 to 7 in favor. (See Roll Call #273, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 14, 2000, page H4436)

When the FY2001 Labor-HHS-Education bill was sent to conference a motion to instruct Conferees to go to the higher Senate levels for education and other programs was offered. It also instructed conferees to permit language insuring that funds provided or reducing class size and repairing school buildings was used for those purposes. It was defeated 207 to 212 with Republicans voting 208 to 4 in opposition. (See Roll Call 415, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 19, 2000, page H6563)

In summary, the record clearly shows that over the past six years House Republicans set the elimination of the Department of Education as a primary goal. Failing that, they attempted to reduce education funding to the maximum extent possible. In every year since they have had control of the House of Representatives they have attempted to cut the President's request for education funding. Appropriations bills passed by House Republicans would have cut a total of \$14.6 million from presidential request for education funding. In three of the six years that they have controlled the House, they have actually attempted to cut education funding below prior year levels despite steady increases in school enrollment and the annual increase in costs to local school districts of proving quality class room instruction.

The education budget cuts have not been directed at Washington bureaucrats as some Republicans have tried to argue but mainly at programs that send money directly to local school districts to hire teachers and improve curriculum. Programs such as Title I, After School, Safe and Drug Free Schools, Class Size Reduction, and Educational Technology Assistance all send well over 95% of their funds directly to local school districts. While zealots in the Republican Conference drove much of this agenda it is clear that they could not have succeeded without the repeated assistance from dozens of Republicans moderates who attempt to portray themselves as friends of education.

The one redeeming aspect of the Republican record on education over the last six

years is that in most years they failed to achieve the cuts that they spent most of each year fighting to impose. When a coalition between the Democrats in Congress and the President made it clear that the bills containing these cuts would be vetoed and that the Republicans by themselves could not override the vetoes, legislation that was far more favorable to education was finally adopted. For Republican members to attempt to take credit for that fact is in effect bragging on their own political ineptitude. The question concerned Americans must ask is: What will happen if the Republican find a future opportunity to deliver on their six-year agenda? They may eventually become more skillful in their efforts. They may at some point have a larger majority in one or both Houses or they may serve under a President that will be more amenable to their agenda. All of these prospects should be very troubling to those who feel that local school districts can not do the job that the country needs without great assistance from the federal government.

This is not an issue of local versus federal control. Almost 93% of the money spent for elementary and secondary education at the local level is spent in accordance with the wishes of state and local governments. But there are national implications to failing schools in any part of the country. The federal government has an obligation to try to help disseminate information about what does and does not work in educating children, and it has an obligation to respond to critical needs by defining and focusing on national priorities. And that is what the other 7% of educational funding in this country does. Education is indeed primarily a local responsibility, but it must be a top priority at all levels—federal, state, and local—or we will not get the job done.

The House Republican candidates now shout loudly that they can be trusted to support education, but their record over the six years speaks louder than their words. Their record shows that in three of the last six years, House Republicans tried to cut education \$5.5 billion below previous levels and \$14.6 billion presidential requests. It shows that the more than \$15.6 billion that has been restored came only after Democrats in Congress and in the White House demanded restoration. That is the record that must be understood by those concerned about education's future.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—GOP EDUCATION  
APPROPRIATION CUTS COMPARED TO PREVIOUS YEAR  
(Millions of dollars)

	Prior year	House level	House cut
FY 95 Rescission .....	25,074	23,440	—1,635
FY 96 Labor-HHS-Education .....	25,074	20,797	—4,277
FY 97 Labor-HHS-Education .....	22,810	22,756	—54
FY 00 Labor-HHS-Education .....	33,520	33,321	—199

Discretionary Funding, Minority Staff, House Appropriations Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—GOP EDUCATION CUTS  
BELOW PRESIDENT'S REQUEST  
(Millions of dollars)

	Request	House level	House cut	Percent cut
FY 96 Labor-HHS-Education	25,804	20,797	—5,007	—19
FY 97 Labor-HHS-Education	25,561	22,756	—2,805	—11
FY 98 Labor-HHS-Education	29,522	29,331	—191	—1
FY 99 Labor-HHS-Education	31,185	30,523	—662	—2
FY 00 Labor-HHS-Education	34,712	33,321	—1,391	—4
FY 00 Labor-HHS-Education	40,095	37,142	—2,953	—7
Total FY96 to FY01 .....	186,879	173,870	—13,009	—7

Discretionary Funding, Minority Staff, House Appropriations Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—EDUCATION FUNDING  
RESTORED BY DEMOCRATS  
(Millions of dollars)

