

hydrogen. I think one of the better developments in automobiles that is coming along the path is the use of fuel cells, where we will be able to use hydrogen, combine it with the oxygen in the atmosphere, and with almost no pollution produce electricity to drive an electric motor. Now, this is not easy technology, but we know it works because we used it on space vehicles, we have used it on the shuttle and other places for energy purposes, and we have trial automobiles which use fuel cells. Right now they are still expensive because they are experimental. But someday, when we get the design down and manufacture them in bulk, I am hoping that we will be able to use fuel cells as a good source of energy. We can either use gasoline in them or some other fossil fuel and preform it, as they say, so that we extract the hydrogen from it and run the hydrogen through the fuel cell and get our power that way.

Even better would be if we developed a hydrogen economy, where we develop hydrogen out of our fossil fuel resources, or by electrolyzing water, H₂O, remember, and separating it into hydrogen and oxygen, and that way we could, using electrical energy from nuclear plants or other plants, generate hydrogen and pipe it around, sell it at hydrogen stations instead of gasoline stations, and power our automobiles that way.

The Hybrid, incidentally, is an interesting way of improving mileage, and again using the energy more efficiently. A couple of manufacturers are doing that now. I expect a few more will be developed. But I regard that as an interim. It is slightly more efficient but not as good as the fuel cell is going to be.

We have to look at other possibilities for alternative sources of energy. Solar energy is tremendously promising in terms of its potential. We get as much energy on this earth from the sun per day as we expend from all our other energy sources for quite a number of years. Huge amounts of energy from the sun hitting the earth. The problem is it is very diffuse and, therefore, very low quality, very hard to use. But we are making progress in photovoltaic cells, and I expect in not too many years we will find new homes built with solar shingles on the roof, shingles that will generate electricity and help heat the hot water in the House, help heat and cool the house, provide electricity for cooking, for the clothes dryer, and things of this sort, and with some electronics can actually provide high enough quality electricity to run TVs, VCRs, and so forth.

So that is I think a promising alternative that is coming down the pike. I would estimate probably 10 years from now that will be economical. It is not going to be economically feasible to take our existing shingles off and put these others on. That would be costly. But as part of a new building or as part of a required replacement of shingles, it will become economically feasible.

□ 2130

We have others. Wind as power, of course, has potential. It is not a stable source of energy. We need an energy storage device or supplementary energy. The same of course is true for solar, but it again depends where one lives. I think it has real promise, particularly for less developed countries. That, incidentally, is one of reasons and the main reason I was opposed to the Kyoto protocol.

I think President Bush was exactly right in saying that it is dead because it only put restrictions on the developed nations, not to developing nations. If we do not have some restriction on them or at least tell them at a certain date they have to meet these requirements just as we do, we will soon find all of them putting in highly polluting coal burning plants that produce a lot of CO₂, greenhouse gases, a lot of pollutants. Then when we say, there is too much production. There needs to be a cutback. They will say, look, we have all these investments now and all of these marvelous plants. We cannot cut back now.

I think if we have an international agreement, if we ever reach one that places restrictions on us, it also has to place restrictions on less developed countries because then they will make investments in alternative sources of energy such as solar, which is certainly the best answer in many places such as Africa and parts of Asia, rather than building these power plants which will create more problems.

So I have talked about a whole range of different issues tonight, and I did not get into the specifics of some of our current problems. But I am simply saying that the plan that the Republicans are developing is a good launching pad for the things that I have been talking about that we have to move towards in the future. It contains the seeds of a long term national energy policy and certainly will provide the good short term energy policy that we need right now to address the problems of prices at the gas pump and the crisis in California.

One last thought on that. We have to not only consider energy issues as we have talked about now, but we also have to consider the international relations or foreign policy aspects of it. We are 70 percent dependent right now on oil from other countries. As I said earlier, energy is our most basic natural resource.

We are at the mercy of other countries because if they cut off our supply for whatever reason, political or war or whatever, we are at their mercy because our industry cannot operate without energy and we cannot produce enough internally instantaneously. That is why it is very important, as the energy plan of President Bush points out, that we must establish our independence from the fossil fuels of other countries. We have to develop our own sources. We have to develop alternative sources so we can truly be energy inde-

pendent and not depend on the good will of individuals who may not feel very kindly toward us at various times.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, in closing I would say I hope that the lessons that are being learned in California do not have to be learned in the United States to get a decent energy policy. Even though California is second only to Rhode Island in energy conservation, we have had 68 stage one power emergencies, 63 stage two power emergencies and 38 stage three power emergencies.

The way it happens is when electricity begins to run out, that is a stage one alert. When it gets worse, that is a stage two alert. When that gets worse, that is a stage three alert and from there we enter into rolling blackouts.

We are having to suffer through that because I think we have not been keen on making sure that California has had adequate energy supply and we will create that. We will become a great State or continue to be the great State that we are. But I do not want the country to have to go through the same problems that California is because of an unrealistic expectation out of energy and where the supply needs to go.

California is getting real real fast. I think the rest of country needs to learn to get real about where our energy supplies need to come from. That is why I applaud the leadership in the House and also the President of the United States for putting this energy plan together, a realistic one that also includes alternative fuels, energies and conservation and puts them in their proper perspective.

ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN AGRICULTURE AND EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KERNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today we concluded the appropriations debate and passed an agricultural appropriations bill for \$74.6 billion. I think that it passed with a minimum amount of discussion and controversy.

I think we had an overwhelming vote from all the members. I voted for it myself, even though in the past I have been wary of agricultural bills that have large amounts of subsidies for farmers for crops that no longer need subsidies. But that is not a point that I want to expand on. I want to say that we have passed a bill for \$74.6 billion, the Federal Government's involvement in agriculture, and the farmers of the United States are less than 2 percent of the population.

We take good care of our farmers and they give us good return. We are the best fed Nation in the world, but we certainly take very good care of them. Any people among those farmers and

that particular group that continues to talk about not wanting the help of government or complaining about big government, telling government to get off their back, et cetera, it is hypocritical because the government is very much involved in producing the best agricultural system in the world. It is a monument to the achievement of government and education. The Morrell Act which created the land grant colleges in all of the States set off a process which created agricultural engineering and science, an approach to implementing new theories rapidly, the county agents, and a number of different innovations that still survive to this day. There are still committees in every county that relate to the Department of Agriculture.

The system has been very productive. The system is, however, a system that we oversee as the Federal Government, and it is fed and kept alive by the Federal Government. Most people do not know it, but the department of government in Washington which has the second largest number of employees, second only to the Pentagon, is the Department of Agriculture, although we now have less than 2 percent of the population which are actually farmers, bodies who can be called farmers.

Mr. Speaker, we take good care of agriculture and as a result, we get good return. There are 53 million children in the public schools of the Nation. That is far more than 2 percent of the population. If we want to put the same kind of investment into education, we would reap greater and greater returns. I assure my colleagues, on education. As I said before, the productivity of our agriculture system is directly related to the fact that we understood the role of education in agricultural production very early in the life of the Nation. Land grant colleges were not established to teach theology or philosophy. They were established to bring a new approach to teaching engineering, agriculture and biology in all kinds of things that were very practical and productive. So the great system for feeding America which feeds a large part of the world is based on a step taken by the United States government in the area of education. One of our monumental achievements in the area of education was the Morrell Act which established the land grant colleges in all of the States of the United States.

The Morrell Act, of course, was inspired by Thomas Jefferson's genius when he created the University of Virginia, a State-based university. He took the first step and Morrell followed through, and every single State benefited from the same vision, an extension of the vision of Thomas Jefferson.

We need the same kind of vision as we look at the 53 million children that are in our public schools. We need to understand that a large part of what we have been able to accomplish as a Nation is based on the fact that we have subscribed from the early days to the philosophy of universal education.

The Federal Government has not played the first role, but the Federal Government certainly has never interfered with the States, and every State accepted the responsibility. It is the ethic of the American people which lead to the creation in the constitution of every State the responsibility for education.

The Federal Government discovered in World War I and World War II that it had to go beyond that in terms of the development of its youth population, its scientists and technicians, and so it began to play a greater role in higher education in general. Now following the genius of Lyndon Johnson and the great society era where he established the first Federal support for elementary and secondary education, the Federal government has been a partner. We are weak partners. We do not have a major role in terms of funding. We actually only fund about 7 percent of the total education budget for the Nation. It is the State and local governments that fund the rest of the education budget, but we are involved.

We recognize the necessity for that involvement and I think every State education official and local education official, and certainly teachers and principals throughout the Nation, will indicate that since the Federal Government got involved to the present there have been improvements.

The Federal Government's role in education has been a very positive role, a role that we can be proud of. I am here today to sort of remind us that we should not allow this lull in the attention being offered by the Federal Government, by the people here in the Congress and the White House to education, do not let this lull allow us to take for granted what is going to happen next in the area of education in terms of this year's legislative agenda.

We have passed a bill here in the House of Representatives, Leave No Child Behind, the President's bill, and the bill has passed in the other body. It is now waiting deliberation by conference. I read in the paper that the other body has appointed its conferees, the people who will sit on the conference committee. We have not done that in the House, but I assume that we will do that fairly soon. It is likely this process will go beyond the August recess, and that the climax will take place in September when we return from the August recess.

In the meantime, I want Members to still be aware of the fact that the last word has not been stated, it is not over yet by a long shot. We have a major dilemma. We have to confront a major dilemma with respect to the bills that have passed in the House of Representatives and the other body. The dilemma is this. We have authorized in both cases amounts of money to implement the Leave No Child Behind education program, amounts of money that are far greater than the amounts of money that have been reserved in the budget, the budget which has been

passed in this House and in the other body, does not allow for the implementation of the most important provisions of the Leave No Child Behind legislation.

For example, one very important piece, Title I, Title I has been the major instrument for granting and providing public assistance, Federal assistance to education agencies across the country. It is about \$8 billion. Title I in the Leave No Child Behind legislation is supposed to double in the next 5 years beginning with increments which will go into effect this year. So in this year's budget, there has to be the first increment for the movement of Title I forward. And in a 5-year period, it will reach \$17.2 billion, according to the authorization. It is hypocritical to have all of the powers that be, the White House, both parties agreed on this, and then to have the authorization sitting there without an appropriation to back it up. There is no room in the budget at this point.

