Left Behind, she actually considered quitting because of the paperwork and restrictions imposed upon her. She struggled to have time to give individual attention to each of her ''special needs'' students.

Ironically, she obtained her teaching position due to her performance the year prior as a permanent substitute teacher in a classroom. Because she was not required to fill out all the forms and paperwork required by No Child Left Behind, she excelled and the school offered her a permanent position.

In its origin, No Child Left Behind attempted to provide greater school choice and reduce Washington's involvement in education. But instead this expensive and largely unsuccessful legislation has broadened the scope of the Federal Government's role in education. Enshrined in our Constitution is the 10th amendment, which reads, ''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved for the States respectively, or to the people.'' Federal control of education is listed nowhere in the Constitution. And in accordance with the 10th amendment, education should be the responsibility of State and local governments.

Because I believe each child's educational path should be determined by a child's parents and not by the Federal Government, I am an original cosponsor of the A-Plus Act. The A-Plus Act would give States, teachers and parents the freedom and authority to determine what educational path a student should take.

As part of this legislation, States can opt out of Federal programs, and State leaders can decide how to use Federal education funds to improve student achievement.

We all are seeking the best possible educational opportunities for our children, and the way to achieve this is to let States and local communities be accountable for academic achievement and educational reforms.

With that, I yield back, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2000

IN HONOR OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. JOSEPH'S CHURCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALL of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues a small story from a small corner of America called Rowena, Texas.

The 20th century began with a tremendous movement of people to west Texas in search of good land, opportunity and prosperity. Among these intrepid travelers were many Czech and German Americans whose forefathers had come to Texas to farm, ply trades and create better lives. Their descendants found these lives in Rowena.

In 1906, four Rowena Catholics, William Glass, Mike Feist, Frank Schwertner and John Jansa, sought to erect a church to serve their community and better practice their faith. After a year of toil, the church opened and celebrated its first mass, a wedding, on November 20, 1907. The church was aptly dedicated to St. Joseph, the patron of immigrants, families and working people.

St. Joseph's grew rapidly during its early years, reflecting its growing significance in the community. In 1916, the church opened St. Joseph's School, with the Sisters of the Divine Providence serving as teachers. And in 1924, a new church in the gothic style was dedicated, and the annual fall festival was begun to support the church. To this day, the gothic church still stands, and the fall festival is still celebrated each year.

Soon the church began to host community-service organizations and social clubs as well. The Knights of Columbus, St. Ann's Altar Society, Catholic Daughters of America, the KJT, KJZT and the Immaculate Conception Society would all call the church home through the coming decades.

The Great Depression and World War II would see an especially important role for St. Joseph's and its parish organizations to play as they led their rural community through troubling times.

As the church aged in the 1950s and in the 1960s, it prospered. It marked its 50th anniversary in 1957, and a new community space was constructed in 1961. And all the while, the high school continued to educate and graduate the youth of Rowena.

Unfortunately, as with all institutions, the church inevitably faced a period of decline. As the small town of Rowena began to lose population, difficult times ensued for the church. The parish school finally closed in the late 1970s, and church membership shrunk.

Shaken by these developments, the parish renewed its commitment to the sacraments, its members and its community. They reestablished religious instruction, revitalized their parish organizations, and moved into the modern age. Today, St. Joseph's is fittingly led by another immigrant, Father Bhaskar Morugudi from India.

2007 marks St. Joseph's centennial celebration. The belief of four men led to the creation of the parish, but it took the faith of a community to sustain it. Throughout the last 100 years, St. Joseph's has been the rock for the people of Rowena. It has educated their children, guided them through trouble and saved their souls.

As the parishioners of St. Joseph's look to the future, I urge them to remember the rich history that lies in their past. The legacy of their founders created in Rowena through service, education and salvation is inspiring. The church is woven into the threads of Rowena itself and highlights the history of America herself, and I feel privileged to share this story with you all.

No matter who we are or where we're from, we can all find common ground in the story of St. Joseph's parish. It is a story of individuals seeking and creating a better life for themselves and their descendants, and of a people of deep devotion seeking to practice their beliefs and enrich their community. We should all strive to be so noble in our ambitions and generous in our spirits.

Today I celebrate and honor the parishioners of St. Joseph's in Rowena, Texas as they reflect on the past and embark on another 100 years of ministry and service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the war in Iraq, since its beginning, has gone against every traditional conservative position I've ever known, especially fiscal conservatism. There is nothing conservative about the war in Iraq. So it should have been no surprise when William F. Buckley, often called the ''Godfather of Conservatism,'' wrote in 2004 that if he had known in 2002 what he knew then by 2004, he would have been against the war. But listen to what he wrote in June of 2005, 2 years ago.

William F. Buckley. ''A respect for the power of the United States is engendered by our success in engagements in which we take part. A point is reached when tenacity conveys not steadfastness of purpose, but misapplication of pride. It can't reasonably be disputed that if in the year ahead the situation in Iraq continues about as it has done in the past year, we will have suffered more than another 500 soldiers killed. Where there had been skepticism about our venture, there will be contempt.''

That was William F. Buckley in 2005. And his main point was, quote, ''A point is reached when tenacity conveys not steadfastness of purpose, but misapplication of pride.'' Unfortunately, we are losing our young soldiers at a much faster rate than the 500 a year that Mr. Buckley said would move the American people from skepticism to contempt; 103 U.S. soldiers killed in April alone, at least 71 more killed through May 21, including 15 this past weekend, and someone told me 8 more today.

