Our nation must make amends for the ter-rible damage that has been done to the Native Hawaiian people since the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy by military force in 1893. From 1826 until 1893, the United States had recognized the Kingdom of Hawaii as a sov-ereign, independent nation and accorded her full and complete diplomatic recognition. Trea-
ties and trade agreements had been entered into between these two nations. In 1893, a pow-erful group of American businessmen engi-neeered the overthrow with the use of U.S. naval forces.

Queen Liliuokalani was imprisoned and over 1.8 million acres of lands belonging to the crown, referred to as crown lands or ceded lands, were confiscated without compensation or due process.

A Presidential commission, led by Con-
gressman James Blount declared that the takeover was an illegal act by the U.S. gov-
ernment. The 556-page petition dated 1897– 1898 protesting the annexation of Hawaii by the United States was signed by more than 17,000 people. Historians advise that this number constitutes a quorum of the native people of Hawaii. A petition was signed by 21,259 Native Hawaiian people; a second pet-
ition was signed by more than 17,000 people. I say that the takeover was illegal because there was no treaty of annexation. The petition was signed by 21,259 Native Hawaiian people; a second petition was signed by more than 17,000 people. Historians advise that this number constitutes nearly 100 percent of the native population at the time. Their voice was totally ignored.

Since the overthrow of the Kingdom and up until the present, Native Hawaiians have suf-
fered from high rates of poverty, poor health status, low income, low educational attain-
ment, and high rates of alcohol and drug abuse and incarcer-
atation. By 1919, the Native Hawaiian popu-
lation had declined from an estimated 1,000,000 in 1778 to 22,600. In recognition of this severe decline and the desperate situation of the native people of Hawaii, Congress en-
cacted the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, which returned 200,000 acres of land con-
fiscated by the federal government (out of the total of 1.8 million acres stolen) to the Native Hawaiian people as an act of contrition.

Unfortunately, the lands that were returned were in 20 percent of the number of young people who are fluent in the Native Hawaiian Language. Now taught through a number of immersion programs, beginning in kindergarten and con-
 tinuing through high school. The University of Hawaii at Hilo now has a program for a Mas-
ters’ degree in Native Hawaiian Language and Literature—the first program in the United States focusing on a Native American Lan-
guage.

It is important to note that Congress does not extend services to Native Hawaiians be-
cause of their race, but because of their unique status as the indigenous people of a once-sovereign nation with whom the United States has a trust relationship. The political status of Native Hawaiians is comparable to that of American Indians and Alaskan Natives.

Justice requires that the United States fulfill its trust obligations to Native Hawaiians who lost everything at the time of their annexation. The $28 million authorized for Native Hawaiian education programs in the bill can’t begin to make up for the loss of a nation. I call upon my colleagues to support the re-
authorization of the Native Hawaiian Education Act and justice for the Native Hawaiian peo-
ple.

**PRESIDENT BUSH’S EDUCATION PLAN**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-
tleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, as the only Member of Congress from Florida in the Education and the Workforce, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of President Bush’s No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this important education re-
form legislation. This legislation will do three key things. First, we will in-
vest an additional $5 billion in reading over the next 5 years for children in grades K through 2. This is critical since right now 70 percent of the fourth graders in our inner-city schools can-
not read at basic levels.

Second, we will require the States to conduct annual tests in grades 3 through 8 in reading and mathematics. This is critical to ensure that none of our children somehow fall through the cracks. How many times have we turned on the television only to see a college athlete explain that he is not able to read even though he somehow graduated from high school?

We are going to put a stop to that right here, right now in this Congress.

Third, in exchange for pumping his-
toric levels of money into our public education system, we are going to in-
sist on accountability. There must be a safety valve for students who are trapped in persistently failing schools. Therefore, if a school continues to fail for 3 consecutive years, the student is going to have the option of staying in school and receiving $1,500 to use toward tutoring or he could transfer to a public school or he could transfer to a charter school or even a private school if that is in his best interest.

Now why do I support this legisla-
tion? Because I know it will make a meaningful difference in the lives of young people and it will ensure that every child in this great country of ours will have the opportunity, whether he is rich or poor, to get a first class education.

How do I know this to be true? Because we have already implemented these same principles, measuring perfor-
ma nce and demanding account-
ability, in the great State of Florida. What happened as a result? We went from having 78 F-rated schools based on low test scores to only 4 F schools in the course of only a year.

Let me give you two examples. First, in my district of Orlando, Florida, there is a school called Orlo Vista Ele-
mentary School. At this school, 22 percent of the children are from low-in-
come families and they are entitled to receive the free hot lunch program. Eighty-six percent of the students are minorities. This school was rated as an F school by the State of Florida based on abysmally low test scores.

However, after measuring the stu-
dents’ performance, pumping Federal titie I dollars into the school, along with local school board money and State dollars, we were able to make sure that we cured the problem and that all children were able to read, write and perform math appropriately.

As a result, the school went from hav-
ing 30 percent of the children pass a standardized test in 1 year to over 79 percent of the students being able to pass that same test a year later. It is no longer an F school.

Earlier this month, I had the pleas-
ure of taking our U.S. Secretary of Ed-
ucation, Rod Paige, on a personal tour of this same Orlo Vista Elementary School in Orlando. I wanted him to see firsthand why the school was in the worst shape.

I took him into a reading lab, and while there I observed a little 6-year-old African-American boy reading. This is a child who, 1 month ear-
lier, was having problems with reading and was set apart.

The student/teacher ratio for this child was one-to-one. As he leaned over the shoulder watching this little child read, he was blown away and so im-
pressed. This child was flying through that book, reading as well as most adults that I know.

