

"Chris has spearheaded many projects in the last year," she said. "Under her guidance, we are redesigning the journalism curriculum. The way that scholarships are awarded has been changed and Journalism Week, which faded away in the last five years, was revived."

In addition to noting Martin's work in creating the Vietnam war correspondent women's panel, Rubinkowski ultimately felt that Martin was chosen as dean of the journalism school because of the respectable and likeable persona that she reflects.

"People like and respect her because she's a good journalist and leader."

After coming to WVU in 1990 as an associate professor, Martin directed the school's writing program, chaired the news editorial sequence and coordinated its honors program.

Before coming to WVU, she taught writing, literature and journalism at Washington and Jefferson College in Washington, Pa. Martin also worked as a reporter, education writer and news editor for the Pittsburgh Tribune Review and the Uniontown Herald-Standard.

Martin is also a 1999 Freedom Forum Teacher of the Year, a 1998 Carnegie Foundation Professor of the Year (the only one in West Virginia), a 1997-98 WVU Foundation Outstanding Teacher and the 1996-97 Journalism Teacher of the Year.

Martin also began a program that brings together WVU and state newsrooms called, "Bridging the Gap: A Personnel and Resource Exchange." In addition to her work with WVU, she conducts writing workshops for newspapers across the state.

Martin also co-directs the reporting and writing fellowship program for college graduates at the Poynter Institute in St. Petersburg, Fla. every summer.

Martin earned her undergraduate degree in English from California University (Pa.). She also holds a master's degree from the University of Maryland, where she is currently completing a Ph.D. in American studies.

Martin currently is in Vietnam, pursuing her interests in female war correspondents who covered the Vietnam War. She was unavailable for comment.

□ 2000

EDUCATION

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Washington, I was determined to make education our Nation's number one priority. That commitment has not changed.

What has changed is my understanding of what it takes so that our children are ready to learn when they enter the classroom. We can have the best schools and the best teachers in the world; but if our children do not enter the classroom ready to succeed, those schools and those teachers and those students will fail.

Let us face it, if today's children are lucky enough to have two parents living with them, chances are both parents work outside the home, they work long hours, they commute long distances, and it is our children who are being left behind.

It is certainly not their parents' fault. They are working and commuting long hours to support their

families. But it is our children who are paying the price because their parents need to earn a living. That is not right. Parents should not have to choose between financial stability and their children's emotional stability. We need to help parents bridge the gap between work and family so their children are ready to learn when they enter the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, we know that learning does not start on the first day of kindergarten. Children are growing and changing from the very day they are born. Study after study has shown that the first 3 years are critical to a child's development. Provisions need to be made for families so that they can be together at these critical times so parents can be with new babies and newly adopted children.

Paid family leave is a key tool we can use to make sure that children get off to a positive start and that their parents can be with them at these critical times. And by providing parents with voluntary universal prekindergarten programs, we will give them the chance to get their children on the right track. Programs like Head Start and Early Head Start show us that pre-K programs work. All parents should have the option of enrolling their children in a structured, quality, voluntary pre-K program.

With parents working hard, children are spending more and more time in child care. Ensuring that quality child care is available to all children will go a long way to making sure that our children are ready to learn when they go to school.

We need more good child care, including care for children under the age of 3 and for night and weekend workers. But it is not just young children who are coming to school unprepared. Older children face challenges also.

Title XI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which I wrote and saw signed into law in my first term, needs to be expanded. It needs to be expanded to allow schools to use more Federal funds for in-school support services for students and for their families.

Services such as after-school programs, mentoring programs, tutoring and counseling help young people address their angers and their frustrations and their fears before they have tragic consequences, and these programs ensure that young people are ready to learn when they enter the classroom.

Also, Mr. Speaker, students cannot learn when they are hungry. It is proven that those students who eat breakfast do better on tests, they are more well-behaved in school, and they miss less time from school than those who do not eat breakfast. We need to make sure every child starts the day off with a good meal.

My pilot Federal breakfast program, which is underway in five school districts across the Nation, is the first step toward a universal school breakfast program.

We must also make quality education accessible to all of our children. That means building new, modern schools that are welcoming to those with disabilities as well as to those without. That means making sure that no one is left behind.

In the high-tech global economy, however, those without a high-tech education, those without high-tech skills will be left behind. That is why we must make sure that minorities and women are encouraged to study math, science, technology, and engineering. Females make up slightly more than 50 percent of this country's population, but less than 30 percent of America's scientists are women.

My "Go Girl" bill will create a bold new workforce of energized young women in science, math and technology careers.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EDUCATION IS KEY TO OPPORTUNITY, EQUALITY, AND SUCCESS

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. Mr. Speaker, I could not help but listen to the Members who have preceded me in discussing what I think is a universal issue, and that is to help our children in this Nation learn.

Education is the key to opportunity, the key to equality, the key to success. Unfortunately, we have failed in creating opportunities for excellence.

It is difficult for a country as powerful as America and Members of the United States Congress to be able to come to the floor of the House and admit, in some part, failure. That is why it is so very important for us to emphasize what needs to be done and to also emphasize that all cannot be done at the local level.

Education is national. It should be a national priority. And so, Mr. Speaker, I think it is vital that, before we leave this session, we focus on issues such as reducing class size so that our children can get individual tutoring and teaching and nurturing so that education is fun and education for them is a positive experience.

To do that, we must admit that our schools in America are crumbling and local jurisdictions cannot build all of the schools that are needed. Every one of us have schools in our community that have portable buildings, limited

heat, limited air conditioning. They were only supposed to be there on a temporary basis. Yet first-graders and kindergartners and second-graders are all in these portable buildings maybe high school students and middle school students. And for some, in inclement weather, those individuals have to leave those portables to go to the restroom facilities, gym facilities.