□ 2145

So it is going to have to be negotiated through some extraordinary effort. We are going to have to break the budget or greatly shift some items around in order to accommodate the authorized amount. We certainly want to make certain that the priorities are such that this authorized amount will be honored before some other items may be honored. In order to do this, we cannot leave it to the processes here in Washington. The same processes that have generated this movement forward, however small it may be, and I am not pleased with the fact that Leave No Child Behind is inadequate in so many ways. It is inadequate because it has no money, not a single penny, for school construction. The Leave No Child Behind legislation that passed the House of Representatives did not allow a single penny for school construction. There is some hope because the other body did place \$175 million in the budget for charter school construction.

It is very interesting, in an era where the majority party has insisted that it would not move forward on any school construction appropriation because it is not the job and the duty of the Federal Government, they do not want to get involved, the same leadership of the same party put in \$175 million for charter school construction. I am all in favor of leaving the \$175 million in there for charter school construction, but I would like to see it expanded so that we can at least get back to the \$1.2 billion that the previous administration had appropriated for emergency school construction across the board, not just charter schools but all schools that had need.

So we have work to do. There are inadequacies and some of those inadequacies cannot be addressed in the appropriation process. They require new authorization. But some of the inadequacies can be addressed. The one that I have just given as an example can be

addressed. And since there is \$175 million in the budget for charter school construction, then it is in order, it is certainly in order, to expand that school construction money to move it to encompass more than just charter schools, and I certainly will be intending to offer an amendment to that effect when the bill comes back to us. If you cannot offer an amendment, I certainly will seek through the confereencing process to have the conferees consider moving from \$175 million just for charter schools to a larger amount which would deal with school construction emergencies across the board where they are needed.

There are many other items that they can deal with also because they are in the authorization language and we can move in that respect. I think that the other body had a set of authorizing figures, the amounts for authorization, in a number of areas that are higher than the authorization figures in the House of Representatives bill. So there is hope there that in the confereencing process, we can move in the direction of the amounts of money that have been established by the other body and be able to deal with some of the inadequacies that are left.

I think the important thing is the public must realize that the fact that education is on the agenda at all, the fact that it was one of the first items the new administration placed before the Congress is due to the common-sense pressure that is being applied from the bottom. It is the public opinion that keeps consistently stating to the elected officials that education has to be one of our priority items. It seems that we are always running away from it. Elected officials have not really engaged the education agenda the way they should. Considering the fact that for the last 5 years, it has been among the top item and for the last 2 years it has been number one on the agenda of the public opinion polls, we should have done more. We should have done more. But our engagement has been of a shadow boxing approach where we engage in it with rhetoric, there is a lot of talk about education, there is a lot of discussion, and then when the authorizing and the appropriation process takes place, there is minimum effort. In the Leave No Child Behind legislation, we do not have maximum effort, we have minimum effort. It is important for the public to remember that. Whatever we are going to conclude with this year is still far short of where we should be in terms of the Federal involvement in education.

People say, "Well, it's really a local and a State matter." Yes, it should primarily remain a local and State matter. In terms of support for education, financing of education, funding of education should remain primarily a State and local matter. But that does not mean that the Federal Government cannot be more involved than 7 percent. Seven percent leaves us a lot of room. Why do we not shoot for 25 per-

cent? There are people who fear that greater Federal involvement will mean a loss of local control, a loss of State control of the schools. With 7 percent involvement, and the local government and State government have 93 percent of the funding, then certainly you cannot control anything. If you have 93 percent, if the other party has 93 percent, you cannot control it with 7 percent. Let us not kid ourselves. If we increase it, the Federal share, from 7 percent to 25 percent, we still are not in a position to control, and that is a bogeyman that should be shot down and forgotten. We should be moving toward more Federal funding in terms of a greater percentage of the bill for education should be paid by the Federal Government.

All taxes, all revenue comes from the local area, anyhow. All politics is local, all revenue is local. The money we print in Washington is symbolic, it is symbolic of the taxes that are flowed in here from the States and the localities. So give it back to them in ways which promote the item that the American public has indicated is the number one item. They would like to see more Federal involvement in education. Let us keep the debate going, let us continue to talk in terms of what is needed, instead of merely settling for the parameters that have been established by the Leave No Child Behind legislation.

I want to take the opportunity today to talk about two groups, two statements of vision that have come to my office very recently. One is a book that is written by Dwight Allen who is an education professor at Old Dominion University and William Cosby, Bill Cosby. Most people do not know that Bill Cosby has a Ph.D. in education and that he has always been interested in schools and in children. Cosby wrote several books on children and families that were best sellers some years ago. This book is a combination with an education professor friend of his. The title of the book is "American Schools, the \$100 Billion Challenge." The \$100 billion does not refer to \$100 billion over the next 10 years, Mr. Speaker, it refers to \$100 billion per year that ought to be added to the Federal effort in education. It is interesting that they would think in those terms, when a second presentation by the Children's Defense Fund, the Act to Leave No Child Behind as a bill that has been introduced in the Senate, S. 940, and in the House as H.R. 1990. Senator CHRISTOPHER DODD of Connecticut is the sponsor in the Senate and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the highest ranking Democrat on the Committee on Education and the Workforce in the House is the sponsor. They are talking about \$100 billion, also. It is very interesting. What can we make of this and should I waste your time with utopian proposals for the Federal involvement in education? Frankly, I do not believe they are utopian.

