

go into defense expenditures if we do not say that we ought to have some for education.

Education is the key to our future's defense. Our national security is all bound up in the educated populace we produce. Education is the key to Social Security. How? Because we want a populace that is working. We want young people who are working, and they must be able to qualify for the high-tech jobs being created every day more and more.

And if we do not have workers, young people who can qualify for those jobs, they will not come out and take the jobs. What we will do is contract with overseas corporations. We will send the work overseas and companies will do the work overseas who do not pay into the Social Security System. The best way to rob the Social Security System is to deny the work force the opportunity to earn the money and pay into the Social Security fund.

There are some other ways we can save Social Security, too, but the present time-honored way we fund Social Security is through the wages of working people. If we have fewer people working, and they have already projected that, we cannot avoid the demographics, we are going to have fewer people working. But how few? Can we avoid wiping out the whole work force because they cannot qualify for high-tech jobs? So many will not be able to qualify for high-tech jobs. We have a real dilemma here.

The kind of greatness and the kind of vision and courage being shown in Kosovo by our national leaders now we need to apply in the sector of education, looking down the road. If we do not do it, we will have a great deficit in major areas. This great indispensable Nation is going to stumble and fall if we do not have as many people educated as possible. Every person that can be educated must be educated.

It is likely that our posterity will pity us. They may even spit on us in the future as they evaluate and analyze our great lack of vision at this critical moment when we have maximum opportunity to go forward in the revision of our education system. We are in danger of becoming the victim of midget minds and tiny spirits. Too much of the planning at the Department of Education is being undertaken by midget minds and tiny spirits.

Too many tiny spirits are guiding our caucuses, both the Republican and the Democratic Caucus. We are not willing to take hold of where we are in modern America and deal with education the way we dealt with the GI bill after World War II. We understood the implications of the need for a more educated population and we had a massive education program in the GI bill.

A Congressman named Morrill, many years ago in the 1800s, around the time of the Civil War, had the vision to see

that every State in America needed a land grant university. We dealt with it. A big mind and a big spirit seized the problem.

Thomas Jefferson, who created the first State university, the University of Virginia, had a vision. The model he established inspired Morrill to go on to create land grant colleges and universities all across the country.

The vision of a transcontinental railroad, the Federal Government financed the transcontinental railroad. We had the people in Congress who had the vision to take hold and to do things in a big way.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BUD SHUSTER) is my hero here in Congress. He is a Republican, but he had the vision to take hold of the highway problem, the transportation infrastructure problem, and with a lot of criticism. He was called a big spender, and still called a big spender, but he had the initiative and he used the available power that he had to pass a highway transportation infrastructure bill that is meaningful. We need it. We need it far more than we need some of the weapon systems that are being proposed. We need it far more than we need some of the other wasteful expenditures taking place presently.

We are in danger of becoming, as I said before, the victims of midget minds and tiny spirits. We seem to possess the cerebral alertness, the statistical understanding that a crisis looms ahead if we do not meet the education emergency at the moment. We understand the trends, the projections, the inevitability of continued inadequacy in our school systems. We comprehend with our heads, but we seem incapable of engaging with our backbones and moving forward with our decision-making feet. In the education arena we need giant minds and great spirits. We need to end the overwhelming neglect of education.

In the minds of our citizens, the concerns related to national defense do not compete with the overwhelming mandate to improve our schools. Nothing in the minds of our citizens, the American electorate, the people who have common sense out there, nothing in their minds competes with education. It is number one. "It is education, stupid." It is education.

Look at the polls, but do not look at the polls and let your eyes blink. Here in Washington, in the Congress, Democrats and Republicans, we need to act on appropriating and vesting real dollars in an education system which will take us into a cyber civilization in the future where everybody needs to be educated.

The dollars that we are willing to appropriate in response to the American people's stated concern about education are minuscule. We are throwing pennies at a problem which requires

billions of dollars. We must change our minds.

If the American people are listening, they might help open the eyes and the ears of their own Congressman or Congresswoman. Have them make a survey. Even in the richest districts there are often schools that need help.

I challenge every Member of Congress to make a survey and select a few schools in their districts and go take a look at what they need. There are some places where they need money for wiring for the Internet; there are other places where they need money to fix the roof; there are some places where they need money to tear down old buildings and construct new schools. All over New York City we have schools that need money to put in a new furnace and get rid of the pollution and the asthma-generating coal-burning furnaces.

We need to address these issues in our Education Task Force and the Democratic Caucus, as well as the Committee on Education and the Workforce. Members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce were on the floor before, and I want to applaud what they had to say. They understand the problem, but I do not think that the solutions that are being proposed have yet come to grips with the magnitude of the need.

We need to spend many billions on school construction. School construction is just at the center of the problem, but that is a place to start. If we do not meet the need for adequate buildings, safe buildings, across America, the Congressional Budget Office says we need about \$147 billion to just stay even, if we do not meet that need or begin to step forward to move toward meeting that need, then everything else we propose to do in Washington at any level is fraudulent, everything else we propose to do about education.

We are feeding the people a spin on the problem without coming to grips with the reality and the substance. We must go forward and invest in education in order to prepare our education system to take us forward into a new cyber civilization.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF
MEMBER OF HON. DAN MILLER,
MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Laura Griffin, staff member of the Honorable DAN MILLER, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 8, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House that I received a subpoena for

documents and testimony issued by the Circuit Court of the Twelfth Judicial Circuit of Florida In and For Manatee County, Florida.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined to comply with the subpoena to the extent that it is consistent with Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

Laura Griffin,
Case Manager.