What kind of life is that for our children?

We need increased teacher salaries. We need to respect teachers for the learning and the knowledge that they bring to the classroom. And, yes, we need the training of more math and science teachers.

I have seen the actual results of that. The ranking member on the Committee on Immigration Claims, we supported H-1B non-immigrant visas to help in our high-technology industry. But, Mr. Speaker, the real issue is are we preparing Americans for those jobs, are we training incumbent workers, are we training college students? There has to be a greater opportunity and there must be a greater access and opportunity for education.

I visited with some of my elementary school students this past week from Henderson Elementary School, hard-working students. But yet, Mr. Speaker, they had maybe three computers to a classroom, maybe not that many. I asked the 10-year-old and 9-year-old how often they got to the computer, and they said maybe once or twice or three times a week. Even if there is slightly more than that, that is not enough to prepare a technologically educated society.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we do more for education.

Let me just simply close on another and different note, but I think it is extremely important to clarify something very close to my heart as a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, a cosponsor of the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999 and 2000. There seems to be a lot of debate about this, Mr. Speaker. But let me clarify the record.

Coming from Texas, all of the world's eyes were on Jasper, Texas, in 1998 when the heinous act of James Byrd, Jr. was discovered, the dismemberment of a man because of his color. Out of that terrible tragedy, legislators such as Representatives Senfronia Thompson of Texas, Senator Rodney Ellis of Texas, Joe Deshotel, a cosponsor, and many others put forward the Hate Crimes Act of Texas in order to ensure that this terrible act would be an illegal act not only in Texas but to show the world what Texas was made of.

That act was dealing with race, ethnicity, gender, disability, religion or sexual orientation. It was inclusive. It was constitutionally secure. It would pass constitutional muster, unlike the legislation of 1991, which was simply a Hate Crimes Reporting Act that I believe the Governor of the State of Texas was referring to in all of his debates.

We do not have a real hate crimes legislation or bill in the State of Texas. And when the family of James Byrd, Jr. went to the Governor's office and begged for his support for that very strong legislative initiative, he did not give it. Plain and simple, the signals went out to the Senate that it was not a legislative initiative that the Governor's office was supporting.

It passed the House, with Speaker Laney, the Democratic speaker in the House of Representatives in the State of Texas. But in a Republican Senate in the State of Texas, it could not pass.

The Governor of my State, Governor Bush, did not help it pass and did not support its passage. And now we do not have, in light of the heinous act, murderous act against James Byrd, Jr., not even as a tribute to him could we pass a real hate crimes bill in the State of Texas.

I hope this Congress will take up the challenge and stop the opposing of a real hate crimes legislation that could be passed in this session and do what is right. We could not do what was right for Texas. Let us do what is right for all of America and make it a Federal law, and let us not stand in the way of acknowledging that that country abhors hateful acts because they are simply different. As the Voters' Rights Act was passed and the Civil Rights Act was passed, we can pass a real civil rights bill, the Hate Crimes Prevention Act, and tell America and the world that we stand not for hate but for inclusion and empowerment.

SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss Social Security. It is going to be almost like a professor lecturing a class. So everybody that is interested in Social Security should listen up. Those that are not interested in Social Security should be because it is America's biggest program, probably the United States Government's most important program.

When I came to Congress in 1993, I left the Michigan Senate as chairman of the Taxation Committee. At that time, we were looking at the consequences of low investment and savings. I discovered that, in the United States, we have the lowest savings of any industrialized country in the world. And then I started looking at Social Security and the problems that Social Security was having in terms of the demographics in terms of financing the current promises in future years.

When I came to Congress, what I did in 1993, I introduced my first Social Security bill. And then 2 years later, in 1995, 1997, and 1999, I introduced subse-

quent Social Security bills, all scored by the Social Security Administration to keep Social Security solvent for the next 75 years.

I have been serving as chairman of the Bipartisan Task Force on Social Security in the Committee on the Budget. With testimony we received, we came up with 18 unanimous recommendations of what should be in a Social Security bill. I incorporated those and introduced a bipartisan bill that is now before the House.

I would suggest to everybody, current retirees, near retirees and young workers and young people in general to start looking at Social Security because it has the potential of developing a generational warfare if we continue to make promises of increased Social Security benefits and then we simply satisfy that challenge by increasing taxes on future generations.

Let me just say that if we do nothing, if we add no more benefits to Social Security or Medicare or Medicaid but continue under the existing programs to keep those programs solvent, we will have to have a payroll tax to keep Social Security and Medicaid and Medicare solvent that will take 47 percent of our wages.

□ 2015

Right now the FICA tax is 15 percent of wages.

The Social Security Benefit Guarantee Act. When Franklin Delano Roosevelt created the Social Security program over 6 decades ago, he wanted it to feature a private sector component to build retirement income. Social Security was supposed to be one leg of a three-legged stool to support retirees. It was supposed to go hand in hand with personal savings and private pension plans, and it is interesting, searching in the archives for some of the testimony back in 1935 when we started Social Security, to see that the Senate on two different occasions voted that it should allow private investment savings as an alternative to the government doing it; but when the House and the Senate went to conference, the decision was made that year to simply have it a totally government program, and that is what it is, a pay-as-you-go program where existing workers pay in their taxes to support existing retirees.

The demographics, the problem of demographics, fewer workers and more retirees, which we will get into in a moment. The system is really stretched to its limits. Seventy-eight million baby boomers begin retiring in 2008. These are the high-income people in general. That means they go out of the paying-in mode, paying in their taxes, directly related to their higher incomes, and start taking out benefits again directly related to what their incomes have been. That is when the problem starts. Social Security spending exceeds tax revenues starting in 2015. We increased the Social Security taxes substantially in 1983 so currently, temporarily, there are huge