Because we operate within the parameters of political practicality, I have not offered an amendment to the effect of levels of funding as high as proposed in these two documents, but they make sense. Their proposals make sense. Their proposals talk about moving away from incremental, nickel-and-dime approaches to reform and let us do the things that are really necessary on a scale that is necessary to move us forward. What has America got to lose by having a greater Federal investment in education? And what does it have to gain? I think that the gains in investment in education are tremendously geometric. The gains are fantastic in terms of what you invest and the educated population that you get as a result, what they produce. What are we producing in America now? We are way ahead of the rest of the world. Agriculture is just an old-fashioned basic example. We got way ahead of the world by investing heavily in education in agriculture. We are way ahead of the world right now in terms of digitalization, computerization and anything involving science and the application of science. Our pharmaceutical industries, our medical. Why are we there? Because in addition to the Morrill Act which established the land grant colleges, on several occasions the Federal Government has acted with broad and thorough funding powers to boost education.

The GI bill. When the men who fought in World War II came back, every single one of them was given the right to an education financed by the Federal Government, from A to Z. There are some who went to barber school, some who went to business school. Many went into our universities. Our universities had never had such an enrollment. Enrollment was doubled and tripled in many of our universities as a result of the GI bill, a Federal bill that paid the bill, paid the expenses for men, veterans, to become educated. What came out of that? Large numbers of men who would never have gone to college, who would never have become technicians or never have become scientists, they entered the workforce and entered our economy at a time when automation was taking place. The great jump forward, the great leap forward after World War II was automation in our plants. We had the technicians and the mechanics and the people to do that because of this tremendous investment that this Nation made in education.

We have not looked back and really thoroughly examined what we have done. The institutional memory of the American citizens in terms of what we have done in education and what we have reaped as a result is not there automatically. You have to talk about it. But we got a great boost. The fact that we are ahead in computer science is not by accident. We filled our universities and the great expansion that took place in education following the GI bill, once the GI bill recipients were

out of college, every university that was publicly financed found its enrollment still going up, because through that experience, they expanded greatly, and they made it possible to have lower tuition and more and more young people could go to college and the age of the computer, digitalization, communications improvements, and all the kinds of things that we take for granted now were made possible by the crop of technicians and scientists who came forward through that process.

It is likely that if we were to invest \$100 billion in education every year for the next 10 years, we will reap 10 times that much incrementally, it will probably be geometric, to heights that we cannot conceive. Most people cannot conceive the need for that many educated people. They say that you do not need that many educated people. When I came out of college, there was a raging debate in certain places about do we need more people, more educated people? They will only take the jobs of those who now have the jobs. Do we need more teachers? There was a limited supply of teacher jobs. We would have a pressure on the professions that could not be met by educating all these new people.

What has happened? We have gone through a process where now there is a tremendous shortage of teachers. Let us take teachers, because teachers outnumber lawyers. Teachers outnumber doctors. That is a profession that has large numbers of people involved, large numbers in school who come through the process and become teachers, and we used to take for granted, if you could not do anything else, you could teach and therefore you would always have a large number of people who on the way to some other profession would teach for a while first and then for various reasons teaching was a profession that we had no shortages. Women who were not allowed to get into corporations to the degree that they are today and many other professions had sort of walled them off, medicine, law, sort of hemmed women in, they kept them in teaching and nursing. All those barriers have fallen now and we have a tremendous shortage of teachers right now at this very moment and the shortage is increasing geometrically. It is increasing right now greatly.

New York City had 4,000 teachers who resigned or retired over a 2-year period 2 years ago. In this last year, they had 4,000 teachers in one year. They expect to have 6,000 retire next year. We are into a situation where they can see the number of people qualified in terms of years spent in the system and the other pressures will lead to a tremendous drain on the number of teachers.

□ 2200

There is a great shortage of teachers in New York City right now. We are not able to get trained, certified teachers to fill all of our classrooms, and many other big cities have the same problem.

The other pressure, other than just not having the bodies that come out of the process of education, is that the surrounding suburbs, which usually are more wealthy sometimes in other States, in New Jersey or Pennsylvania, New York is surrounded by suburbs that can pay much higher salaries for teachers. So they have shortages in those areas and it speeds up, it escalates, the drain of teachers in New York City.

I am told that one of the big problems we have with school construction is that school construction has now hit a problem because the construction industry certainly in the New York area has sort of over booked. They have more than they can handle because the construction industry has a great shortage of skilled personnel, carpenters, sheet metal workers. The people who make construction go are in short supply. So we have a skills problem in the area of construction.

We have a problem recruiting policemen. There is a difficulty. There is a big debate. They have lowered the standard for policemen. Whenever you move in search of some skills that go beyond just a high school education, there are shortages developing in big metropolitan areas. I am certain that the experience in Los Angeles and Chicago and Detroit and some other areas is not going to be so different. There is unemployment at the lower levels where you have no skills and no education, but in the areas where the people are semi-professional or professional, the shortages have already shown up. So just to fill the shortages, just to fill nurses, nurses is another area which we are hearing more and more about every day. I have heard some 1-minute speeches on the floor of the Congress. I have seen items in the newspapers repeatedly about hospitals not having enough nurses and other medical personnel. So that is another area of skilled and professional people where you have a shortage.