We were making a difference. We caught the problem and solved it with a one-to-one student/teacher ratio.

This particular situation in Orlando was not unique. For example, at Dixon Elementary School, which is up in the Panhandle in Escambia County, another F-rated school existed because of persistently failing test scores. Yet in one year, after implementing similar legislation in Florida, we saw the stu-
dents go from only 28 percent being able to pass a standardized test to this year over 91 percent passing that same test.
I genuinely believe that we can replicate the same success that we have had in Florida all across the United States by passing the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, and I urge my colleagues to support this important education reform legislation.

THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all start my remarks this evening by commending the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Nussle), as well as our ranking member, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), given the collegiality and the civility that they have demonstrated in the course of putting together a budget resolution, particularly that work that they specifically were involved with on the committee in putting together the package that we started debate on tonight and will finish tomorrow but also the conduct of the debate that we saw here this evening. I think they demonstrated by their leadership that we can have some real differences of opinion on what the best direction is that we should be taking for the sake of the country, have differences of opinion in regards to what the budget resolution should look at but do so in a civil manner. I think that was demonstrated here this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take this time, along with a few of my colleagues from the new Democratic Coalition, to continue the discussion that we are having on the budget resolution this evening. This is a very important time in the legislative process of this session of Congress because it is the budget resolution that establishes the broad frameworks that we will be filling in the spaces and the details throughout the course of this legislative year that will set the tone in regards to many of these programs, the size of tax cuts, the commitment to debt reduction, the commitment to trying to preserve and protect Medicare and Social Security for future generations. We want to devote a little bit more time this evening in regards to where we see things going as part of the new Democratic Coalition.

It is a coalition that comprises roughly 80 Members now within the Democratic Caucus. We believe in pro growth strategies. We believe in the necessity to reduce the national debt. We believe in tax relief for working families, and we believe that there are also some very crucial investments that we need to make collectively as a nation in order to see the type of economic progress and the expansion of economic opportunities, not just in the coming year but for future years.

Mr. Speaker, I have some severe reservations in regards to the Republican budget resolution that has been submitted; not the least of which is that the cornerstone of what they are offering is a very large, very sizable tax cut that is based not on this fiscal year or even next year but over the next 10 years.

Many of us believe that if surpluses do, in fact, materialize during the course of future years, and many of us hope that they will, that the economy will remain strong; that the current projections will prove accurate; that this is an excellent time for us to get serious on national debt reduction; to be serious about finding some long-term solutions to preserve Medicare, Social Security; deal with the rising crisis that we have in this Nation in regards to the cost of prescription drugs, while also being able to deliver a responsible tax relief package that all Americans will benefit from.

That is where our major point of contention is with the Republican proposal. We believe in tax relief like they do, but we would like to see tax relief that is done in a responsible and fair manner.

There have been a lot of numbers bandied about during the course of this evening and undoubtedly they will again tomorrow; but basically, the corner of the budget resolution that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Nussle) and his committee has reported out calls for a $1.6 trillion tax cut over 10 years. To compare that with the $1.4 trillion tax cut that will happen this year or to any great extent next year; but most of the tax relief that they are talking about is backloaded severely to the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th year from now. They have to do that for one simple reason: we do not have the surpluses and no one is predicting that the surpluses will be generated within the next 5 years, at least, in order to pay for a tax cut of that magnitude, so they have to backload it, hoping that the surpluses will, in fact, materialize 8, 9, 10 years from now.

Now, the average person in my district knows what is going on with this game. In fact, many of them are highly suspicious of these 10-year forecasts. They know that this is very speculative, these forecasts that are being banded about right now, that no one can predict with any degree of certainty what the economy is going to be doing next year let alone what it will be doing 5, 6, 10 years from now. In fact, it has been said that God created economists in order to make weather forecasters look good. That is exactly what we are talking about, when we are talking about economic forecasts and projected budget surpluses that may or may not materialize 7, 8, 9, 10 years from now. There was a lot of talk earlier this evening that this tax cut they are offering does not even compare to the size of the tax relief that President Kennedy introduced back in 1960, that Ronald Reagan had introduced with his economic plan back in 1981, and perhaps in real dollar terms, the size of it does not compare. However, there is one very important significant difference, and that is the context in which these tax cut proposals were offered back in 1960, 1981, and today. Because I submit that back in 1960 and 1981, they were looking at an entirely different economic and demographic situation than we are today.

But back in 1960, they were still keeping the budget in relative balance. In fact, during the decade of the 1960s, they were exercising fiscal discipline and responsibility by maintaining budgets that were within balance. In fact, the last time before the 1990s that we had a balanced budget in this country was 1969, LBJ's last budget that he submitted in his last year in office. Also, back in 1981 we were not looking at a $5.7 trillion national debt that we have to make interest payments on, which comprises roughly the third largest spending program in the entire Federal budget.

But back in 1960, they were still keeping the budget in relative balance. In fact, during the decade of the 1960s, they were exercising fiscal discipline and responsibility by maintaining budgets that were within balance. In fact, the last time before the 1990s that we had a balanced budget in this country was 1969, LBJ's last budget that he submitted in his last year in office. Also, back in 1981 we were not looking at a $5.7 trillion national debt. I believe back then the national debt was roughly $1 trillion as opposed to what we are facing today.

So there is a significant difference between what we are calling for today and what the circumstances that existed back then were.

The other significant difference is that they were not at that time facing a demographic time bomb waiting to explode. By that I mean the aging population that we have in this country, the baby boomers who are all going to start to retire at approximately the same time early next decade entering the Medicare and Social Security programs, bringing incredible fiscal pressure to bear if we cannot find long-term reforms for those programs, and that is something that I feel is getting