ILLEGAL NARCOTICS

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House at this hour to discuss primarily the issue of illegal narcotics and its effects on our young people and our country, but I could not help but hear some of the words of my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), who just spoke here and talked about education.

I want to say to my colleagues and to the American people that I too support education. I support anything this Congress can do, anything our Nation can do to enhance educational opportunities for each and every American. However, I do have some differences with the previous speaker.

The previous speaker represents 40 years of trying to get more education power, more education decisions, more education regulation in Washington, D.C.

□ 1815

And I think I represent a new wave of thinking that has come here in the last few years that education decisions, education of our children, and decisions about education policy are best decided at the local level with parents, with local school boards, and through local initiatives.

Then I think we also heard the argument that we are spending money on military defense and others, and this money could be converted into education. I might remind my colleagues in the House that the number one reason that we came together as a Nation to allow us to live a free life in a free society is in fact the principal reason for the formation of the United States, and that is the question of national security.

Without national security, without the ability to defend ourselves, without the ability to have a defense of this Nation, all other things are impossible. And under the Constitution, if we care to look at that document, that is our prime responsibility and all things flow from that level.

So we cannot discard our military, particularly with an administration and folks what want to send our troops to every corner of the Earth and every conflict, at great expense, stretching our limited Federal dollars, and also

spend additional funds or take away funds from education. So we cannot have both, but we try to do our best in meeting our Federal obligation.

I might say, and I did not really want to get into this too much tonight, but I just had the opportunity to meet with a couple from Florida, and they were here and heard some of the debate about education in the Congress, and one of these individuals, the wife, was a teacher and she was delighted to hear the philosophy of the new majority relating to education, that the power and the ability to teach and the funds go to the classroom, to the teacher and the student, not to the education bureaucracy in Washington, Atlanta, and is forced at different layers of the education bureaucracy even within the State and in particular in my State of Florida.

Our discussion was quite interesting because we did not identify the problems the way the previous speaker did; we identified the problems I think the way parents do, the way teachers do and local citizens who examine education. And we do not need a Harvard Education Ph.D. to look at American education today and see that teachers are not allowed to teach.

We asked the simple question in our conversation a few minutes ago off the floor with this couple from Florida, "How can you teach, how can you have order in a classroom when you cannot have discipline in a classroom?" And the same well-intended liberal policies from the other side of the aisle have amassed laws and regulations, which, combined with liberal judicial decisions, have handcuffed our teachers so that it is almost impossible to have discipline in the classroom through this maze of Federal regulations, mandates, and court orders. So we have said we want the teacher to have the ability to teach in the classroom.

Now, we also have a unique approach to education because we do not think that the money needs to be in Washington and again the power and the regulations all coming from Washington, but we think that those resources, that those abilities, should be at the local level with the teacher, with the parent, with the local school board, again reversing this trend where everything has come to Washington at a very heavy expense.

Now, let us also for a minute, before I get into this drug discussion, talk about funding of education. My friends and my colleagues, the Federal Government only provides between 4 and 5 cents of every dollar on education, 4 and 5 cents. Now, of course we can provide more. The problem is we provide about 90 percent of the Federal regulations in education. So we provide very little money, but all of the constraints and mandates and regulations that cause teachers instead of teaching, not allowing them to teach, to be filling

out papers, to be complying with Federal regulations, and to report to a maze of bureaucracy that now starts at the local level, goes to the State level, goes to the regional level, and ends up at the Federal level.

I was chairman during the past 4 years of the Subcommittee on Civil Service. One thing I learned as chairman of that Subcommittee on Civil Service is where the bodies in the Federal bureaucracy are buried. The first 5,000, if my colleagues ever care to go down to the Department of Education, now imagine, there are 3,000 of 5,000 Federal education employees in the Department of Education here in Washington D.C., or in the close environs, 3,000 people.

Now, we also got into the discussion of changes in education. And we have, as a new majority in the Congress, tried to shift again this responsibility from Washington, the authority, the regulation, and do away with some of the bureaucracy. We started out with some 760 to 780 Federal education programs, all well-intended, but each with its own administrative level, 760 to 780 of those. We have got it pared down to 700.

Quite frankly, we have only begun the paring process. But every one of these programs has turned into lobbying organizations, into special interest activities; and they justify their existence by lobbying the Congress, by telling what a good job they have done. And what, in fact, we have again are 3,000 bureaucrats in Washington D.C., most of them making between \$70,000 and \$100,000 if we look at the pay schedules.

Now, I am not saying that we should abolish the Department of Education, but I think we could do it with 10 to 20 percent of the personnel that we have just by consolidating the programs.

In fact, there are proposals and there will be proposals before this Congress very shortly to go to a Super EdFlex, where we take the amount of money, we divide it by the student population and other criteria and we send it to the States. This Congress, under this new Republican majority, has tried to reverse the trend in that 80 to 90 percent of the Federal dollars do not get into the classroom, do not get to the teacher. Now, is that what people want with their Federal money, that 80 to 90 percent of this Federal money does not get to the classroom, to the teacher?

Again, we have to allow the teacher to teach and discipline in the classroom, authority, the responsibility, the ability to teach in the classroom. We have to give that first. And secondly, we have to give the Federal money to the student and to the teacher, a unique approach, not to the 700-plus Federal programs, not to the 700-plus administrators.

If we have only three administrators for each program at the Federal level,