Just to fill those traditional positions, just to take care of the careers that we are all familiar with, you need more people who are educated. But when I talk about a great geometrical increase in the benefits that you get from having an educated population, I mean more than just replacement of the usual professionals, I am talking about professions that we have not even conceived yet that are just shaping up. The people in the area of genetics, a large numbers of people in the field of genetics, who were not there 10 years ago, it is an exploding field. People in biotechnology, on and on it goes in terms of the kinds of research that if you have the personnel, if you have the people who have the scientific know-how and have been trained, you can move much more rapidly to unearth new discoveries in science. Whether you are talking about discoveries in biotechnology and microbiology, in physics, all kinds of discoveries, telecommunications, can take

place in direct proportion to the number of people who are educated. All of the forward motion in terms of technology and science can also move forward without the costs being so great. The greater the supply of professionals and technicians, the less the costs. We have some high cost scientists and some high cost scientific projects because there are too few scientists available.

In the area of computer technology, it is kind of a recession, a correction, they say, in the dot com industry. Computer specialists were in high demand. Information technology personnel is in high demand and I am told this is only a blip on the screen, that pretty soon the demand for information technology personnel will be as great as it was before. So an investment in education pays off geometrically. If we spend a billion dollars more per year on education for the next 10 years, it will give this society benefits which are worth far more than we invest. If you have to state everything in terms of dollar value, trillions and trillions of dollars would be realized because we would develop, we know that there are secrets out there waiting to be unlocked in biotechnology alone, that if you put more people to work there is a correlation between the ratio of people put to work and the benefits that you would achieve. The same thing is true in certain areas of digitalization, computerization and those areas. They reap benefits, what they call in economic terms productivity. American productivity has greatly increased, and one of the downsides of the great increase in productivity is that it puts out of work a lot of people who did mundane tasks but at the same time it creates a need for a different kind of employee and personnel with much more know-how.

We want to have the personnel with the know-how available to take the jobs. So our investment in education has a dual effect of moving us forward to an era where more will be unlocked at a faster and faster pace, new technology, new medical benefits, new ways to decrease the energy employed to produce items and all other so-called seemingly unsolvable problems, problems that cannot be solved now, seemed they cannot be solved. You can solve them if you get more personnel, if you get more trained people. The training process, the education process from the first grade to graduate school and beyond graduate school, is such that you are only going to produce a certain number of geniuses, but you can rest assured if you put a certain number of people through that process there will be geniuses discovered. The world is not run by geniuses. Geniuses are regular people who serve with partners with them, other scientists and theoreticians, and the theoreticians and scientists have to have technicians to work with them. The technicians have to have mechanics. All up and down the line of the funnel you will

have developed people breaking out in their own capacity.

If you give them the opportunity, they will develop to their fullest capacity, which means that everybody will be improved and everybody will be able to make a contribution that they could not make if they did not have the education.

We should not hold back and hesitate as most of our political leaders are. The governors and the mayors and the people who are in charge continually become an obstacle in the forward movement of the appropriation of the adequate sums of money for education. They are the ones who prefer to talk about education without really improving education.

We have a problem in New York City with the receipt of State aid over the years has been clearly unfair. They have not given the city pupils the same kind of support from the State that the other pupils have gotten outside of New York City. A court suit was mounted and a judge came to the conclusion that, yes, it is true. The State has not been appropriately financing the schools in the city and the State should take corrective action. The governor of the State has appealed that decision, and one of the things he said in his appeal is quite frightening. The firm that was hired by the State of New York, which is the firm that has been used in a lot of school segregation cases in the south, that firm has based its defense, its appeal on the following theory: That city students failed in school because of their poverty. No amount of money, whether to raise teachers' salaries, to build more schools or to install science labs, would make a difference. That is what the States attorneys are saying, that poverty is the cause of the failure of the school system; the inability of the children to learn is due to their poverty.

Now, we know that there would be a revolution if the governor had dared to say due to their race, due to their ethnicity or due to their religion. That would be clearly discrimination. Clearly, he would get a reaction from right across the country about that kind of approach. But it is a hidden statement. Most of the poor children in New York City are minority children, either Hispanic or children of African descent and they are being told in this defense that the governor has put up that poverty is a problem.

It is not the lack of funding. I do not want to go into that too far. I just want to point out that it is a frightening notion. If you move in that direction and do not challenge that kind of theory, the problem is that in 10 years you would end up with a clear statement by policymakers in the State that the State does not owe any children universal education because if they are too poor to learn then we should not invest the money trying to make them learn. The implications of assuming that poverty blocks learning, poverty dooms the school system, the

implications are devastating and we hope to deal with that argument right away.

I got something from one of my constituents about a new proposal about reparations. There is a young man that has caused a stir by putting out a pamphlet about reparations, makes a statement about 10 reasons why reparations for blacks is a bad idea for blacks and it is a racist idea also. Reparations become suddenly not only a bad idea and something that we should not talk about but it is also a racist notion for any group to say we may be owed reparations. I can see 10 years from now if you let the governor go unchallenged with poor students, whether they are African American or Hispanic, being told it is a bad idea for you to demand a universal free education because, after all, we have tried and we could not educate you because you are poor.

