and churning out mindless regulations for our teachers and our States.

President Clinton really did not tell the rest of the story when he did not tell the people that of those nearly 5,000 people in the U.S. Department of Education that three-quarters of them, about 3,500, are right down the street in Washington, DC, making over twice what our average classroom teacher is making in my district.

President Clinton did not talk about ending welfare as we know it, welfare, really which has destroyed our family structure, any sense of values, self-discipline, and respect and really any hope for education. President Clinton really did not tell the rest of the story about his failed drug policy that has raised youth drug use to all-time levels and made juvenile crime epidemic in this country.

You know, the debate going on, the debate today about funding the country, and we have just been in the process of passing a resolution to continue for 4 more weeks, a lot of people say, ''Why can you not decide this?''

There are some fundamental differences about how we spend money on education, the environment, and these other issues. Most people would not know this. But, in fact, the Republicans have proposed from the beginning in their budget a vast increase in spending in education, $25 billion more over the next 7 years.

But the real debate is over how those dollars are spent, again, whether we finance bureaucrats in Washington, whether we pay to continue to support programs where students cannot read their own diplomas, where students continue to score lower in their tests and we spend more money. My community college has entrants of which over 50 percent need remedial education. So the real question is how we spend our money.

I wanted to also cite for the House and the Speaker here a story from the Orlando Sentinel that cites a report on State education and job training programs. It says State and Federal Governments spend about a billion dollars in Florida on vocational education programs. What is the result? And this is from the report: The programs fail to produce graduates or workers who can earn a decent salary. In fact, only about 20 percent of those who enter these programs completed them, and then a small percentage, 19 percent, found a job after that, and then most of them got a low-paying job and were out of the job in a short period of time.

Lawmakers in Florida were astonished, this report says, when they heard the findings.

The report also indicated that money was wasted on duplicate programs. So this debate about education and environment is paying more and getting less, and that is what this is all about.

People have to understand, because this is important, it is not just how much money you throw at the program, it is how you spend it and do we improve these programs, do we provide a better education, do our students come out with a diploma they can read and then get a job where they can earn a decent living and be a productive and capable, independent citizen in this great Nation?

So that is what the debate is about, paying more and getting less.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, again, as Paul Harvey would say, that is the rest of the story.

## APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BRITISH-AMERICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 168(b) of Public Law 102–138, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the British-American Interparliamentary Group: Mr. CLINGER, Pennsylvania, vice chair; Mr. BROWNBACK, Kansas; Mr. EMERSON, Missouri; Mr. LINDER, Georgia; Ms. MOLINARI, New York; Mr. PETRI, Wisconsin; and Ms. PRYCE, Ohio.

There was no objection.

## THE MICHAEL NEW CASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, it is an unusual thing for me to come over and do a 5-minute special order. I very seldom do that. Part of the reason that deals with the issue of Michael New, who was stripped of his position and discharged from the U.S. Army because as a military hero he was twice decorated, he refused to wear the blue beret and the shoulder patch of the United Nations. As some people say, Michael New should be thrown out. He was insubordinate, he did not listen. That is what the Army said in their court martial and their proceedings.

But I have a resolution in with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT], a good friend of mine that says that the Congress of the United States should reinstate Michael New with his rank and back to the Army because he brings to the attention of the American people more than just this individual obstinacy. He said he took an oath to the U.S. Constitution, not to the charter of the United Nations. And, quite frankly, I agree with him, and I think we have taken this new world order business a little bit too far.

I think the Michael New case is more than about a soldier that has been thrown out of the Army. I think it is a microcosm of how we as a Nation have gone so far that we have our troops under foreign command wearing the uniforms of other identities. And, quite frankly, all the money we give the United Nations, I think they blow an awful lot of it. They should be doing more peacekeeping so we would not have to send in our troops in the first place.

I just wanted to come over here for the New family, because it was a special order that was put together by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT], and I stand in support of Michael New and I oppose this new world order madness that has our troops under foreign command, wearing foreign uniforms, and I think Michael New is not an individual that has just gone off rebelliously. He is a twice-decorated veteran. He is a patriot, and I think he takes a stand that should become the subject of great debate here in the Congress of the United States.

So I thank you for belaboring that issue with me, and Mr. BARTLETT will give more information on the resolution itself because I just came over spontaneously and wanted to offer my support.

## THE HEALTH COVERAGE AVAILABILITY AND AFFORDABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to my colleagues about two items.

First, I wish to congratulate the House on the passage last evening of H.R. 3103, the Health Coverage Availability and Affordability Act. For the first time in this Congress we have passed legislation which will provide for 25 million Americans at least accessibility, affordability, and accountability in health insurance.

This legislation in its most pertinent parts provides portability. If you lose your job, you take the insurance with you. If you get a new job, you will take that insurance with you.

It also makes sure that no matter what preexisting medical condition you may have, you still qualify for health insurance.

It increases deductibility from 30 percent to 50 percent for the self-employed who provide health coverage for themselves and their employees. It will allow small businesses group coverage of insurance, will also provide medical savings accounts.

I am very hopeful the Senate will agree. This legislation is forward-thinking and positive.

### TRIBUTE TO CHARLES REED

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a tribute to a fallen hero. U.S. FBI agent Charles Reed of my district was gunned down last Friday trying to do his job to win the war against drugs, and for 16 years served the people of the tristate area of Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, in making sure we eliminate the scourge of drugs in our country.

One of the most successful agents in the history of the country, he found leads where no one else could even tell there was evidence lurking, and he