

specific regulations. And in this case of No Child Left Behind, the U.S. Department of Education has developed a set of regulations based on an extreme interpretation of the legislation. There are many problems with the way No Child Left Behind regulations have evolved, but let us just take a look at two examples.

Acknowledging that quality teaching is critical to student performance, No Child Left Behind calls for teachers to meet competency and training standards for subjects they teach. This sounds reasonable, but any new Utah secondary teacher is required to have a bachelor's degree in the subject that he or she teaches. In rural schools, teachers often must teach multiple subjects.

□ 1515

In the case of foreign language teachers, many Utah teachers are former LDS missionaries with foreign language fluency. Even if these teachers have college minors in the language, they would still not be considered qualified to teach the subject. Special education teachers also teach a variety of subjects every day. Is it reasonable to require multiple college degrees? Clearly, greater flexibility is necessary to pursue teacher quality.

Now, the No Child Left Behind Act also recognized that teacher turnover is a problem, and it directs States to ensure that poor and minority children are not taught by inexperienced teachers at higher rates than other students. Again, this sounds reasonable, but the implementation has proven problematic.

In Utah, anyone with less than 3 years of teaching is considered an inexperienced teacher. The Jordan School District has a low percentage of inexperienced teachers across the whole district, and Midvale Elementary School in that district, they just recently aggressively recruited a dozen new teachers with foreign language skills to meet students' needs. But because they are all new teachers, it drives the school's percentage of inexperienced teachers above the district average, so the school is a failure under this requirement. Again, this just does not make sense.

As a Congressman, I often hear about the unintended consequences of legislation. As someone who supported the No Child Left Behind Act, I am gravely concerned that a lack of funding and an inappropriate set of regulations have brought on many unintended consequences that will harm Utah's schools.

The gap between legislative intent and real world implementation must be addressed. That is why I have cosponsored legislation to suspend No Child Left Behind requirements until Congress fulfills its funding commitments.

I have seen the great work that goes on every day in our schools. Our teachers, our principals, the PTA parents, teacher aides and school district staff work hard for our kids. None of them

would ever want to leave any child behind. They know that the best investment we can make is the investment in our children's education. Congress should do everything we can to help them succeed.

#### THE COST OF IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, 140 years or so ago, former President John Quincy Adams came to the House floor and read letters from his constituents about slavery and about the abolitionists because the House actually passed a rule in 1838 saying that Congress could not debate the issue of slavery on the House floor, believe it or not.

Today, we have not really been free; we have not had committee hearings; we have not had floor debate on a lot of the questions about what is happening in Iraq, getting answers from the President and from the administration about the reconstruction, the cost, how the money is being spent; all of that, and I have gotten letters from hundreds of constituents asking for answers to those questions.

But what we have seen, Mr. Speaker, is information from the Bush administration that obfuscates, that deceives, that simply does not tell us.

Deputy Defense Secretary Wolfowitz recently said, "No one that I know of would ever say that this war is cheap."

Well, that is not what the President's people were telling us before the invasion. Budget Director Mitch Daniels said Iraq, back then, before the attack, said Iraq would be "an affordable endeavor that will not require sustained aid."

Now, Jane from Sheffield Lake, Ohio, wrote to me, "We cannot let this enormous deception from the Bush administration continue."

Back several months ago, White House economist Glen Hubbard said the costs of any intervention would be very small.

Edward from Akron in my district wrote, "I believe we were duped by this administration through misleading statements and outright lies."

Larry Lindsey, the President's Chief Economic Adviser, estimated the war in Iraq would cost \$100 billion to \$200 billion, the war and the aftermath and the reconstruction. He was shunned by the administration after saying that. He was later fired because of that.

From Akron Ohio, Susan writes, "Please represent us in Summit County and get to the bottom of these untruths and these lies."