I do not want to go too deeply into the implications of that kind of argument. My point is that the governors and the mayors and the people who are blocking the way, and people in high places, of course, in the Federal level, blocking the way in terms of the appropriations of ample resources for education, they are refusing to respond to the public outcry for improvements by dealing with basics. Basically, you need whatever it takes to provide certain physical facilities that are safe, physical facilities that are conducive to education. You need to provide basic instructional assistance by having trained teachers, teachers who are certified and know what they are doing. You need to have decent equipment, decent supplies, decent sized laboratories. You need a library at every school. The basics are not there.

Before we move to more theoretical kinds of considerations of accountability and testing and blaming the teachers, let us put the basics in place. The basics are not there, however. These people who talk about \$100 billion per year are on track because instead of proposing utopian ideas, Dwight Allen and Bill Cosby are proposing ideas that make a lot of sense. Senator CHRISTOPHER DODD and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) in the Act to Leave No Child Behind, S. 940, H.R. 1990, are making some sound proposals. I must point out that the Act to Leave No Child Behind is not just an education bill. This is about children. It goes beyond education, to health, environment, nutrition, housing. This is about a program for children. In terms of the dollar figures, they come out at the same point as the cost by proposals, but nothing proposed here is outlandish, outrageous, utopian. It is all very sound and very on target.

□ 2215

But we have lost sight of that. In the deliberation of the education bill, I offered a motion to instruct which was related to construction. Now, because of the atmosphere, we were tempted to

compromise and to try to win votes by watering down the original amendment that I had made. We came all the way down from an amendment that I made which would have appropriated \$10 billion a year over a 10 year period for school construction, to \$1.2 billion, the amount equal to the amount appropriated by the outgoing Clinton Administration for school repairs, mostly emergency repairs.

So even though the need clearly is up at the point where you need at least \$10 billion a year just for school construction, and that is based on several studies that have been conducted by the General Accounting Office and conducted by the National Education Association showing that you needed about \$320 billion. The National Education Association study, if you combined school construction and repair with new technology, you need \$320 billion. New York State had the highest need of about \$44 billion in order to bring the schools up to par to a level where they could serve the present population appropriately.

So my estimates and my figures on school construction were not pulled out of the air. They were already a compromise. But on the floor here I offered a motion to instruct which was watered down to \$1.2 billion per year. Of course, that failed. It got a party line vote, and we failed to pass it. But it was a far cry from the need.

We have to do that. As people who are trying to compromise and get something done, we have to sacrifice our vision of what the need is. But I do not want the people out there who have had the common sense all these years to keep the pressure on elected officials to lose sight of what is needed. We do not need \$1.2 billion for school construction, we need \$10 billion a year for school construction. We need the kind of figures that are stated in this book, American Schools, the \$100 Billion Challenge.

I am going to read a few examples from this \$100 billion challenge which Bill Cosby and Professor Dwight Allen put forth. I am going to read these, as I said before, not as a politician, an elected official offering these as suggestions that I intend to put in legislation tomorrow, but as mind-stretching exercises.

Let us stretch our minds and try to look at education from the point of view of these experts. They are both Ph.D.s in education, they are both very concerned about it, but they are outside looking into the governmental process, and some of the conclusions they come to would be very instructive. We did not hear from these people in hearings before we passed the Leave No Child Behind legislation. Nobody was interested in hearing these kinds of statements.

But here is a vision that is worth consideration by all that really care about education. In the section \$100 billion for teachers, a summary of the listing, they start out with \$6 billion

regular in-service training on the Internet for all teachers.

Now, we have pages and pages of discussion of teacher training and teacher improvement, but I do not think any one of our legislative proposals dealt with anything of this nature, certainly not with that kind of figure. I think our total amount for training of teachers is something close to \$4 billion for all training, and in-service training and upkeep for teachers.

Here, in this proposal, just to read a few examples, \$6 billion for regular in-service training on the Internet for all teachers. Compensate every teacher in America \$2,000 per year extra to spend 2 hours a week on the Internet upgrading their knowledge of his or her subjects, their teaching methods and of the newest research. We all agree that lots of teachers are out-of-date in their knowledge of both content and method of teaching. Current methods are hit and miss and often not valued by teachers who receive such training. The Internet offers a dramatic new potential. Developing and presenting new content and methods in a systematic way for all teachers can now be routine and cost-effective in a way never before possible—\$6 billion they propose to spend on regular in-service training on the Internet for all teachers in the Cosby-Allen proposals.

Another area that they propose expenditures which I found to be interesting was the expenditure of \$2 billion to train a corps of master teacher mentors. Provide a trained corps of clinical master teacher mentors for each teacher in training and for beginning teachers. There would be several concomitant benefits of paying mentor teachers \$2,000 to \$5,000 stipends each year. This is above their salary. First of all, well-trained mentors would provide better supervision and guidance for new teachers, and if the mentors are well paid, they will be encouraged to provide more and more and better assistance and they will stay in the school system, instead of moving on to higher paying jobs elsewhere.

Another item, \$5 billion, \$5 billion, this is one I have never seen before, for a corps of \$100,000 classroom teachers. Listen closely, \$5 billion for a core of \$100,000 classroom teachers. Pay 5 percent of all teachers, pay 5 percent of all teachers, an added \$50,000 per year to attract and hold a share of the brightest college and university graduates as master teachers.