Saddam Hussein was an evil man, but he had a total military budget only a

little over two-tenths of 1 percent of ours, most of which he spent protecting himself and his family and building castles. He was no threat to us whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, we all respect, admire and appreciate those who serve in our Nation's Armed Forces. As I said a few days ago on this floor, serving in our military is certainly the most honorable ways anyone can serve our country. I believe national defense is one of the very few legitimate functions of our national government, and certainly one of the most important. However, we need to recognize that our military has become the most gigantic bureaucracy in the history of the world, and like any huge bureaucracy, it does many good things, of course, always at huge expense to the taxpayer. And like any huge bureaucracy, our military does many things that are wasteful or inefficient. And like any huge bureaucracy, it tries to gloss over or cover up its mistakes. And like any huge bureaucracy, it always wants to expand its mission and get more and more money.

Counting our regular appropriations bills, plus the supplemental appropriations, we will spend more than $750 billion on our military in the next fiscal year. This is more than all the other nations of the world combined spend on their defense.

The GAO tells us that we presently have $50 trillion in unfunded future pension liabilities, on top of our national debt of almost $9 trillion. If we are going to have any hope of paying our military pensions and Social Security and other promises to our own people, we cannot keep giving so much to the Pentagon. No matter how much we respect our military, and no matter how much we want to show our patriotism, we need to realize there is waste in all huge bureaucracies, even in the Defense Department.

There is a reason why we have always believed in civilian leadership of our Defense Department. The admirals and generals will always say things are going great because it is almost like saying they're doing a bad job if they say things are not doing well. And the military people know they can keep getting big increases in funding if they are involved all over the world. However, it is both unconstitutional and unaffordable, and, I might add, unconservative, for us to be the policemen of the world and carry on civilian government functions in and for other countries.

National defense is necessary and vital. International defense by the U.S. is unnecessary and harmful in many ways. Now we are engaged in a war in Iraq that is very unpopular with a big majority of the American people. More importantly, every poll of Iraqis themselves shows that 78 to 80 percent of them want us to leave, except in the Kurdish areas. They want our money, but they do not want us occupying Iraq. Surely we are not adopting a foreign policy that forces us on other people, one that says we are going to run Iraq even if the people there want us to leave.

The majority of the Iraqi Parliament has now signed a petition asking us to leave. It is sure not traditional conservatism to carry on a war in a country that did not attack us, did not even threaten to attack us, and was not even capable of attacking us. And it is sure not traditional conservatism to believe in world government, even if run by the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush, when he ran for office in 2000, campaigned strongly against nation building. Unfortunately, that is exactly what we have been doing in Iraq. The President, in 2000, said what we needed was a more humble foreign policy. That is what we needed then, and it is what we need now.

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

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

U.S. SHOULD NOT SELL ARMS TO PAKISTAN

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to discuss a contract recently awarded by the U.S. Government to Lockheed Martin for 18 Sniper Advanced Targeting Pods, or ATPs, to be sold to the Government of Pakistan. Sniper ATPs allow aircrews to perform intelligence, targeting, surveillance and reconnaissance missions from extended standoff ranges.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is irresponsible for the U.S. Government to sell high-grade weapons technology to Pakistan, a nation that has turned a blind eye to the increasingly dangerous Taliban insurgency in the western region of its country.

Numerous press accounts in recent months have discussed the growing presence of Taliban training camps and bases in the tribal regions of western Pakistan that border Afghanistan. Just last week, in the port city of Karachi, over 40 people were killed, with even more injured during 2 days of gun battles and mayhem in response to an antigovernment rally. Most reports claim that this violence against protesters was perpetrated by the Muttahida Quami Movement, or MQM, which is an ethnically based Mafia allied with Pakistani President Musharraf.

In a country that claims to be somewhat democratic, the actions of the MQM and President Musharraf seem to be just the opposite. Coupled with the Pakistani President's refusal to put forth a good-faith effort to root out Taliban insurgents in his country, it hardly seems like a good idea for the United States to be selling arms to the Government of Pakistan.

Earlier this year, Democrats passed H.R. 1, which implemented the recommendations of the bipartisan 9/11 Commission. Included in this bill was language that would end U.S. military assistance and arms sales licensing to Pakistan in the 2008 fiscal year unless Pakistani President Musharraf certifies that the Islamabad government is ''making all possible efforts to end Taliban activities on Pakistani soil.''

I believe that the U.S. should live up to this commitment by ceasing the sale of arms to the Government of Pakistan. I fear that if we do, in fact, provide these weapons technologies to countries in unstable regions, such as Pakistan, they could be used against U.S. allies, such as India.

This U.S. policy of military sales to Pakistan will contribute to increasing security concerns throughout South Asia. The U.S. has no way of knowing if these technologies will be used against al Qaeda and the Taliban, and not against India or other peaceful nations. In fact, the government has simply watched while terrorist groups like Lashkar-e-Tayyaba, or LET, committed terrorist acts in Jammu and Kashmir and other parts of India. The actions within its own country prove themselves not fit for, in this case Pakistan, for receiving these weapons.

Mr. Speaker, although Pakistan has claimed to be an ally in the global war on terror, it clearly has not taken the necessary steps to end terrorism in its own backyard. I strongly believe that economic assistance is necessary to support economic restructuring that will stop Pakistan from becoming a breeding ground for terrorists.

At the time after 9/11, when we decided that we would allow economic assistance to Pakistan and development assistance, I was all for it because I think it makes sense; that's the way to lead to a democratic and stable Pakistan. But military assistance is another matter. Allowing this sale sends the wrong message, I think, particularly in the climate that we live in here today, and what Pakistan has been doing in not living up to its part of the deal in fighting the Taliban.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 51312(b), and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy:

Mrs. MCCARTHY, New York
Mr. KING, New York