	House level	Conf agree- ment	Res- toration	Percent in- crease
FY 95 Rescission .....	23,440	24,497	1,057	5
FY 96 Labor-HHS-Education .....	20,797	22,810	2,013	10
FY 97 Labor-HHS-Education .....	22,756	26,324	3,568	16
FY 98 Labor-HHS-Education .....	29,331	29,741	410	1
FY 99 Labor-HHS-Education .....	30,523	33,149	2,626	9
FY 00 Labor-HHS-Education .....	33,321	35,703	2,382	7
FY 01 Labor-HHS-Education .....	37,142	40,751	3,609	10
Total FY95 to FY01 .....	197,310	212,975	15,665	8

Discretionary Funding, Minority Staff, House Appropriations Committee.

NIGHTSIDE CHAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

OVERVIEW OF SPEECH

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, good evening. It is time for another nightside chat.

This evening I want to cover a couple of areas with my colleagues here. First of all, a couple comments about the Olympics, and then I would like to move on.

I had a discussion last week and in fact over the weekend I talked with a good close friend of mine, his name is Al, and we discussed a little about the situation with Wen Ho Lee, who is the spy, or the fellow who was accused of spying, but the gentleman in New Mexico, and I kind of need to retract my words there, I will not exactly call him a "gentleman" from my point of view, you will see. I think the facts are going to be very interesting.

Last week, as my friend Al and I discussed, I laid out what I thought was a very strong case that makes it very clear that this fellow in New Mexico, who has been accused of a crime, and, by the way, who is a convicted felon, in fact is not a hero. He is not a martyr. He is not somebody who has been victimized. He is not a victim of racial profiling. He is not a victim of the race card. I want to discuss that case in a little more depth, in fact in a great deal of depth tonight. So I am looking forward to that discussion.

DISRESPECT SHOWN BY AMERICAN OLYMPIC  
ATHLETES

First of all, let us talk about the Olympics. That is an exciting event. All of us had an opportunity, I am sure, to watch the events, and we are very proud of our athletes and the sports people that we send over to participate in these events and the medals. I mean, of course, in the West we are absolutely thrilled about the wrestler out of Wyoming who beat that Russian wrestler. To me, that was probably the highlight of the Olympics.

But let me say, first of all, I consider our athletes obviously very, very capable young people who I am proud to have represent the United States, in most cases. These athletes, in my opinion, while I would not call them heroes, you certainly would call them celeb-

rities. They have spent a lot of hard years to represent the United States.

But what I saw over the weekend dismayed me, and I want to be very specific about it, because it applies only to maybe four, maybe five at least, not the whole bunch. But, unfortunately, it kind of casts a shadow over all of our U.S. Olympic athletes, and that is those Olympic athletes representing the United States who thought it was kind of entertaining to show a lack of respect as they were receiving their medals and the Star Spangled Banner was played.

Perhaps it would be good for my colleagues to continue to remind our constituents just exactly what that song, the Star Spangled Banner, our National anthem, what it means and where it came from and what it represents.

Look, this is not some song by Metallica out there or some other group that is used for entertainment. This was a song that was written on sacrifice. This was a song written with the idea of patriotism. This was a song that was written in recognition of the many Americans who fought to preserve this country. They did not fight in Olympic games, they did not fight on a relay team to get the gold medal, they fought on a battlefield, and a lot of them gave their lives.

I will tell you, to every veteran in this country, in fact, to every citizen in this country, those athletes, who in my opinion embarrassed the United States of America with their behavior, owe an apology to every citizen in this country, and they especially owe an apology to those veterans who really went out and fought the wars, who really have represented this country since its conception.

Mr. Speaker, we all have an obligation, whether the moment is an exciting moment or whether the moment is at a funeral, or whether the moment is at the beginning of a basketball game or a football game, we have an obligation to citizens of this country to respect the history of the Star Spangled Banner.

While we do not stand there and recite the history of the Star Spangled Banner, we as Americans have that song to kind of be a symbol to the world, and even as a reminder to ourselves, about what this great country is all about and to see that some of our outstanding young people in this country who have been given the privilege, and, by the way, it is not in reverse, it is not what the country could do, so-to-speak, for those athletes, it is what those athletes can do to represent our country, and they do not represent our country when they stand there and make the kind of mockery or the kind of little professional side show they thought was entertaining for the cameras.

I hope those individuals out there who give sponsorships and commercial contracts keep in mind what these particular individuals did, how they embarrassed, in my opinion, the rest of