In other words, you get master teachers who would be making up to \$100,000 a year. Pay 5 percent of all teachers \$100,000 a year. We need to break the mold of a single salary schedule for all teachers. Just as the dream of a NBA million dollar contract does energize sandlot and school basketball all over the Nation, realistic aspiration of \$100,000 stipends per year for even a small percentage of teachers would energize applicants at all levels and increase the recruitment pool. We are a Nation that responds to financial incentives.

Another item, \$10 billion, \$10 billion, for teaching assistance and other support staff for teachers. Now, I would wholeheartedly endorse this one as being practical, being necessary, and we ought to write it into our legislation right away. Teaching assistance and other support staff for all teachers.

Build the concept of a teacher and his or her staff with clerical and technical support in the classroom, including teaching assistants and interns. Teachers are now required to do it all. Teachers are self-contained in their classrooms. Sporadically they may have teaching assistants or some volunteer support. If we are to make the most efficient use of our most valuable resource in education, well-trained teachers, we must begin to provide them the support that is routine for all other professionals.

I think we ought to stress that. Real professionals, every other professional, whether you are talking about lawyers or doctors or engineers, they have staff; they have staff assistants, they have people at various levels of support. Teachers deserve the same kind of support, and you would actually have a more efficient and more effective classroom, a more effective use of your highest price personnel, if you were to have each teacher being seen as part of a unit, where they are the head of the unit, directing the unit, but they are not weighted down with a lot of tasks that are not professional, not productive and do not involve learning. So I would wholeheartedly endorse that proposal as being a very practical one and one we should have moved on long ago.

We talk a lot technology in the classroom and about the use of technology in the classroom, computers in the classroom. I do not think teachers should have to learn how to make computers do new things in terms of their curriculum and opening the eyes of youngsters with more creative approaches to teaching. They should not have to do all that and also learn how to fix the machine when it breaks.

When computers are on the blink, they should not have to be the ones to fix them, the servicing of the computers, the servicing of any equipment. There is a whole array of things that teachers should not have to do, and if you had that built in a system, that taken care of by a unit, you would have more people staying in teaching instead of resigning and retiring as quickly as they can.

Another item they have here in the Cosby-Allen proposals is a \$1 billion item, challenge grants for teacher initiatives for educational reform. Teachers should be encouraged to examine their own practices and to try new initiatives. A series of challenge grants should be established, with teachers from other states making a judgment about the priorities of which initiatives to fund.

The whole debate on education and the production of the Leave No Child

Behind Act in both Houses of the Congress, the people who were consulted least were the teachers. We talk a lot about what teachers should do, we have prescriptions in here for their training, we even talk about teacher preparation institutions, penalizing them if they do not graduate teachers who can pass the certification tests. We are deeply into education and the molding of teachers and the use of teachers, but very few teachers were consulted, I assure you, in this process.

Because of the pressure of public opinion, we politicians, we elected officials, have gotten involved, but we have left out the most important ingredient, and that is the input, the advice and consultation of the teaching profession and the teachers themselves.

So this \$1 billion challenge grant would recognize that teachers have initiatives and teachers are sometimes the best teachers of other teachers. Teachers should be encouraged to examine their own practices and to try new initiatives.

Another item, \$6 billion for 6 years of pre-service training for teachers. Provide \$10,000 per year for 6 years of universal teacher training for 100,000 teachers each year. There is a wide consensus that we need to attract a share of the brightest student to the profession of teaching. They propose 6 years of funding, an incentive to increase the time of training profession and to raise the standards of the teaching profession generally.

There are all sorts of variations possible. For example, funding can be in the form of loans that include one year of funding forgiven for every year as a teacher. We have had those proposals offered in terms of forgiving loans, but we have not had any proposals that talked about \$10,000 per year in order to allow students to get a 6 year education.

Another item, \$3 billion, one-year internship for teachers after professional training. These are items which coincide with some practical proposals that have been made in legislation already. \$1 billion for higher salaries for more teacher educators. Increasing salaries of \$10,000 teacher educators by \$25,000 to \$75,000 per year. Again, the same principle, to attract the brightest graduates into teacher education.

Another \$1 billion is proposed for the development of teacher training materials. Then technology, \$15 billion proposed for technology for all schools, the purchase, maintenance and replacement. And on and on it goes, into a budget which concludes with \$100 billion per year for education, American schools.

Again, I have been talking about a vision offered by Bill Cosby and Dwight Allen. Dwight Allen is a noted Professor of Education Reform at Old Dominion University, and Bill Cosby has a Ph.D. in education and has been interested in education for a number of years and has written several books on children and families.

In conclusion, I have offered these two visions which are outside the usual discussion that takes place here on the Hill. It just so happens that they come at a time when there is a great need to keep the dialogue going.

We cannot sit still and wait until the conference committee acts. We should not sit still and wait until the final negotiation takes place, probably at the end of September. We need to keep the pressure on. The public needs to remind each one of us in the Congress that they have made education a priority, and making education a priority, there is a need to have resources behind the rhetoric.

The dilemma we face is that we have two bills that have passed, one in the other body and one here in the Congress, and both have authorization figures much higher than any provisions that have been made in the budget. We need to solve that dilemma in a positive way. We need to have the pressure applied from those who care about education to make the appropriations figure measure up to the authorization figures as a one first positive step.

At least the Leave No Child Behind legislation should not be hypocritical, it should do what it says it is going to do in the authorization bill. That is the first step. The other steps require the kind of vision to go forward that is indicated in these two visions, one from the book written by Bill Cosby and Dwight Allen, and the other from the Leave No Child Behind legislation which deals with more than just education, and is sponsored really with the backing of the Children's Defense Fund.