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the President's proposal to spend \$87 billion. That is just this year. That is in addition to the \$65 billion check that Congress and the American people have already written to the President for the

war in Iraq. This \$87 billion details how the President's request allocates \$157 per Iraqi, U.S. taxpayers pay \$157 per Iraqi, for sewage improvements, but in the President's budget there is only \$14 per American for sewage improvement in this country.

The administration, according to the President's request for this \$87 billion, is devoting \$38 per Iraqi for hospitals, but in this country, only \$3.30 per American citizen for hospitals.

The President is seeking almost \$6 billion to rebuild and expand Iraq's electricity generation and distribution system, as millions of Americans are regaining power lost from Hurricane Isabel and as Congress continues, frankly, not very well in this Congress, to deal with the fallout from the August blackout.

The President requests from the \$87 billion, 350 times more money for Iraqis individually; \$255 per Iraqi for electrical power rehabilitation, 71 cents per American for electrical power rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, Americans need some answers. How are we going to spend this money? Where has the \$1 billion a week gone now? We need accountability. We need, most importantly, for the President to assure us that our troops will be well-supplied, and that our troops will be safer than they have in the past.

In fact, I received a call just last night from a young man whom I know who was injured in Iraq from my district. He spent 70 days in the hospital. Because of this administration's policy, he owes \$550 back to Bethesda Hospital, back to the government, because the government has charged him, believe it or not, \$8.10 for every day's meal he has eaten in that hospital as an injured soldier in the United States of America, injured in the battlefield in Iraq. Yet, now the administration simply is not telling us how we are going to spend that money, not making the private contractors, many of them friends of the President who are getting literally hundreds of millions of dollars, not disclosing where that money is going, how they are spending it.

I would close, Mr. Speaker, Elizabeth from Akron writes, "The Bush administration's blatant disregard for the ability of the American people to sort through, to discuss and to reach reasonable conclusions on important issues is disturbing. What else aren't they telling us? What other lies are they trying to foist on us? Whether one supported the war or not, the question of the obvious and overwhelming deceptions the administration seems to regard as normal is disturbing."

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

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

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

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

#### THE CASE FOR LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise at the end of a week of activity here on Capitol Hill to do nothing less than to begin a process and an effort that I hope will be a part of the fabric of my career for however long I have the privilege of serving in the United States House of Representatives.

I rise very simply, Mr. Speaker, to make the case for life; to make the arguments, philosophical, intellectual, moral and historical, on this blue and gold carpet, on a regular basis, for the sanctity of human life.

My inspiration, oddly enough, Mr. Speaker, for this series, was just mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) in his remarks immediately preceding mine. It is almost uncanny to me to have heard it. For my inspiration in rising today on the House floor is none other than a former Member of this body who served as a Member of Congress from 1827 until his death in 1848.

Prior to being a Member of the House of Representatives, John Quincy Adams was President of the United States, and his father President before him. But, remarkably, after one term in Congress, John Quincy Adams felt compelled, Mr. Speaker, to be elected to Congress from the State of Massachusetts and to come to this place. And more than any other purpose, it is clear as one studies his speeches and pronouncements on this floor, that he was a man deeply committed to the abolition of slavery in America.

Just as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) reflected, it is reported that oftentimes on a weekly basis or more throughout the nearly 20 years that John Quincy Adams served as a Member of this Congress, in a Chamber, as you know, Mr. Speaker, just down the hall, the great, grand old man and former President would come, history records, and bring his papers with him and make the moral and the intellectual and the historical and even the Biblical case against slavery in America.

We are even told that some of his colleagues at the time during the course of those two decades actually tried to change the procedural rules of the House, because they thought it rather impolitic to have old Mr. Adams coming down and bringing up that difficult issue again. But he did it, and he did it

well, and he did it without apology. And as I rise today to begin what I hope for however many years I serve in Congress to be a series on the case for life, I am inspired and magnetized by John Quincy Adams.

Now, many may say that John Quincy Adams, who perished, we are told, in the midst of a session of Congress, fell over backwards in his Chair, was carried into a waiting room where he died the next day, some may say that his death in 1848, long before slavery would vanish from this continent, proved that he had failed in his endeavor.