□ 2230

We are going to hear more about this as we go toward September. The important thing is that we should understand that the door is not closed, and the final decision has not been made. There is room for an appropriation which measures up to the authorization and all of us should dedicate ourselves to the proposition that we will fight to have the appropriation measure up to the authorization for education.

NIGHTSIDE CHAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KERNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

HONORING OUR FALLEN FIREFIGHTERS

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments of my Special Order to address a very sad situation that occurred yesterday in Winthrop, Washington State. As my colleagues know, this time of year is the time of year in our Nation across the Nation that we face horrible forest fires. Most of the time, we are able to conquer those fires through the able leadership of the Forest Service, the BLM, our professional fire depart-

ments, our volunteer fire departments and volunteers across the country. But every once in a while the fire gets the best of us, as it did in Storm King Mountain in Glenwood Springs, Colorado, the town that I was born and raised in.

I was in Storm King at the time of the incident and I remember the situation very well. I remember the horrifying fire that took Storm King Mountain. I remember the horrible tragedies and the tears of the young children and the widows and the mothers and the fathers and all the families and the friends and the shock of that community. We had hoped that Storm King Mountain in Glenwood Springs, that the incident would never repeat itself, but we knew at some point in time that it would, because it is almost like part of a fate of fighting fires. Over a period of time, we are going to have casualties. It is a war of its own, really. We think about it, thinking about a fire that is unpredictable, in some cases; some cases it is predictable, an enemy that has no discrimination as far as who it picks to destroy. We see it destroy animals, we see it destroy mountains.

We know that basically, it is a force that can erupt, just like the force erupted yesterday. Yesterday we had a fire of about 5 acres and we had what we call the blowup. The thing that scares anybody dealing with fires, the worst condition that we can have are the conditions that accumulate in the incident called fire blowup. That means we have low humidity, we have very dry timber, and we have a wind that is unexpected that comes in. This fire which burns 5 acres over some period of time exploded from 5 acres to 2,005 acres in a matter of moments. These firefighters that lost their lives yesterday, 4 of them, had no chance. By the way, I understand we lost another firefighter who was a pilot on a slurry bomber at another fire; not this fire, but at another fire somewhere in the northwest as well.

So my words of honor this evening are for all 5 of those firefighters. But I am only knowledgeable on the incident of the 4 firefighters who lost their lives yesterday. I would like to mention their names. Tom Craven, Tom was 30 years old. He was from Ellensburg, Washington. Karen L. Fitzpatrick. Karen was 18 years old, of Yakima. Devon A Weaver. Devon was 21 years old of Yakima. Jessica L. Johnson. Jessica was 19, of Yakima.

Tom, Karen, Jessica and Devon 2 days ago were alive. Two days ago, when our country called upon them to respond to a fire, they did so without hesitation. Now, despite the young age and, in fact, this was one of the first fires, or not the first fire for one of those individuals, despite the age, they received training. And at some point, one has to fight their first fire. At some point, one has to pick up actual field experience.

Almost every firefighter we have had in the history of this country gets

through those first few fires. In fact, almost all of our firefighters are able to retire, or at least leave it without a fatality. But that was not meant to be the case for these 4 young people. We lost a lot of spirit. We lost a lot of youth. Two days ago, we did not have families in mourning, we had families who were excited that their children, in most cases, and I am sure in this case, were doing what they dreamed of doing for a long time, and that is going out and taking on fire, and going out and helping our country in a time of need. Going out and literally saving communities, saving animals, saving vegetation, saving our mountains. We have seen it. We have seen it throughout our country, what these people do. I saw it at Storm King Mountain in Glenwood Springs, Colorado, about 7 years ago.

So my comments tonight are intended to be in honor of these 4 firefighters. In fact, I expand that beyond those 4 firefighters to the fifth firefighter who I understand lost their life yesterday, to all firefighters across the Nation. To those firefighters who today cannot of course hear these words because they are camped out on the side of a mountain fighting a fire somewhere in Colorado or fighting a fire in Oregon or Washington or out there in California. These are gutsy people, and they carry out a mission that takes a lot of risk. They know the risk. They go into it with full knowledge. But I guess if one is a young spirit, one always goes into it thinking, I can overcome, I can get by it, but they did not get by it, and we should recognize them for the hero status that is properly bestowed upon them.

I can say to the families of these 4 deceased, our Nation, the United States of America, owes your family a great deal of gratitude, that we consider these lost firefighters heroes, the way the word "hero" should be used, not for some celebrity sports figure, but for a figure to me that is much more of a hero than any movie star or sports figure could ever be, and that is these 4 young people who gave their lives yesterday for the United States of America.

ENERGY CRISIS IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move on to my topic discussion. As usual, as my colleagues know, we have had preceding speakers here on the floor, and it was interesting when I listened to my good friend, the respected gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and the respected gentleman from California (Mr. DEFAZIO). Both, most of the time, seem to be fairly knowledgeable on the subjects that they address, but I have disagreements with the statements that they made this evening. I was surprised that the gentlemen from California, when they talked about the energy shortage that they have had in California, as has become typical with some of the people out of California, blame everybody else; blame everybody else.