But God works in mysterious ways, Mr. Speaker, and I cannot help but feel to this day that at some time from heaven John Quincy Adams smiled down when he realized that on the back row of the Congress in which he gave those lectures arrived in the year 1847 a tall, lanky man from the State of Illinois who served for one term in Congress, and Abraham Lincoln would later reflect that the speeches on the abolition of slavery that he heard from the great man John Quincy Adams deeply impacted his thinking and his life. And when Abraham Lincoln would then run for the Senate in Illinois and lose, and then be propelled on that same issue to the Presidency, he, no doubt, as is all of our posterity, was in debt to the rantings of that old man.

And here is hoping that my rantings may cast seeds, somewhere, Mr. Speaker, whether in this Chamber or through the means whereby people observe what we do here, that some might reflect on the principles that we share over the course of this series on the case for life and be inspired by it, because it matters.

Despite the fact that ever since Roe v. Wade became law in 1973 America has looked across the street to the U.S. Supreme Court to define this business of abortion, and despite the fact that, frankly, even in this Congress we pay scant attention to the issue, it, nevertheless, is a colossal issue about which our Nation must attend, for one reason and one reason only: 1.6 million abortions are performed in the United States each year. Ninety-one percent are performed during the first trimester, twelve or fewer weeks gestation. Nine percent are performed in the second trimester.

Approximately 1.5 million U.S. women with unwanted pregnancies choose abortion every year, and most are under the age of 25 years and unmarried. And as psychologists across America now reflect, post-abortion stress syndrome, which seems to viciously take hold of women at or around the age of menopause, where in many cases women are led into therapy because of a deep sense of remorse about decisions they made decades before, it is a decision that those 1.5 million women make not just for that day, but for many, Mr. Speaker, a decision that colors much of the rest of their life.

Approximately 6 million women in the United States become pregnant every year. About half of those pregnancies are unintended, and 1.5 million elect to terminate them with legal abortion.

□ 1530

Each year, more than 1 million U.S. teenagers become pregnant, and the teen pregnancy rate has moved in the last 30 years to truly startling statistics. Eighty percent of women having abortions are single, 60 percent are white, 35 percent are black, 82 percent of women having abortions are unmarried or separated, and almost half, this is almost incomprehensible to me, but statistics from Planned Parenthood's National Center for Health Statistics suggest that almost half of American women, 43 percent, will have an abortion sometime in their life. Yet, we rarely talk about it here. A procedure of deep physical and emotional and moral and perhaps even spiritual consequences reflected on through the millennia is scarcely talked about in the center of the most powerful government on Earth.

Today I would like to speak, if I may, about a few of the historical aspects of the case for life. Oftentimes, when I am standing before groups of young people, I will say, rather obliquely, that for roughly 3,000 years in Western Civilization, until 1973, it was the unanimous position of medical ethicists throughout Western Civilization that abortion was immoral and unethical. And I am always amazed at the startled look on children's faces. Because, of course, every student that I see in a classroom was born in the post Roe v. Wade America where abortion is a settled fact. It is a settled legal reality. But to begin with the realization that for 3 millennia through, if I can use the word, through the gestation of Western Civilization, there was, as Mother Teresa often reflected, that core principle that human life is sacred. Often rejected, even by nations and peoples in the midst of our civilization, nevertheless, the sanctity of human life rises out of the march of our civilization, almost like no other.

We all are familiar with the founding documents of this Nation that speak of certain unalienable rights endowed by our Creator, and among them are life. It is an astounding thing to consider. But what did our Founders think of when they thought of life? They were men who reflected on the ancients; they reflected on history. The Founders of this Nation, some of whom are remembered on the walls and carved in stone throughout this building, were truly learned men. So it is important when we think about a reference to the unalienable right to life, what did our Founders think about when they said life? What did they think of as human life? In the context of our common law and in the context of the history of the ancients or the Middle Ages, or even the early church fathers who so deeply